


UNIVERSITY
OF PITTSBURGH
LIBRARY




Lar.Rm.
qD20
R547r
v.15

THIS BOOK PRESENTED BY

James D. Gray





A. Lincoln

RIDPATH'S

AN ACCOUNT OF THE ORIGIN, PRIMITIVE CONDITION AND ETHNIC DEVELOPMENT
OF THE GREAT RACES OF MANKIND, AND OF THE PRINCIPAL EVENTS IN THE
EVOLUTION AND PROGRESS OF THE CIVILIZED LIFE AMONG MEN
AND NATIONS, FROM RECENT AND AUTHENTIC SOURCES.

WITH A PRELIMINARY INQUIRY ON THE TIME, PLACE AND MANNER
OF THE BEGINNING.

By JOHN CLARK RIDPATH, LL. D.,

AUTHOR OF A POPULAR HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES, ETC.

A NARRATIVE OF MORE THAN SIX THOUSAND PAGES, PROFUSELY ILLUSTRATED WITH
COLORED PLATES, RACE CHARTS, HISTORICAL MAPS, TYPE-PICTURES,
SKETCHES AND DIAGRAMS TO THE NUMBER OF MORE
THAN THREE THOUSAND.

CINCINNATI:
THE JONES BROTHERS PUBLISHING COMPANY.

PREFACE TO VOLUMES XV AND XVI.



HAVE now brought to conclusion and put into its final form the work on General History, the outlines of which were dimly conceived many years ago.

It would be impracticable, and perhaps of little profit, to trace the slow development of such a work from its first conception to the final stroke with which at length it is finished and delivered to the public. To the author such a retrospect of processes and combinations must be of much personal interest, but the reader will be concerned rather with the aggregate and final result than with the tedious evolution.

At first view it will appear to the student of history that the Ancient and the Modern World are, in their historical records, of about equal duration and importance. The beginnings of Ancient History are set, in a general way, about as far beyond the Christian Era as our own times are placed thereafter. To Ancient History belong the Classical Ages—an epoch of achievement and glory which may well challenge the most brilliant periods of the recent era. But a closer judgment of the relative importance of Ancient and Modern History will show the great preponderance of the latter. This is one of the more important facts which have impressed themselves upon the writer's mind in the preparation of these Volumes. He has come to believe in the great preeminence of the Modern Era over the most brilliant epochs of Antiquity. This is said of the aggregate and total achievements of modern times as compared with the aggregate and total achievements of any given period in the history of the Ancient World.

It is from considerations such as these that Modern History has, under the writer's hand and treatment, expanded to a considerable extent beyond the limits originally proposed. This principle has been the foundation of the

present Four-Volume Edition of the work. A single volume of the four, with the first third of the second, will be found appropriated to the History of Ancient States and Nations, while all the remaining volumes are devoted to the History of the Middle Ages, the Period of Renaissance, the Revolutionary Epoch, and the Nineteenth Century.

It is in the last-named division that the largest increment and modifications of the present edition will be discovered. To the History of Antiquity the Book on the Parthian Empire has been added in Volume I. As to the history of Greece and Rome, only incidental emendations and extensions of the narrative will be found. But in the history of our own century the whole work has been done anew, and on a larger scale.

Another important element in the growth of the present issue of this History relates to the part allotted to the most recent annals of our times. By this is meant the narrative of affairs in the different nations during the eighth and ninth decades of our century. When the work was first projected, History seemed to have reached a pause with the conclusion of the Civil War in the United States and the establishment of the German Empire in Europe. The period which the writer was thus obliged to make at the beginning of the eighth decade is at length ended, and he is now able to pursue his course with tolerable certainty for a full score of years. Nor have the course and tendency of affairs during this period been devoid of interest from a historical point of view. To this period belong the demonstration of Italian unity; the definitive establishment of a German Empire under the auspices of the House of Hohenzollern; the progressive—but somewhat broken—march of English Liberalism towards the establishment of an Imperial Federation for the whole British Empire; the vindication of the right to exist on the part of the Thiru

Republic of France; and particularly the restoration of a complete national autonomy in the United States.

It is not needed in this connection to dwell *in extenso* on the minor modifications which have suggested themselves in the composition of these volumes. It may be thought that all such departures from the original sketch for the production of a literary work are but so many evidences of the imperfection of the plan, and that references thereto are in the nature of communications at the confessional. This view, however, is at once superficial and incorrect. It proceeds upon the assumption that a literary production has the character of a mechanical contrivance rather than of an organism. Such a view runs to the effect that literature and its products are the results of a sort of infallible calculus rather than the phenomena of growth and life. As a matter of fact, every true product in the world of letters has the analogy of the tree which proceeds from germination by way of expansion, leafage, and blossom, to final completeness of height and form and the bearing of fruit. The fable of the birth of Minerva is not repeated in literary production. Even the poem, most imaginative and immediate of all our mental products, does not spring full-winged from the flames of imagination. No work of art is conceived in its completeness by a single effort of the mind. How much less should we expect a literary work, extending through thousands of pages, and covering in its subject matter the vast panorama of human affairs from the primitive shadows of the heroic ages to the broad revelation of the present hour, to be produced in all its entirety and amplitude in the first concept of the outline!

From these considerations, I have been willing that this History of the World should be improved according to the laws of growth and development, until it has at length reached its present form and substance. It only remains to add a single remark relative to the difficulties of composing a true history of recent events. Contrary to what would seem to be the manifest principles of historical narrative, it is the recent event and not the remote which is most difficult of just treatment. In

the first place, the evidences of the real nature of current affairs are all stained and swollen like rivulets under the disturbance of last night's rain. The waters are muddy and perturbed. Their course is difficult to discover. Channels have been produced by the temporary deluge, which will pass with the fortnight and leave no further trace. The true volume of present affairs is difficult to estimate. The senses are confused by portents in the earth and heavens, which nothing signify.

In still another particular the production of current history is greatly embarrassed and distracted. This is the necessity of the writer to constitute a part of that vast society, the movement of which he is expected to describe. He is himself borne along with the current. He must needs feel its fluctuations. Anon he finds himself in the middle of the stream, or borne at intervals into the whirling eddy near the shore, from which point of view universal nature seems to revolve around him. He is expected to share the sympathies, the beliefs, the passions of the current age. He is expected to be swayed by the dominant prejudice, to think as his party thinks, to do as the majority do, to dream the prevailing dreams, to see the anticipated vision. He is expected to wear the form and fashion of the times; to be pleased with the current pleasure; to smile, to sigh, to weep, to sleep and wake, to go and come, to live and to die, even as do those with whom he is associated in the destinies of life. This setting of the writer among the very facts, the tendency of which he is expected to discover and describe, is the most serious of all drawbacks to the accuracy and fidelity of his work. I can not hope that what I have written in this Fourth Volume, closely involved as it is with the movements of the current age, shall be wholly free from the coloring of prejudice and the mistakes arising from the personal equation. Doubtless there is in the following pages much chromatic and spherical aberration; but I cherish the hope that the reader will find much to have been faithfully delineated and lifted somewhat above the level of the political and partisan distortion which is unfortunately the prevailing vice of our times.

J. C. R.

CONTENTS OF VOLUMES XV AND XVI.

	PAGE.
PREFACE,	I-3
CONTENTS,	3-22
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS,	23-27
INTRODUCTION,	29-30

BOOK TWENTY-FIRST.—THE UNITED STATES.

CHAPTER CXXII.—AMERICAN MIDDLE AGES.

General Historical Outlook after Waterloo.—Transformation of Society.—Aspect of the Nineteenth Century.—Progress of the United States in Particular.—Sketch of James Monroe.—Policy of the New Administration.—Haytian Complication.—Difficulties with the North-western Indians.—Manner of Settlement.—Admission of Mississippi.—West Indian Piracy.—Question of Internal Improvements.—National Road and Erie Canal.—First Passage of the Seminole War.—Jackson's Part Therein.—Cession of Florida to the United States.—First Commercial Crisis.—Admission of Illinois and Alabama.—Missouri Imbroghio.—The Compromise.—Re-election of Monroe.—The West Indian Piracy Again.—Question of the South American Republics.—Visit of Lafayette.—Presidential Election of 1824.—Sketch of John Quincy Adams.—Revival of Partisanship.—Difficulties with the Creeks.—Deaths of Jefferson and Adams.—Disappearance of Morgan.—Rise of the Tariff Issue.—Character of the Epoch.—Election of Jackson to the Presidency.—Sketch of the New Executive.—The Political Revolution.—Question of rechartering the Bank.—Whig and Democrat.—Tariff Agitation renewed.—Webster and Hayne.—Nullification.—Black Hawk War.—The Cherokees.—Continuance of the Seminole War.—Story of Osceola.—End of the Bank of the United States.—Distillation of Funds.—Re-election of Jackson.—Foreign Complications.—Necrology of the Fourth Decade.—Disasters.—Admission of Arkansas and Michigan.—Farewell of Jackson.—Sketch of Van Buren.—Subjugation of the Seminoles.—Second Financial Crisis.—Independent Treasury Bill.—The Canaanian Rebellion.—Character of Van Buren's Administration.—Election of Harrison to the Presidency.—Statistics and Growth.—Sketch of Harrison.—His Death.—Notice of Tyler.—His Break with the Whig Party.—North-eastern Boundary Question Settled.—Disturbance in Rhode Island.—

Completion of Bunker Hill Monument.—Land Troubles in New York.—Rise of the Mormons.—Their Exodns to Utah, 37-68

CHAPTER CXXIII.—MEXICAN WAR AND SIXTH DECADE.

The Texas Agitation.—Rebellion and Independence of the Province.—Question of Annexation.—Election of Polk to the Presidency.—The First Telegraph.—Texas admitted into the Union.—Also Florida and Iowa.—Sketch of Polk.—Anger of Mexico.—Question of Boundaries.—American Army on the Rio Grande.—Outbreak of the War.—Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma.—War Spirit in the United States.—Plan of the Campaigns.—Capture of Monterey.—Expedition of Kearney.—Fremont in the Rockies.—Revolution in California.—Scott Commander-in-Chief.—Battle of Buena Vista.—Capture of Vera Cruz.—Invasion of Mexico.—Battle of Cerro Gordo.—Conflicts about the Capital.—Capture of Mexico.—End of the War.—Terms of the Treaty.—Oregon Boundary Question.—Settlement of the International Line.—Discovery of Gold in California.—Rush for the Mines.—Founding of Smithsonian Institution.—Its Organization and Work.—Necrology of Fifth Decade.—Admission of Wisconsin.—The New Cabinet Offices.—Presidential Election of 1848.—Questions Involved.—Sketch of Taylor.—Proposition to admit California.—Nature of the Issue.—New Mexico organized.—Passage of the Omnibus Bill.—Death of the President.—Sketch of Fillmore.—Retirement of Henry Clay.—Political Sentiment of the Times.—The Cuban Imbroghio.—Failure of Lopez.—Policy of Fillmore.—The Newfoundland Fishery Question.—Visit of Kossuth to the United States.—Arctic Voyages of Franklin and Kane.—Deaths of Calhoun, Clay, and Webster.—Cuba and the Tripartite Treaty.—Presidential Election of 1852.—Position of Parties.—Sketch of President Pierce.—Question of the Pacific Railroad agitated.—

ernment.—Conscription Act and Draft Riot.—Suspension of Habeas Corpus.—Lessons and Results of the Draft.—Sherman's Work between Corinth and Mobile.—Forest's Raid.—Fort Pillow.—The Red River Expedition.—Battles of Mansfield and Pleasant Hill.—Damming the River.—Ascendency of Grant.—He is promoted to Lieutenant-General.—Extent of the Union Army.—Plan of the Campaign of 1864.—Sherman's Progress from Chattanooga to Atlanta.—Battles before that City.—Death of McPherson.—Hood supersedes Johnston.—Siege of Atlanta.—The Capture.—Hood's Invasion of Tennessee.—Battles of Franklin and Nashville.—Ruin of the Confederate Army.—Sherman's March to the Sea.—Capture of Savannah.—Advance against Columbia.—Fighting *en route*.—Capture of Charleston.—Fayetteville.—Hampton and Kilpatrick.—Johnston restored to Command.—Averasborough and Bentonville.—Capture of Raleigh.—Negotiations of Sherman with Johnston.—Stoneman's Raid.—Results of the Expedition.—Farragut captures Mobile.—Fort Fisher taken.—Exploit of Cushing.—Work of the Confederate Cruisers.—The *Saratoga*.—The *Santee*.—The *Nashville*.—The *Florida*.—Other Privateer Craft.—Story of the *Alabama*.—Her Destruction by the *Kearsarge*.—Movements of the Army of the Potomac.—The Confederacy on the Defensive.—Lull in the East.—Counter-movements of Meade and Lee.—Grant at the Head of the Armies.—Beginning of the Advance.—Battles of the Wilderness.—Sheridan's Cavalry Raid.—Cold Harbor.—Losses of the Campaign.—Grant's Movement by the Flank.—Investment of Petersburg.—Siege on the Shenandoah.—He is superseded by Hunter.—Peshmont.—Early crosses the Blue Ridge.—Battle of Monocacy.—Defeat of Wright at Winchester.—Sheridan given Command.—Defeats Early.—Fisher's Hill.—Union Disaster at Winchester.—Rally and Victory of Sheridan.—Destruction in the Shenandoah Valley.—Continuance of Siege of Petersburg.—Spring Hill.—Battle of Five Forks.—Capture of Petersburg and Richmond by the Union Army.—Retreat of Lee.—Confederate Surrender at Appomattox.—Terms of Capitulation.—Surrender of Johnston.—Collapse of the Confederacy.—Capture and Imprisonment of Davis.—Re-election of Lincoln.—Admission of Nevada.—Question of Finance.—Coin and Paper Money.—Chase's Work in the Treasury.—System of Revenue.—Greenback Currency.—United States Bonds.—National Banks and Currency.—Merchandise in Silver and Gold.—Lincoln's second Inaugural.—He is assassinated.—Murderous Assaults on the Government.—Fate of the Conspirators.—Character of Lincoln.—His Funeral.—Johnson in the Presidency.—Amnesty Proclamation.—Subsidence of the Armies.—The War Debt.—Attitude of Foreign Powers toward the

United States.—Mexican Finance of Napoleon III.—Death of Maximilian. Success of the Atlantic Cable.—Money Order System established in the United States.—Organization of Western Territories.—Purchase of Alaska, 100-174

CHAPTER CXXV.—EPOCH OF RECONSTRUCTION.

Difficulty between the President and Congress.—Nature of the Issue.—Reconstruction Proclamation.—Congress pursues its Own Course.—Civil Rights Bill.—Johnson's Denunciations.—Philadelphia Convention.—The President makes a Tour of the Country.—His Speeches. Mutual Recriminations.—Reconstruction Plan of Congress.—Fourteenth Amendment.—Vetoes.—Plan Civil and Plan Military.—Re-admission of the Ten Seceded States.—Affair of the Attorney-General.—Dismissal of Stanton.—The Impeachment Trial.—Grant nominated and elected President.—Sketch of the New Executive.—The New Cabinet.—Completion of the Pacific Railway.—The Fifteenth Amendment.—Story of Black Friday.—Completion of Reconstruction.—Ninth Census of the United States.—Project to annex Santo Domingo.—Day of Settlement with Great Britain.—History of Alabama Claims.—The Geneva Award.—Great Railway Development.—Burning of Chicago.—Settlement of North-western Boundary Question.—Military Methods in the Government.—Grant's Southern Policy.—Ku-Klux Epoch.—Re-election of Grant.—Overthrow and Death of Greeley.—Great Fire in Boston.—History of the Modoc War.—Their Treachery.—Reduction and Imprisonment of the Savages.—Continued Troubles in the South.—The Louisiana Imbroglio.—Credit Mobilier Scandal and Investigation.—Financial Panic of 1873.—Construction of the Northern Pacific Railway.—The Texas and Pacific Line.—Admission of Colorado.—Securology.—Coming of the Centennial Year. The Commission.—Buildings of the great Exposition in Philadelphia.—Sketch of the Centennial Exhibition and Ceremonies. Results of the Anniversary.—Disposition of the Buildings.—War with the Sioux.—Destruction of Custer and his Forces on the Big Horn.—Overthrow of the Sioux Nation.—Capture of the Chiefs.—Twenty-third Presidential Election.—Political Questions of 1876.—The Disputed Presidency.—Appointment of the Joint High Commission.—Decision in Favor of Hayes and Wheeler, 174-193

CHAPTER CXXVI.—LATEST PERIOD.

Sketch of President Hayes.—The Inaugural Address.—The New Cabinet.—Railroad Strike of 1877.—Riot and Destruction of Property.—Scenes in Pittsburg, Chicago, and San Francisco.—Nez Percé War.—Question of Remonetization of Sil-

ver.—History of the Standard Unit. Destruction of the Monetary Character of Silver. Nevada Silver-mines.—Nature of the Resumption Act.—Agitation for the Restoration of the Silver Dollar.—Success of the Measure. The Yellow Fever Epidemic of 1858.—Question of the Fisheries.—Hull-fax Award against the United States.—Establishment of the Chinese Embassy at Washington.—Institution of the Lifesaving Service.—Nature of the Work. The Resumption Act. Approximation of Gold and Paper Money.—General Character of the Administration.—National Conventions of 1850.—Platforms and Candidates.—Claims of the Third Party. Election of Garfield and Arthur.—Measures of the Forty-sixth Congress.—Refunding the Public Debt. World Tour of General Grant.—Census of 1850.—Lessons and Deductions therefrom.—Necrology of the Quadrennium.—Sketch of President Garfield.—His Inaugural Address.—The New Cabinet.—Question of Civil Service Reform.—Nature of the Issue.—Break in the Republican Party. Affair of Conkling and Platt.—Shooting of the President.—Story of his Decline and Death. The Funeral.—Questions involved in the Case of Guiteau.—Sketch of Arthur.—Cabinet Changes.—The Star Route Conspiracy. The Trial and Results.—Progress in Physical Science. Epoch of great Inventions.—Story of the Telephone. Contributions thereto of Bell, Gray, and Edison. The Phonograph.—Nature of the Instrument.—Possible Uses. The Electric Light. Evolution of the Invention.—Work of Edison.—Results of Electric Lighting.—Great Structures of the Times.—Building of the Brooklyn Bridge.—Other Structures of like Character. Washington Bridge in particular. Subsidence of real Political Questions. The Tariff Issue.—Considered *in Extensu*.—Exposition of the Doctrine of Free Trade.—Theory of Incidental Protection elucidated.—Principles and Doctrines of Limited Protection.—High Protection. Prohibitory Tariffs.—Recurrence of the Issue in American Politics.—Position of the Parties.—Difficulty of Political Alignment on the Issue.—Presidential Aspirants of 1854.—The Nominations.—Election of Cleveland and Hendricks.—Political Sequels of

the Election.—Retirement of General Sherman from Command of the Army.—General Sheridan succeeds Him.—Completion and Dedication of the Washington Monument.—Sketch of President Cleveland.—The New Cabinet.—Question of Official Patronage.—Revival of Civil War Memories.—Epoch of Military Memoirs.—Sickness and Death of General Grant.—Of General McClellan.—Of General Hancock.—Of General Logan.—Of Vice-President Hendricks.—Of Horatio Seymour.—Of Samuel J. Tilden.—Of Henry Ward Beecher.—Of Chief-Justice Waite.—Outline of the History of the Supreme Court.—Sketch of Chief-Justice Waite. Appointment of Judge Lamar to the Supreme Bench. Judge Fuller appointed Chief-Justice. Death of Roscoe Conkling.—Sketch of his Character and Career.—Labor Agitations of the Period.—Causes of the Disturbance.—Strikes of 1886.—Haymarket Tragedy in Chicago.—Charleston Earthquake.—Nature of such Convulsions.—Work of the Forty-ninth Congress.—Pension Legislation.—Interstate Commerce Bill.—Bad Features of the Measure.—Party Politics.—Factitious Issues.—Question of Protection and Reform of the Revenue.—The President's Position.—Renomination of Cleveland.—Candidates and Platforms of 1888.—Election of General Harrison.—Admission into the Union of South and North Dakota, Montana, and Washington.—Establishment of the Department of Agriculture.—Sketch of Harrison.—His Inauguration.—The New Cabinet.—Centennial of the American Republic.—The Celebration at New York.—Outline of Ceremonies. Review of Constitutional History.—Philosophy of the Event.—Organization of the Enterprise in New York City.—The Anniversary Proper. The Exercises in Wall Street.—The Great Parade. The Banquet.—Holiday in the City.—Special Parade of May-day. Historical Allegories.—Easy Movement of the Multitudes.—The Samson Complication.—Condition of the Islands. Difficulties of the Americans and Germans.—Destruction of the War-ships.—Settlement of the Trouble.—Story of the Johnstown Flood.—The Pan-American Congress.—The International Maritime Congress.—Conclusion, 193-248

BOOK TWENTY-SECOND.—GREAT BRITAIN.

CHAPTER CXXXVII.—LAST TWO HANOVERS.

Europe after Waterloo. Great Britain least shaken.—Napoleon's Dread of England.—Her Policy in the Age of Revolution.—Madame Krieger and the Holy Alliance.—Part's thereto.—Principles of the Compact.—Peril of its Continuance.—Position of Great Britain relative to

the Alliance.—The Hanover-Brunswick Dynasty.—George III. and the Prince of Wales.—The Regency.—Accession of George IV.—Sketch of his Life and Character.—His Double-Dealing. Liverpool and Castlereagh.—General Conditions of the Period.—Revival of Revolutionary Spirit.—Revolt against Ferdinand VII. He is supported by the Holy Alliance.—Interest of Great Britain in Greek Revolution.—Independence of Greece.—

Peel reforms British Criminal Code.—Savagery of the Former Jurisprudence.—Work of Sir Samuel Romilly.—Sir James Mackintosh.—The Acts of 1826.—Incompleteness of English Reforms.—Canning Ministry.—Death of the Duke of York.—Wellington Prime Minister.—Repeal of Test Act.—Rise of the Catholic Question.—Outbreak of the Burmese War.—Invasion of Borneo.—Siege of Ava.—Subjugation of the Burmese.—The Treaty.—Apparition of Daniel O'Connell.—First Measures of Catholic Reform.—Removal of Disabilities.—Retreat of the Ministry before the Catholic Party.—Passage of Relief Bill.—Humiliation and Death of George IV.—Note of his Character and Reign.—The Duke of Clarence Heir to the Crown.—Note on Queen Caroline.—Sketch of William IV.—Prenotations of Parliamentary Reform.—Existing State of Representation.—Growth and Evolution of the House of Lords and House of Commons.—Character of the Commons.—Jealousy of Royalty thereto.—Historical Vicissitudes of the Lower House.—Vices in the System of Parliamentary Election.—Evils of the British Land System.—Development of Great Cities.—Pocket and Rotten Boroughs.—Attitude of Toryism towards Reform.—Effects of French Revolution of 1830 in Great Britain.—Opposition to the Reform of Parliament.—Fall of the Wellington Ministry.—Russell and the Reform Bill.—Agitation of the Country.—The Landed Aristocracy in Opposition to Reform.—Political Crisis of 1830-31.—Deadlock between the Houses.—How to put down Tory Opposition.—Retreat of the Lords.—Passage of the Reform Bill.—Unpopularity of Wellington.—Salutary Effects of the Reform.—Equalization of Representation.—Remaining Restrictions.—Reformed Parliament of 1832.—Wilberforce Agitates the Abolition of Slavery.—Passage of the Emancipation Bill.—Character of the Measure.—Second Agitation by O'Connell.—Irish Question Emergent.—The Irish Establishment.—Religious Conditions in the Island.—O'Connell proposes Disestablishment.—Opposition to the Measure.—Irish Insurrection.—Coercion Bill.—Fall of the Grey Ministry.—Accession of Melbourne.—Abolition of Irish Bishops.—Ascendency of O'Connell.—His Character and Powers.—Question of the Poor Laws.—New Statute on Pauperism.—Passage of the Municipal Act.—The Tithe Commutation Act.—Relations of Great Britain to Belgic Revolution.—General Policy of England in the matter of European Disturbance.—Character of the Melbourne Ministry.—Death of William IV., 253-274

CHAPTER CXXVIII.—EPOCH OF CHARTISM.

Vicissitudes of the Royal Houses.—The English Dynasty.—Descent of the Crown to Victoria.—Her Age and Character at the Accession.—The Ceremonies.—Separation of Hanover from

England.—The Young Queen with the Tories.—Lord Brougham.—Lynnhurst.—Other Notables of Parliament.—Continuance of Reformatory Tendencies.—Durham's Career in Canada.—Great Extension of the Applied Sciences.—Discoveries and Inventions.—Genesis of Steam Navigation.—First Voyage Across the Atlantic.—Applications of Electricity.—Wheatstone's Work.—Railroad Evolution.—Project of the Penny Post.—Sir Rowland Hill.—The Post Debate in Parliament.—Passage of the Post Bill.—Prenotations of Chartism.—Origin of the Charter and its Provisions.—Opposition of the Poor and Middle Classes thereto.—Practical Failure of the Reform Bill of 1832.—The Real English People.—They clamor for the Charter.—Causes of Disaffection in England.—Career of Thom.—Heroes of Chartism.—Henry Vincent in Particular.—Popularity of the Cause.—Agitation of the Masses.—Work of the Orators.—Monster Meetings.—Conflict with the Authorities.—Banishment of the Leaders.—Ebb and Flow of the Movement.—Troubles in Jamaica.—The Issue in the Home Government.—Overthrow of the Melbourne Ministry.—Question of the Bed-chamber.—Absurdity of the Crisis.—Return of Melbourne.—Disruption of the Whigs.—Accession of Peel to Power.—Probable Extinction of the English Guelphs.—Relation of Victoria to the Dynasty.—The Marriage Project.—Choice of Prince Albert.—His Relation to the Queen and the Throne.—His Part in Public and Domestic Affairs.—His Character.—His Career.—Project of Arbitration for Military Quarrels.—Outbreak of the Opium War.—Antecedents of the Conflict.—Rights of the Chinese.—Bad Faith of Great Britain respecting the Opium Trade.—Conduct of the Traders.—Policy of the Government after the Beginning of Hostilities.—Demand of the Chinese Authorities.—Destruction of Opium in Canton.—Sending out of the Fleet.—Victory of the English.—Helplessness of the Chinese Government.—Concessions of the Treaty.—The Indemnity.—Melbourne Ministry weakens.—Beginnings of Public Education in Great Britain.—First Grants of Public Money.—The Educational Societies.—An Annual Appropriation conceded.—Foundations of the Modern System laid.—Position of Statesmen on the Project.—Other Important Measures of the Late Ministry. The Affair of Stockdale.—Sunday Opening of the British Museum.—Hume defends the Measure.—Affairs in the East.—Rise of Mehemet Ali.—Condition of the Turkish Government.—Conquests of Mehemet and Ibrahim.—Interference of the Western Powers.—English Fleet in Eastern Mediterranean.—Mehemet obliged to yield.—The Treaty.—Attitude of France.—Gizot Prime Minister.—Quietus of the Melbourne Ministry.—Peel Prime Minister.—First News from Cabul.—Philosophy of the Cabul Situation.—Interest of Great Britain

in, Algha, 1850.—Shah Sujah and Dost Mohammed.—Destiny of Russia.—Story of Alexander Burnes.—Walls of England with Dost Mohammed.—Sir W. M.—23rd of June.—Heart of the Key of London.—Machinettes.—Exposition.—Resurrection of the Magicians.—Tearing of Beulah.—Supremacy of Dost.—Insurrection of Cabul.—Akbar Khan.—Massacre of the English.—Surrender of Peshawar.—Harass of the Sepoys.—Retreat of the English.—The Women given up.—Total Destruction of the English.—Doctor Brydon.—Recovery of the English.—Recapture of Cabul.—Rescue of the English Women.—Total Losses.—O'Connell in Parliament.—His Attitude towards Parties.—The Agitation for Repeal of the Union.—Sketch of the Relations of Ireland with England.—The Act of Union.—Disproportion of Irish Representation.—Subordination of Irish Interests.—Sentiments of the Irish.—Plan of O'Connell.—His Power over his Countrymen.—Hated of the Conservatives.—The Monster Meetings.—Ephemerality of the Population.—Ascendency of O'Connell over the Irish.—Question of Physical Force.—O'Connell appeals to Historic Memories.—Interference of the British Government.—Suppression of the Clontarf Meeting.—Dissensions of the Irish.—Prosecution of O'Connell.—Waning of His Influence.—His Death.—Condition of the English Minors.—Parliamentary Investigation.—Passage of Lord Ashley's Bill.—The Factories Act.—Effort to establish Secular Universities.—The Toll-roads Question.—"Daughters of Rebecca."—The Mazzini Inauguration in London.—O'Connell and Queen Poona.—Question of Protection and Free Trade.—Nature of Industrial Conditions in the British Islands.—Lagging of Agricultural Pursuits.—Corn Law of 1870.—Protective Policy of the Eighteenth Century.—Great Britain compared with the United States.—Contrast of the two Countries.—Lagging of Manufactures in America.—Protective System here Reversed.—Growth of English Manufacturing Terms.—Refractment of the Corn Law.—Its Effects.—Agreement of Whigs and Tories on the Protective System.—Religion of that System to the House of Lords.—That Body a Landed Aristocracy.—Opening of the Struggle of 1846.—Anti-corn Law League.—Richard Cobden.—Crisis and Distress in Lancashire.—Union of Cobden and Bright.—Aversion of O'Connell.—Apparent Hopelessness of the Cause.—The Argument of Starvation.—Pillage of the Potato Rot in Ireland.—Dependency of the Irish on the Potato.—Spread of Terror.—The Crystal Palace in England.—The Free Traders versus the Protection.—The Cornlaw Lunatics.—Averred to be the Understanding of the English People.—The Irish as they are.—Emergency of the Government.—Union compels Free-trade stipulations.—The Ancient System overthrown.—Appanage of Privilege.—His Resentment of the Leader-

ship of the Aristocracy.—Provisions of the Reform Bill of 1832.—Desperate Condition of Ireland.—Coercion Bill proposed.—Position of Parties thereon.—Defeat of the Ministry.—Interest of Great Britain in the Arctic Regions.—Expedition of Sir John Franklin.—Uncertainty of His Fate.—Liberty at Recovery.—The Spanish Marriage Project.—Nature of the Issue.—Views and Preferences of France.—The Trick of the Marriage.—Great Britain beaten.—Futility of the French Scheme.—Its Ridiculous Outcome.—Last Act of Chartism.—European Revolutions of 1848.—Opposite Conditions in Great Britain.—Genesis of English Liberty.—Solidity of the British Constitution.—Hopes of the Chartist.—Their Policy.—The Monster Petition.—The Proposed Procession.—Shall we Fight?—Alarm in London.—Preparations for Defense.—The Procession forbidden.—Weak Ending of the Enterprise.—Survival of Chartist Principles.—Their Foothold in the British Constitution.—Parallel in American History.—Divisions of the Irish Patriots.—Rise of Young Ireland.—O'Brien and Meagher.—Other Leaders.—Rally of the Irish Students.—Mitchel and His Party.—Rebellion advocated.—Effects of the French Revolution of 1848 in Ireland.—Tone of *The United Irishman*.—The Emergency in Parliament.—Mitchel arrested and transported.—Effects of the Act.—The Insurrection.—Arrest and Condemnation of the Leaders.—Commutation of the Sentences.—Consequences of the Disturbance.—Discouragement of the Irish.—Subsequent Career of the Revolutionists.—Irish Exodus to America.—Problem of Ireland in the United States.—Mutual Gifts of the Two Peoples.—Story of the Affair of Don Pacifico.—Palmerston forces a Settlement.—Death of Sir Robert Peel.—Tendency to Formalism in the Church of England.—*Sacra Echesia Rediviva*.—Project of Phil IX.—Opening of the Flaminian Gate.—Wrath of the English People.—Russell's Letter.—Parties in Parliament.—Rome Aided by Political Divisions.—Passage of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. 274-323

CHAPTER CXXIX.—FROM HYDE PARK TO BOSPORUS.

The Prince Consort advises First International Exhibition.—Albert's Place in English Society.—His Mental Characteristics.—He speaks at the Mayor's Banquet.—Antagonism awakened.—Philosophy of the British Opposition.—Nature of English Progress.—Objections to the World's Fair.—The Royal Commission.—Hyde Park chosen.—Buxton and his Crystal Palace.—Change in Public Opinion.—Formal Opening of the Exposition.—Queen's Account of the Day and the Event.—Duration of the Fair.—Results of the Enterprise.—Subsequent Expositions.—Their Real Significance.—Appanage of Lord Palmerston.—

Sketch of His Career.—His Sympathy with Napoleon and the *Coup d'Etat*.—Favors Hungarian Revolution.—The Queen and Prince offended.—Lord Palmerston dismissed.—The *Coup d'Etat* makes Uneasiness in England.—Organization of the Militia.—Tennyson's Verses.—Dread of Bonaparte.—The Militia Bill.—Formation of the Derby Ministry.—Parliamentary Career of Macaulay.—Death of the Duke of Wellington.—Ode of the Laureate.—Disloyalty in the Government.—Gladstone's First Victory.—Formation of the Coalition Cabinet.—Rise of the Eastern Question.—Its Nature.—Place of Turkey in Europe.—Position of Constantinople.—The City falls under the Dominion of Islam.—Original Character of the Turks.—Their Attitude towards the Rest of Europe.—The Ottoman Sickness.—Condition of the Subject Peoples in Turkey.—Position of the Russian Empire.—Plans and Mistakes of Czar Peter.—Possible Outlets of Russia to the Sea.—The South-east and the South-west Passage.—Pressure of Russia.—The Ottoman Power.—Error in the Founding of St. Petersburg.—Projects and Dreams of Catharine.—Growth and Aggressiveness of Russia.—Apprehensions of the Western States.—Condition of Affairs during the Reign of Nicholas.—Decadence of Turkey.—Czar Nicholas visits Great Britain.—He uncovers his Purposes.—England draws back.—Why Great Britain desired the Maintenance of the Ottoman Power.—Syria and Jerusalem a Factor in the Problem.—Antipathy of France and Russia.—Napoleon must make War.—The Religious Question in Turkey.—The Czar makes Overtures to Great Britain.—He discovers the Sick Man.—England will not share the Estate.—Treaty of Kutchnk-Kainarjli.—Position of Lord Russell.—Russell's Construction of the Treaty.—Mentschikoff's Demands.—Conference at Vienna.—The Porte will fight.—Useless Negotiations.—Napoleon's Correspondence with the Czar.—Beginning of War.—Western Fleets and Armies in the East.—The Black Sea.—Destruction of Turkish Fleet.—Declarations of War.—Attitude of Lord Palmerston.—The War Spirit in Great Britain.—Palmerston resigns.—His Recall.—His Conduct as Home Secretary.—Episode of the Cholera in England.—Palmerston's Reply to the Presbytery of Edinburgh.—The Ticket-of-leave System adopted for the Penal Colonies.—Effects of the Measure.—Statute against Smoke and Soot.—Concerning Church Burial, 324-343

CHAPTER CXXX.—SEPOY REBELLION.

General View of India.—The Indie Race.—First Impact of Europeans on the East.—Sketch of the Indian Empire.—Appearance of the East India Company.—Character of British Organization in India.—Relations of the Colonial Government and the Native Kings.—Business of Great

Britain in the East.—The Hindus as Soldiers.—Position of the Bengalese Army.—Indian Caste and its Results.—Hauteur of the Brahminds.—Mohammedanism as a Factor.—Sepoys reduced in Rank.—Exclusiveness of the Sepoy Element.—Difficuity of Discipline in the Army.—Clive and Dalhousie.—Reforms and Projects of the Latter.—Physical Improvements in India.—Shock to Hindu Prejudices.—Change in the Sepoy Armies.—Story of the Greased Cartridges.—Outbreak of the Rebellion at Meerut.—Spread of the Mutiny.—First Conflicts with the English Forces.—Setting up of the Obsolete King of Delhi.—Contagion of the Revolt.—Alarm of the English.—Affairs at Calcutta.—The News in England.—Measures of Lord Canning to suppress the Insurrection.—Bringing of the English Armament from China.—Ontram ordered from Persia.—Saving of the Punjab from Insurrection.—Stratagem of Montgomery.—The Revolt in Oudh.—Crisis at Lucknow.—Death of Lawrence.—Beginning of the Siege.—Cawnpore.—Inefficiency of Sir Hugh Wheeler.—Terrible Character of the Insurrection.—Apparition of Nana Sahib.—Story of Amizulah Khan.—The Nana called to the Assistance of the English.—Horrors of the Siege.—The Capitulation.—Destruction of the Prisons.—Tale of the Prison-house of Cawnpore.—Murder of the Women and Children.—Fate of Nana Sahib.—Revival of the English Cause.—Efforts to heal the Rebellion.—Capture of Delhi by the Sepoys.—Retaking of the City.—End of the Indian Emperor.—Sufferings of the English Garrison in Lucknow.—Breaking of the Storm.—Defence of the English Garrison.—Approach of Havelock.—The Relief.—Continuance of the Siege.—Horrible Condition of the English.—Expedition of Colin Campbell.—His March to Lucknow.—Battles Around the City.—"Dinna ye hear it?"—Raising of the Siege.—Withdrawal of the Garrison.—Death of Havelock.—Final Suppression of the Rebellion.—Lucknow recaptured.—Death of Peel and Holson.—Re-establishment of Civil Authority in India.—Honors for the Conquerors Living and Dead.—Condition of Affairs after the Mutiny.—How to deal with the Insurgents.—Measures adopted by the Government.—Reorganization of the Company.—Confiscation of the Lands.—Policy of Canning.—Opposition thereto in England.—The Hindus accept the Situation.—Sketch of the East India Company.—Its Charters, Rights and Renewals.—Nature of the Company Government.—Extension of its Authority.—Administration of Hastings.—Pitt revolutionizes the Company.—Its Abolition in 1834.—The Government at the Time of the Mutiny.—Transfer of the Company's Authority to the Crown.—Office of Governor-General.—The Councils.—The Queen proclaimed Sovereign.—New Era in India.—Orsini attempts Napoleon's Life.—Effects of the Event in Eng-

Policy of Palmerston.—The Congress proposed for Berlin.—Nature of the Measure.—Its Character.—American History.—Familiarity between a British Crime and a Crime.—Last Days of the Palmerston Ministry.—The War in China.—Reasons of England and France for Hostilities against the Chinese.—Punishment of Canton.—China considered as a Subject.—Palmerston announces Success.—*Prison and The Origin of Spies*. 344-372

CHAPTER CXXXI.—SUFFRAGE REFORM AND AMERICAN CONFEDERATION.

The Derby Ministry.—The Jewish Question in Parliament.—Prejudice against the Race.—Exclusion of Jews from Office.—Policy of Gradual Emancipation.—Election of Rothschild and Salomonson to Parliament.—Nature of the Parliamentary Oath.—"On the True Faith of a Christian."—Second Election of the Jews.—Their Admission to the House.—Condition of the British Poor.—Landed Property and Political Rights.—Obstructions to English Reform.—Slow Progress in Reformatory Movements.—Beating the Law.—Political Hypocrisy.—Method of Indirection.—Loaning Land for Political Uses.—Removal of the Landed Qualification for Membership in Parliament.—Colonization of British Columbia.—Question of the Loman Islands.—British Protectorate.—Gladstone's Mission.—Greek Revolution of 1862.—Shall English Workmen be enfranchised?—General Condition of British Society.—Cry of the Common Man.—Conservative Leadership of Disraeli.—Ascendency of Napoleon III.—Cry of Reform in England.—Shall the Conservatives lead the Movement?—Disraeli proposes a Franchise Act.—Which does not enfranchise.—Debate on the Measure.—Rivalry of Palmerston and Russell.—The former becomes Premier.—The New Cabinet.—Colclen's *Mot*.—Death of Man o' War.—Sketch of His Career and His Writings.—Strained Relations of England with Foreign Powers.—English Views of Napoleon III.—British Distrust of the Emperor.—Commercial Treaty with France.—Influence of Colclen.—Abrogation of Dupes.—Effects of the Wine trade in England.—Question of the Paper Duty.—The Argument.—The Duty abolished.—Palmerston inherits the Question of Suffrage Reform.—The Liberal Bill of 1860.—Nature of its Provisions.—The Measure withdrawn.—Our Deal of Troubles with China.—Shall British Ambassadors be admitted to Peking?—Lord Elgin's Letters to the Summer Palace.—Civil War in Syria.—Origin of the Dupes and Maronites.—Mutual Interests of England and France interfere.—British Protectorate established in Syria.—Pasha's Ministry and American Civil War.—Refranchisement by Countries.—American asks Great Britain to share liberally.—And gets a share.—British withdrawal of Suez.

Logic of the Situation.—Attitude of Great Britain toward the Southern Confederacy.—Declaration of Neutrality.—Sarcasm of Palmerston.—Epoch of falsehood and Injustice.—Effects thereof in the United States.—What Excess might England give for her Conduct?—Question of the Cotton Supply.—Blockade of the Southern Ports.—Strained Logic of the American Government.—Sympathies of the English Workmen.—The Mason and Slidell Episode.—Unlawful Act of the *San Jacinto*.—Precipitate Action of the British Government.—Antipathy to the American Republic.—English Theory of Society contradicted by the United States.—Great Britain becomes the Naval Base of the Confederacy.—Fitting out of the Privateers.—Their Work of Destruction.—American Protests.—Adams at St. James.—"This is War."—Sequel to the Cruise of the *Alabama*.—Organization of the Geneva Tribunal.—The "Three Rules" for Neutral Nations.—Decision in Favor of the United States.—Position of British Statesmen towards our National Government.—Lessons and Reflections.—Danish Complication of 1862.—Alexandra of Denmark becomes Princess of Wales.—Napoleon refuses to aid Great Britain.—Last Parliamentary Battle of Palmerston.—His Victory and Death.—Domestic Life of the Royal Family.—The Saxe-Coburg Princess and Princesses.—Death of the Prince Consort.—The Queen's Widowhood.—Russell Ministry.—Outbreak of the Jamaica Insurrection.—Antecedents of the Revolt.—Fighting at Mount Bay.—suppression of the Insurgents.—Atrocities in the Name of Law.—Removal of Eyre.—Reformation of the Jamaican Government. 373-394

CHAPTER CXXXII.—FENIANISM AND DISEASE-TABLETMENT.

Ministry of Lord Russell.—Cattle Plague and Cholera.—Discontent of the Masses.—Position of Gladstone and Bright.—Proposition for extending the Franchise.—Ministry between two Fires.—The Abullamites.—The Derby Ministry.—Policy of Disfranchisement in the Kingdom.—Work of the Reform League.—The Hyde Park Riot.—Disraeli would take the Wind from the Liberal Sails.—The Queen's Speech.—The Conservative Reform Bill.—The Measure outdoes the Liberal Scheme.—Passage of the Franchise Act.—Its Effect on the Political Society of Great Britain.—The Measure extended to Scotland and Ireland.—Condition of Affairs in the latter Country.—Origin and Rise of the Fenian Brotherhood.—Spread of the Society into the United States.—Leaders of the Organization.—The Movement checked by the American Civil War.—Heart of the Question.—Hopes of the Irish Americans.—Relations of Canada to the Fenian Project.—Purposes and Plans of the Brotherhood.—The Rising in Ireland.—Ends in Smoke.—Weak of the

Fenians in Manchester.—The Movement runs its Course in America.—The Canadian Fiasco of 1866.—Rise of Trades Unions.—Philosophy of the Question.—Growth of such Organizations in English Manufacturing Towns.—Terrorism as an Argument.—The Trades Unions given the Right of Existence.—Tendency towards Cooperation.—Abyssinia.—King Theodore.—Religious Condition of the Country.—Nature of the Government.—Theodore would wed Victoria.—His Capital City.—The King's Liking for the English Officers.—He breaks with Cameron.—Arrests British Subjects.—Seizes a British Embassy.—The Cromwellian Rule.—Expedition against Abyssinia.—Capture of Magdala and Suicide of Theodore.—Revival of the Irish Question.—Religious Status of the Island.—Protestantism in Ireland.—British Politics affected by the Issue.—Scandal and Anomaly of the Irish State Church.—Necessity of Reform.—Project of Disestablishment.—Overthrow of the Conservative Ministry.—Leadership of Gladstone.—Nature of the Bill proposed.—Debate on the Project.—Triumph of the Liberals.—Passage of the Disestablishment Act.—Other Important Measures of the Liberal Party.—Question of Irish Land Tenure.—Abuses and Outrages of Landlordism.—Project of Land Reform.—Beginning of the Great Battle.—Question of Landownership.—Historical Antecedents of the Situation.—Effect of Irish Rebellions.—Home Love and Land Love of the Irish People.—Paucity of Irish Cities.—Dominance of the Agricultural Life.—The System without Alleviation.—Hopelessness of the Irish Tenants.—Autocracy of English Landlordism.—Practice of Eviction.—The Soil cursed by Tenantry.—Discomagement of Industry.—More Work, More Taxes.—The Landlords Absentees.—Control of Opinion by the Upper Man.—Favorable Condition of Ulster.—Gladstone presents His Irish Land Bill.—Its Theory.—Irish Rules Relative to Improvements.—Passage of the Bill, 385-411

CHAPTER CXXXIII.—REFORMS OF THE EIGHTH DECADE.

Question of Higher Education.—Absence of Educational System in England.—Forster's Education Bill.—Its Provisions.—Note on Dickens.—Nature of the Opposition to Forster's Measure.—Attitude of the Non-conformists.—The Bill adopted.—Continuance of the Educational Reform.—Conservatism of Universities.—Condition of Affairs at Oxford and Cambridge.—The Reform instituted.—Project for Reforming the Ballot.—Advantages and Disadvantages of Voting *Viva Voce*.—The Chartist Principle.—Passage of Forster's Ballot Bill.—Proposed Reformation of the British Army.—Gladstone's *Camp*.—Semesis pursues Great Britain with the Alabama Claims.—Effects of French Revolution of 1870 in Great

Britain.—The Irish University Bill.—Dublin University in Particular.—Queen's University.—Catholic Institutions.—Difficulties in the Way of Reform.—Nature of the Gladstonian Measure.—The Debates.—Sentiments of the Country.—Defeat of the University Bill.—The Government embarrassed.—Conservative Reaction.—Disraeli Prime Minister.—New Cabinet.—Retirement of Gladstone.—Question of Ritualism.—Canterbury's Bill.—Plimsoll's Bill for the Protection of Seamen.—Rise of Imperialism.—Outlying British Empire.—Dreams of Disraeli.—Victoria made Empress of India.—Her Admiration for the Prime Minister.—Disraeli becomes Earl of Beaconsfield.—Nature of the Change in His Relations.—Beaconsfield at Congress of Berlin.—The Home Rule Question.—The Home Rule League.—Spread of the Sentiment in Ireland.—Hunger Reinforces the Argument.—Emergency of the Liberal Party.—Gladstone defies the Ministry.—Parliament dissolved.—Rout of the Conservatives.—Chagrin of the Queen.—Gladstone's Ascendency.—Ashantee War breaks out.—Condition of Ashantee Land.—Relations with the Fantees.—British Invasion of the Country.—Story of the War.—Sir Garnet Wolseley on the Gold Coast.—Defeat of the Natives.—Comassie destroyed.—Submission of the Ashantees.—Trouble with the Zulus.—Cetewayo.—The Boers.—Difficulty about the Transvaal Republic.—Cetewayo takes up Arms.—Zulus repressed.—End of the Prince Imperial.—Consequences of His Death.—Difficulty with Afghanistan.—Pressure of Russia in that Direction.—Exposure of Great Britain on the Afghan Border.—Project of an English Embassy at Cabul.—Shere Ali.—The English Expedition.—New Treaty with the Afghans.—Insurrection in Cabul.—Disposition of Yakoub Khan.—Afghan Question.—Treatment of the Liberals, . . . 411-430

CHAPTER CXXXIV.—BATTLE FOR HOME RULE.

The Home Rule Party in Parliament.—Parnell its Apostle.—Other Leaders.—Attitude towards the Ministry.—Beginning of Crime under Suffering.—A Coercion Bill proposed.—Nature of its Provisions.—The New Land Bill.—Home Rulers adopt the Policy of Obstruction.—Parliamentary Usages.—Strength of Home Rule Party.—Final Expedient of the Ministry.—Expulsion and Imprisonment of Home Rule Leaders.—Position of the Liberal Party.—Inclination of Gladstone.—Passage of the Land Bill.—Effects in Ireland.—Epoch of Outrages.—The Arms Bill.—Pressure of the Land League.—The Gladstone-Parnell Treaty.—Filling of the Irish Jails.—Impossible to hold the Crisis.—Sending out of Cavendish as Chief Secretary.—His Murder in Phoenix Park.—Fillets of the Crime in England.—Straits of the Home Rule Party.—Denunciations in Parlia-

ment.—Farrer's Reply.—Shackleton's Death.—Farrer's Lesson of Irish Famine.—Action of the Parties.—Abolition of the Conservatives.—Attention of Europe to Government with regard to Egypt.—Farrer's Speech on Irish Famine.—Opposition of the Conservatives.—Passage of the Famine-Act.—Famines and Consequences in the East.—The War in Egypt.—The Queen's Speech.—Debate on the Budget.—Significance of the Vote.—Division of the Gladstone Ministry.—Relations of the Two Parties to Home and Foreign Announcements.—Managers of Salisbury elected by the Queen.—Position of Home-Knights in the Crisis.—Hesitation of Salisbury.—Appeal to the Country.—Triumph of the Conservatives.—Peace of the new Ministry.—Salisbury overthrown.—Recall of Gladstone.—The New Cabinet.—Gladstone espouses the Home-Rule Cause.—He proposes a Bid for Government of Ireland.—The Prime Minister's Speech.—Break in the Liberal Ranks.—Liberal Ministry overthrown.—Unsettlement of the Question.—Celebration of Her Majesty's Jubilee.—Relations of Great Britain to the Government of Egypt.—Political Conditions in that Country.—British Interest in the Egyptian Debt.—Principles governing National Indebtedness.—Concern of France in the Egyptian Question.—The Financial Con-

dition.—Civil and Religious Condition of Egypt.—Tendency to Independence.—Reforms proposed by Mehemet Ali.—Western Interference compels Egypt to be dependent on the Porte.—Rouhim Pasha.—His Successors.—Egyptian View of the Foreign Domination.—The People demand Reform.—Rise of El Arabi.—Efforts to reach Autonomy.—European Fleet at Alexandria.—Promulgation of the New Constitution.—England supports the Khedive.—Success of Arabi.—Demands of Great Britain.—Riot in Alexandria.—The British Ultimatum.—Bombardment of the City.—Tewfik under the Protection of England.—Defeat of Arabi.—His Banishment.—Governmental Scheme of Fulkem.—Conditions of Settlement.—Apparition of the Mahdi.—Who he was.—Conditions in the Soudan.—Raker's Explorations.—He leaves Gordon in the South.—Withdrawal of the Foreign Control.—Gordon in Khartoum.—His Character and Policy.—Is besieged by the Mahdi.—Gordon's Surrender and Death.—Librets of the news in England.—The Event aids the Conservatives.—British Explorations in Central Africa.—Work of Livingstone.—He is found by Stanley.—Story of Emin Pasha.—Sending out of the Relief Expedition.—Stanley succeeds in his Work.—Revelations in Central Africa.—Conclusion of Narrative.—Promise of the Victorian Age, 450-452

BOOK TWENTY-THIRD.—FRANCE.

CHAPTER CXXXV. BOUVERON RESTORATION.

Napoleon after Waterloo. What might have been. What Was. Louis XVIII. regains the Throne.—Brings back the Past.—Difficulties in His Way.—How he was regarded.—He thanks the Prince Regent.—Humiliation of France.—Pressure of the Emigrant Nobles.—Royalist Rampant.—Curtalement of French Territory.—The Foreign Occupation.—Reaction against the Government.—Richelieu leads the Chamber.—Marquis Desobry.—Struggle of Liberalism.—Censorship of the Press removed.—Right, Left, and Center.—Treaty of Vienna does not apply.—Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle.—Holy Alliance confirmed.—The Government's aims in suppression of State-trials.—Sinking of the *Arcturion*.—Character of Richelieu.—His Middle Course.—Comte V. Elie.—Attention of France to the Sicilian Sicily.—Restoration of Ferdinand VII.—Abrogation of the Constitution of 1812.—Revolution of 1820.—Reign of the Bad Sicilian Societies.—Insurrection of 1820.—Relations of Liberalism to the Cause.—Will the Holy Alliance interfere.—R. Litalien.—Congress of Verona.—Great Britain rejects France's offers to put down the Spanish Exports.—Invasion of

the Peninsula.—Bourbonism non-stated.—Consequences in France.—The Royalists will be All or Nothing.—"After Us the Deluge!"—Death of Louis.—Lateral Descent of the Crown.—Accession of Charles X.—His Previous Career.—Expectations of the Dynasty.—Death of the Duke of Berry.—Birth of the Duke of Bordeaux.—Royalism would outdo itself.—Question of the Estates of the Nobles.—They demand the Earth.—Difficulties of the Situation.—Bill for the Relief of the Emigrants.—Plan of Compensation and Settlement.—The Jesuits restored.—Rise of Journalism.—The Censorship revived.—Making Men Great by Patent.—Opposition in the Chamber.—The Liberals carry the Election.—Polignac Ministry.—Relations of France to the Tino-Hellenic Indulgence.—Ame of Royalism.—Opposition to Polignac.—Périer.—President of the Deputies.—Charles Weakens.—Story of the African War.—Algeris invaded by Boumont.—Success of the Expedition.—Glorification of the Royalists.—We will now do as we please.—The Five Ordinances of July.—Appointing of Thiers.—The Press breaks its Manacles.—Rattling of Insurrection.—Paris on Fire.—The Terror on High.—Flight of the Ministry.—Revolution in Larnest.—The Soldiers with the Insurgents.—The New Chamber of Dep-

uties.—Barricade of the Streets.—The Sansculottes Emerge.—Sacred Right of Insurrection.—The Government swept out.—Charles throws Tabs behind him.—Lafayette—Commandant.—Success of the Days of July.—Wreck of Elder Bourbonism.—Future Destinies of the House.—Progress of the Revolution.—Equality Philip called to the Throne.—Final Flight of Charles from France, 457-480

CHAPTER CXXXVI.—THE CITIZEN KING.

Accession of the House of Orleans.—Popularity of Louis Philippe.—His Previous Career.—He accepts the Crown and becomes Citizen King.—Continuance of the Algerian War.—Battle of Isly and Capture of Abd-el-Kader.—Middle-Class Predominant in French Government.—The Under Man not recognized.—Revolution of 1830 limits the Reaction.—Pretensions of the Past made Ludicrous.—Sympathy with the Revolution in Belgium.—Question of the Defenses of France.—Building of Fortifications at Paris.—The Citizen King would ally Himself with the Spanish House.—Isabella and the Princess Maria may be married.—In that Event Many Things might be.—Balance of Power must be preserved.—Financial Crisis and Insurrection.—Serious Revolt in Lyons.—Duchess of Berry in La Vendée.—Late Birth of Political Reason in France.—Factions in the Government.—Popularity and Unpopularity of the Reign.—First Rivalry of Thiers and Guizot.—The South Ministry.—Changes in the Cabinet.—Republican Attitude towards the Government.—Fieschi attempts the Life of the King.—Punishment of the Conspirators.—Symptoms of Reviving Imperialism.—Condition of the Napoleonic Dynasty.—Louis Napoleon Bonaparte makes His Bow.—The Charmed Name.—The Imperial Fiasco at Strasbourg.—Imprisonment of Louis Napoleon.—Principles of Guizot and Thiers.—The Government Conservative.—Molé Ministry overthrown.—Relations of France with Great Britain.—Guizot calumniated.—Louis Philippe and Victoria.—Jealousies about the Throne of Spain.—Sorrow of Louis Philippe's Household.—Rivalry of France and England in the East.—Ascendency of the Latter.—Body of Napoleon the Great brought Home from St. Helena.—Growth of Bonapartism.—Louis Napoleon as an Author and Adventurer.—The Government completes the French Fortifications.—The King grows Old, and looks backward.—The System an Aristocracy.—Fatal Flaw in the Monarchy.—Cry of Reform.—Failure of the Croops.—Publication of New Histories.—The Reform Banquet of 1848.—Revolt of Paris.—The Soldiers mutiny.—Louis Philippe also casts His Tabs.—Abdication Necessary.—The Republic proclaimed.—Louis becomes William Smith.—All is over.—Exit House of Orleans.—The Fugitives, 480-498

CHAPTER CXXXVII.—REPUBLIC AND COUP D'ÉTAT.

The Universal Revolution.—Provisional Government established.—Finance reaches her Starting-point.—A New Constitution.—Municipal Character of the Revolution.—Insurgent Paris.—The Sphinx appears.—Sketch of Louis Napoleon.—His Relations to the Dynasty.—His Adventures in Foreign Lands.—His Political Writings.—He is elected to the Constituent Assembly.—Is hardly treated by the Republicans.—Silence is Golden.—Presidential Election of 1848.—Louis Napoleon is chosen President.—Is regarded with Distrust.—His Ministry.—He interferes in the Affairs of Italy.—Seeks Favor with Rome.—The French Army suppresses Roman Republicanism.—Question of Universal Suffrage.—Popularity of the President.—Analysis of the Political Situation.—Napoleon the Man of Order.—Shall we stand for Reaction?—The Opposition will have it so.—Political Measures of the President.—He fortifies his Administration.—Issue between Him and the Assembly.—Conception of the *Coup d'Etat*.—Arrest of the Deputies.—Proclamation of the President.—The Chamber would stem the Tide.—Suppression of Insurrection.—Napoleon elected President for Ten Years.—New Constitution promulgated.—Shall the Empire rise?—*Vive l'Empereur!*—Restoration of the Napoleonic Dynasty, 499-506

CHAPTER CXXXVIII.—THE SECOND EMPIRE.

Philosophy of the French Situation in 1852.—Napoleon III. a Legitimate Sovereign.—Absolute Rights of the French Nation.—Restoration of Order.—The Emperor concerned about the Succession.—He takes Eugénie in Marriage.—"The Empire is Peace."—Political and Social Consequences of the Imperial Marriage.—France becomes a Party in the Crimean War.—Motives of the Emperor.—Success of the French Arms.—Birth of the Prince Imperial.—Paris glorified.—The Emperor seeks the Good-will of England.—Projects of Assassination.—Orsmi's Bombs explode.—Punishment of the Criminals.—Popularity of the Emperor.—*Credit Foncier* and *Credit Mobilier*.—Abdul-Aziz visits Us.—Rising Antipathy to Germany.—The Opening Game must be played in Italy.—Cavour and Napoleon at One.—Outbreak of the Franco-Austrian War.—Success of the French Invasion.—Treaty of Villafranca.—Terms of Settlement.—Effects thereof Abroad.—The Emperor's Influence waxes.—He joins Great Britain in a War on China.—Eugénie inspires the Mexican Invasion.—Napoleon at Enmity with the United States.—Miscalculates the Situation.—Folly of Mexican Scheme.—Monroe Doctrine forbids.—Maximilian's Hard Fate.—Reaction against the Empire.—Lessons from

the French Fleet (2).—Paris and the Emperor.—The Emperor returns to the Capital.—Emperors's arrival.—The Spectacle in the Palace.—Plots and Intrigues in the History of Constantinople.—Land routes and Water routes between Asia and the West.—The Starting-Place of Constantinople.—History of Progress during the Mediterranean and R. Sea.—The Russian Success in the Enterprise.—The Western Powers.—The interest in the Canal.—De Lessps appears on the Scene.—Company organize for Success of the Work.—Final Success of the Canal.—Rivalry of Great Britain and France for its Ownership.—Extent of Commerce through the Channel.—French Universal Exposition of 1867.—Clematists distressing to the Empire.—Outline of Events in Schleswig-Holstein.—Contest for the Danish Crown.—Napoleon no longer Arbitrator of Europe.—Germany gains Control of the Disputed Provinces.—Bismark visits Napoleon.—Sketch of the Seven Weeks' War.—Revival of Republicanism in France.—Public Opinion against the Government.—Increase of the Army.—Strength of the Opposition Vote.—Gambetta appears.—Steadiness of the Emperor's Conduct.—Government sustained by a Popular Vote.—*Phobos* and *Scythos consulti*.—Work of the Radical Orators.—Necessity of a Foreign War.—Expulsion of Queen Isabella from Spain.—Question of her Successor.—Candidature of Leopold.—France is offended.—Interference with the Hohenzollern Project.—The Nature of the French Demand.—Napoleon would and would not, 507-523

CHAPTER CXXXIX.—FRANCO-PRUSSIAN WAR.

Anger of the French.—No German Prince shall be King of Spain.—"Be Rough with the King."—War Inevitable.—Opposition of the French Republicans.—Declaration of France.—Spirit with which the Struggle began.—Delusions of the French Statesmen.—Rising of Germany.—Plans of the French Emperor.—His Misinformation.—Vigor of the German Movement.—Organization of the King's Armies.—Germany in the Field.—Affair of Saarbrück.—Baptism of Fire and Other Nonsense.—The Scene changes.—Germany becomes the Aggressor.—Vehemence of Her Attack.—Crown Prince in Alsace.—France on the Defensive.—The Emperor outgeneral.—Strasbourg besieged.—Battle of Gravelles.—General Position of the Opposing Forces.—Battle of Mars-la-Tour.—Peril of Bazaine.—Battle of Gravelles.—Bazaine cooped up in Metz.—Fury of the Parisians.—French Republicans fling themselves into the Conflict.—Plan of MacMahon.—He is overruled.—Falls back to Sedan.—Battle, Crisis, and Capitulation.—"My Good Brother"—Napoleon a Prisoner.—Bismark whistles a Tune.—

French Theory of Bazaine and Metz.—Position of the Empress.—Upheaving and Downrushing at Paris.—Flight of the Empress.—Imperial Family in England.—Proclamation of the Third Republic.—"Not a Foot of Soil, not a Stone of a Fortress."—Radicalism Triumphant.—Frenzy of the New Republic.—Advance of the Germans on Paris.—Great Capitulations of September.—Bazaine becomes a Seagoat.—Ruin of France.—Heroin of Gambetta.—The German Anacanda tightens.—Battles around Paris.—Defeat of Bourbaki.—Uproar in the French Capital.—Thiers elected President.—The New Ministry.—Government at Bordeaux.—Preliminary Treaty.—Formal Deposition of the Emperor.—Armistice.—Negotiations and Treaty.—Severe Terms of Settlement.—Evacuation by the Germans.—*Free In Communion*.—Nature of the Crisis.—Sketch of the Communal Movement.—Composition of the Communists.—The National Guard.—Affair of Parc Wagner.—Embarrassment of the Government.—The Regulas join the Insurrection.—Spread of the Revolt.—Paris in the Power of the Insurgents.—Government at Versailles.—Emissaries of the Commune abroad.—Insurrections in Other Cities.—Revolutionary Government organized.—Revival of 1792.—First Battle with the Government.—National Assnly organizes an Army.—Battle of Mont Valerien.—Reign of Violence begun.—Fighting around the City.—Proclamation of the Government.—Progress of the Siege.—Passion and Fury.—Starvation and Burning.—Taking of the City Gates.—Public Buildings fired.—Slaughter of Prisoners and the Suspected.—End of the Revolt.—Dreadful Scenes in the City.—Disposal of the Communists.—Political Questions to be Settled.—Prerogatives of the Assembly.—Formation of New Constitution.—Difficulty of unifying Political Sentiment.—Reaction against the Commune.—Treaty of Peace with Germany.—Liberal Measures of the Government.—Amnesty for the Bourbons.—Republicans carry the Election.—Thiers chosen President.—Opposition Elements constitute a Majority.—Policy of the Factions.—Payment of War Indemnity.—Dangers to the Republic.—Death of Napoleon III.—Questions of the Executive Office.—End of the Indemnity and Withdrawal of the Germans.—Secret of the Success of French Finance.—Sympathy with Imperialism.—Proscription of the Bonapartes.—Perilous Condition of the Government.—Accession of MacMahon to the Presidency.—His Political Standing.—Influence of the Imperial Party.—Probable Restoration of Monarchy.—Imperial and Monarchical Factions.—Fixing of the Presidential Term and Definitive Establishment of the Republic.—Condemnation of Bazaine.—De Cissey Ministry.—Gains of the Republicans.—Philosophy of the Situation.—Dissolution of the Assembly.—Rise of the Opportunists.—Party of Order.—

Ascendency of Grey and Gambetta.—Death of "The Liberator of the Territory," 523-556

CHAPTER CXL.—THIRD REPUBLIC.

Grey elected President of the Chamber.—Republican Cabinet.—Republican Gains in the Senate.—Grey in the Presidency.—Attitude of the Extreme Left.—Impracticality of the Radicals.—Ministry of De Freycinet.—Power behind the Throne.—Question of the Religious Orders.—Catholic Principles of Action.—Abolition of the Jesuitical Establishments—"Our Enemy is Clericalism."—Establishment of New Educational System.—Resistance of the Jesuits.—Distraction of the Imperialists.—Note on Cassagnac.—Ascendency of Gambetta.—Rochefort and his Journals.—A Communist Platform.—Gambetta's Power in the Government.—Prince Napoleon.—Decline of the Monarchic Cause.—Decadence of Communism.—Effort to reform the Election Laws.—Nature of the Measures Proposed.—Project to abolish Life-tenure in the Senate.—The Gambetta Ministry.—Calling of International Monetary Conference.—American Interest in the Movement.—Question of Silver and Legal Tender.—Propositions before the Conference.—Attitude of Great Britain.—Monometallic and Bimetallic Theories.—Meagre Results of the Conference.—Revival of France from the German War.—End of Proscription.—Change in the Relations of Paris to France.—Break between the Capital and the Country.—Injury done by the Commune.—The Third Republic Representative of France.—Death of Gambetta.—Revival of Distrust against the Monarchists.—Prince Napoleon would be Bonaparte.—Expulsion of Imperial Representatives.—Respectability of the Orleanists.—Counts of Paris and Chambord.—The Former represents the Dynasty.—Episode of the Morton Ball.—Elections of 1884.—Gains of the Socialists.—French War in

the East.—Question of Marriage and Divorce.—The Roman Catholic Theory.—Bad Working of the System.—Statutes to Stimulate Marriage.—Proposition to Revise the Constitution.—Objectionable Features.—Crisis of 1885.—Disaster to the French Arms in China.—Overthrow of the Ferry Ministry.—The Brisson Cabinet.—Profound Vice in the Governmental System.—Question of Patronage.—Corruption of the Public Service.—Defeat of Civil Service Reform.—Plan of Gambetta.—Question of the Appointive Offices.—Analogies of France and the United States.—Socialist Manifesto of 1885.—Great Vote in its Favor.—Republicans retained in Power.—Re-election of Grey to the Presidency.—Difference between the French and American Constitutions.—The Right refuses to Vote.—Monarchists encouraged by the Election.—Conduct of the Princes.—Decree of Expulsion passed.—Proclamation of the Count of Paris.—Bou langer appears and fights a Duel.—Duc d'Annamale puts Fire on the Head of the Republic.—Chantilly given to the French Nation.—A German Toy becomes a Political Issue.—Instability of the French Cabinets.—Badness of Party Discipline.—Attempt to abolish the Sub-prefecture.—Freycinet Ministry overthrown.—The Goblet Ministry.—Question of rectifying the Boundary of France.—Revenge as a Motto.—Bou langer and Rouvier.—The Former becomes an Issue.—Appeals to the People.—Is made the Impersonation of Hatred against Germany.—Great Scandal in the War Office.—Disgrace of Grey's Son-in-law.—The President obliged to resign.—Bou langer stands for Insurrection.—Sadi-Carnot elected President.—Bou langer's Star goes down.—An Absurd Duel pricks the Bubble.—The Attention of the French called to the Centennial of the Republic.—Preparations for 1889.—Notice of the Great Exposition.—Conclusion, 556-580

BOOK TWENTY-FOURTH.—GERMANY.

CHAPTER CXXI.—NADIR OF THE FATHERLAND.

Effects of Waterloo in Germany.—Contagion of the French Revolution.—Gain of the Fatherland from the New Life West of the Rhine.—The Prussian Monarch would profit by Victory.—Satisfaction of Madame Krudener.—Revival of the Middle Ages.—Territorial Work of the Congress of Vienna.—Project of Nationality.—Can We restore the Empire?—Plan of Metternich.—Reforms promised by the Diet.—Establishment of Zollverein.—Old Abuses revived.—Composition of the German Diet.—Disappointment of the Ger-

mans.—Spread of New Ideas.—Bund of Wartburg.—Censorship of Press and Lecture-room.—Real and Apparent Consequences of the French Invasions.—The Period of Reaction.—Understruggle of the People.—The German Rulers administer Husks.—Frederick Wilhelm hugs the Arm of the Czar.—Prussia breaks from Austria.—Origin of the Zollverein.—Recuperation of Germany.—Revolutionary Movements of 1830.—Unanimity of the German People.—Pervidy of Ernest August and Louis I.—German Genius in Disgrace.—Outbreak of Belgian Revolution.—Causes of the Revolt.—Insurrection in Brussels.—Barricade and Battle.—Provincial Government

French Armies.—Napoleon becomes a Specter.—Sedan ends the Tragedy.—Wreck of the Empire.—Germany as an Avenger.—Paris under Foot.—The Armistice and Treaty.—Enormous Indemnity enacted.—Triumph and Pride of Prussia.—Extent of the French Losses.—Events tend to the Establishment of a German Empire.—King William proclaimed Emperor.—The Place and the Occasion.—Tragedy of the Commune.—Return of Emperor William to Berlin. . . . 604-624

CHAPTER CXLIV.—THE NEW EMPIRE.

True Origin of Prussian Greatness.—Germany as a Unit.—The New Constitution.—Adaptation of the System to the People.—What the Latter expect.—Contrast with English-speaking Peoples.—Struggle of State and Church in Prussia.—Opposition of Bismarck to Papal Pretensions.—Expulsion of the Jesuits.—The Falk Laws.—Deposition and Banishment of the Ecclesiastics.—Prenotations of Socialism.—History of the Movement.—Outline of the Socialist Theory.—Marx and Lassall.—Results of Their Teachings.—Opposition to the Chancellor.—The Latter encourages the Socialists.—Mistaken Deductions of the Germans.—Incubus of the Military System.—Assumptions of the Government.—Menace of France.—Hardships of German Labor.—Dream of Emancipation.—Difference of German and British Theories of Government.—Sympathy of the Imperial System with Socialism.—Violence of the Times.—Attempt to kill the Emperor.—Reaction ensues.—Project to suppress the Socialists.—Failure of the Measure.—Government succeeds by Intrigue.—Discoment of Bismarck.—State Socialism proposed.—Nature of the Measure.—Success of the Scheme for unifying Germany.—Philosophy of the Contest between Feudalism and Nationality.—Salutary Imperial Measures.—Where shall the Reichsgericht be established?—Revival of Hatred against the Jews.—Sorrows of that Race.—Hebrew Conquidation of 1880.—Anti-Jewish Ebullition of the German Press.—Treitschke's Agitation.—Reply of the Jews.—Extent and Character of the Controversy.—Question of increasing the German Army.—Era of Monstrous Military Establishments.—Extent of the Various National Armies.—But We are All Peaceable.—Question of the Stamp Duty.—Anomalous Position of Bismarck.—Do It, or We will

resign.—Arbitrary Character of the Government.—Patriotism the Motive.—Bismarck's Explanatory Speech.—Startling Assumptions of Power.—Revival of the Catholic Question.—Necessity of Conciliation.—Meeting of the Three Emperors.—Motives Ostensible and Real of the Conference.—Liberal Gains in the Election of 1880.—Bismarck unmoved by the Result.—Majority against the Government.—The Administration stands Fast.—The Empire would make Peace with Mother Church.—Pliability of Bismarck's Principles.—Overwhelming Generosity as a Policy.—Trick of the Clericals.—We are never defeated.—Attempt to abolish the Marriage Laws.—Course of the Pope to the German Government.—One Manner for Germany and Another for Russia.—Imbroglio about the Importation of American Pork.—Further demands of the Papacy.—Revival of Animosity between France and Prussia.—Thundering of the *Noth-German Gazette*.—Episode of the Crown Prince in Spain.—Affair of the Lasker Resolutions.—Bismarck's Declaration on the Subject.—Resignation of Minister Sargent.—Action of the German Liberals Concerning the Lasker Business.—Westward March of Cholera.—Germany meets the Plague with Science.—Scheme for Foreign Colonization.—Backwardness of Germany in This Regard.—Africa the Field of Operations.—Success of the Colonial Enterprise.—Cui Bono?—Age of Colonization passed.—German Greatness a Thing of Germany.—Affair of the Caroline Islands.—Threatened War with Spain.—German Passion for Emigration.—Motives for going Abroad.—Vastness of the Movement.—Rigors of the German Military System.—Expatriation the Remedy.—America the Chosen Field.—Peculiarities of the German Increment in American Society.—Election of 1887.—Political Arguments of the Day.—Triumph of the Government.—Influence of the Emperor.—His Venerable Character.—Other German Veterans.—What of the Future?—Character and Place of the Crown Prince.—His Political Views.—Anxiety about the Succession.—Announcement about the Prince's Disease.—A Race for Life.—Agony in the Imperial Household.—Death of Emperor William and Accession of Frederick III.—The New Crown Prince.—His Character and Principles.—Decline and Death of the Emperor.—Sorrows of the Empress.—Accession of William II.—Conclusion. 625-654

BOOK TWENTY-FIFTH.—ITALY.

CHAPTER CXLV.—DAWN OF NATIONALITY.

Italy, Ancient and Modern.—Close of the Napoleonic Era.—Period of Incubation.—Career of Murat.—Congress of Vienna dismembers the

Country.—Distribution of the Parts.—Beneficent Results of the Revolutionary Age.—The Rights of Man not Extinct.—Restoration does not restore.—Beginning of Insurrections.—Congress of Laybach.—Austria must subordinate Italy.

Rev. Bygone Days.—Charles Albert becomes King of Sardinia.—Italy restored.—Piedmont and the Republics.—Struggle of Liberty with the Sacred Scriptures.—The Government of Piedmont.—Piedmont and Rome.—The Pope.—Beliefs of the States.—The Government.—Italy becomes a Kingdom.—Control of the Government.—Young Republic.—Italy.—The States.—Accession of Charles Albert.—His Liberal Principles.—Instruction of Young Italy.—Republican Divisions.—Influence of Mazzini.—Proposition of Godolphin.—Mazzini.—Governing.—Changes in the Papal Government.—Policy of George XVI.—Accession of Pius IX.—Liberal Hopes of the People.—Revolts of 1848.—Republican Successes.—Hungarian Revolution and Italy.—Defeat of the French.—Defeat of Charles Albert.—Battle of Novara.—Accession of Victor Emmanuel.—His Liberal Principles.—Material Improvements in Italy. 655-662

CHAPTER CXLVI.—VICTOR EMANUEL

Condition of Affairs in 1849.—Parallel of German and Italian History.—Character of the New Sovereign.—Opposition of the Extreme Republicans.—Shall the Sardinian Kingdom lead Italy?—The House of Savoy can not retreat.—Legislation against the Church.—Ascendency of Count Cavour.—His Genius and Policy.—Difficulties in his Way.—Possible Franco-Italian Alliance.—Alarm of Austria.—Sherrist-made War.—*Crabdi-Dab*.—Strained Relations between Austria and France.—Conference of Plombières.—France declares War.—Beginning of French Invasion of Italy.—Montebello, Palestro, and Magenta.—Success of the Allies.—Italian Insurrections.—Milan taken.—Battle of Solferino.—Change of Napoleon's Plans.—Treaty of Villafranca.—Disappointment of the Italians.—Cession of Nice and Savoy to France.—General Gain to Italy.—Continuance of the Revolution.—Cavour and Cavour.—Difficult Position of the latter.—He holds back the Republican Movement.—"We are Italy."—Sardinia gains the Two Sicilies.—Victor Emmanuel becomes King.—Triumph of the National Cause.—Last Work of Cavour.—His Death.—The King and Government at Turin.—Shall Rome become the Capital?—France the Interlocutor.—Victor Emmanuel and the Count of Schleswig-Holstein.—Complication again.—War of 1859.—Italy gains Venetia.—Epicure of Austria.—Defeat of Garibaldi.—Withdrawal of French Army demanded.—Bad Success of the Prussians.—End.—Italy triumphs with Prussia.—The French Army withdrawn.—Character of the Government.—Condition of the People.—Garibaldi's Career.—Rush for Rome.—Is obliged to retreat.—Return of the French Army.—Struggle of Pius IX.—End of the French Empire.—Victory of the Temporal

Sovereignty of the Pope.—Rome becomes the Capital of Italy.—The King enters the City.—Institution of the Pontiff.—Levitical Council.—Are We Infallible?—We are, under Certain Circumstances.—Financial Embarrassment of the Government.—Measures of upholding the National Credit.—Rage of the Pope.—Completion of the Mont-Cenis Tunnel.—Institution of the New Political Order.—Blood in Po Valley.—The Church would regain her Footing.—Expulsion of the Jesuits.—Liberation of Thought and Industry.—First Scientific Congress.—The Pope makes himself a Prisoner.—Emergence of Italy into Nationality.—Quarter Centennial of the King's Reign.—Marriages in the Royal Family.—Victor Emmanuel's Death.—Outline of His Character.—Pius IX. surpasses the Years of Peter.—Celebration of his Jubilee.—Death of the Pontiff.—Pope becomes Leo XIII.—His Policy. 662-680

CHAPTER CXLVII.—HUMBERT I.

Accession of Humbert I.—His Coronation Address.—Beginning of Social Agitations.—Attempt to assassinate the King.—Overthrow of the Ministry.—The Depotis Cabinet.—Political Parallels with Germany and France.—Want of Party Solidarity.—Elections of 1880.—Weakness of Political Discipline.—Radicalism revived.—Also Christianity.—Change in the Papal Policy.—The Pope calls for Penitentiary Aid.—His Repositions.—His Theory of the Imprisonment.—Pilgrimage to Rome.—The Pope's Address.—Affair of the *Legge della Democrazia*.—Question of extending the Suffrage.—Difficulty of obtaining a Popular Vote.—Reasoning of the Electors.—Proposition for Universal Suffrage.—Hazard of the Experiment.—Shall the Vatican obey the Law of the State?—Improvement of the National Finances.—Parallel with the History of the United States.—Credit of the Government rises to Par.—Resumption.—Prusso-Italian Sympathies.—The Ischia Earthquake.—International Jealousy about Contributions.—Radical changes.—Corruption.—Application of the New Law of Suffrage.—Failure of the Masses to vote.—Question of Transit in Modern Nations.—Age of the Railway.—Great Change in Social and Industrial Conditions.—How shall the Railways be owned, managed, and controlled?—Different Decisions in Different States.—Railway Law in America.—The Problem in Italy.—State Control, but not State Management.—Cholera Visitation of 1881.—The Plague in Naples.—How shall the Disaster be averted?—King's Plan and Pope's Plan.—Changing Views of Leo XIII.—Possibility of Papal Removal to the United States.—Decree in the Volume of Peter's Pence.—Previous Experiences of the Pope.—His Attitude towards Material softness.—Disappointment of the Friends of Universal Suffrage.—Elections of

1886.—Earthquake in the Riviera. — International bonds of Italy and Germany. — The Bond of 1887.—Jubilee of the Pope. — Inconceivable Dispute between the Papacy and the Government. — Logic of the Papal Position. — Impossibility of Re-

cession.—The Kingdom of Italy. — Blessing. — Parallel of Fifteenth and Nineteenth Centuries. — Age of Centralization. — General Tendencies of Old World and New.—Dangers of Overcentralization.

BOOK TWENTY-SIXTH.—EASTERN EUROPE.

CHAPTER CXLVIII.—ALEXANDER I. AND NICHOLAS.

Revolution of the Cossack.—Alexander witnesses the Humiliation of France.—Influence of Madame Kaulner.—Doctrine of the Holy Alliance.—Real Significance of the Compact.—Principle of Interference applied.—Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle.—Troppan, Laybach, and Verona.—Predominance of Russian Influence.—Internal Improvements of Russia.—Character of Alexander.—Ascendency of Metternich in Europe.—The Czar becomes despotic.—Constantine the Heir Apparent.—Nicholas takes the Crown.—Dekabrist Insurrection.—Outbreak of the Persian War.—Gain of New Territories.—The Porte purchases Peace.—Affairs in Poland.—Conspiracy of 1830.—Battles of the Following Year.—Suppression of the Insurrection.—Sufferings of the Country.—Pressure of Russia on Turkey.—Relations of Russia and France. — Break of the Franco-Russian Aech.—Egyptian Complication.—Western Tons of the Czars.—Plans and Policy of Nicholas.—He discovers a Sick Man.—War in the Caucasus.—Shamyl overthrown.—The Czar makes Demands of the Sultan.—Outbreak of the Crimean War.—Theater of the Conflict. 697-704

CHAPTER CXLIX.—CRIMEAN WAR.

Essence of the Eastern Question.—The Conflict on the Danube.—Destruction of Turkish Fleet at Sinope.—Western Armies on the Black Sea.—Turkish Successes.—Position of the Russians.—Battle of Alma.—Sebastopol the Key of the Situation.—Beginning of the Siege.—Battle of Balaklava.—Episode of the Light Brigade.—Struggle at Inkerman.—Sufferings of the Allied Army.—Capture of the Malakoff and Redan.—Battle of Tchernaya. — Russians abandon Sebastopol.—The Czar brought to Bay.—Treaty of Peace.—Terms and Conditions of Settlement.—General Provisions of the Treaty.—Salutary Influences of the Event.—Attitude of the United States on Privateering. 705-714

CHAPTER CL.—LAST TWO ALEXANDERS.

Accession of Alexander II.—Reforms in the Governmental System. — Emancipation of the Russian Serfs.—Polish Insurrection of 1863.—Misfortunes of the Czar's Situation.—Distrust of the

People.—Alexis makes a Tour of the West.—Philosophy of Political Conditions in Russia.—Impossibility of Liberalism at the Head of an Autocracy.—Discontent of the Under Man in Russia.—Rise of the Nihilists.—Policy of Repression Adopted.—Assassination of the Czar.—Arrest and Execution of the Assassins. — Terror the Order of the Day.—Severity of the Czar and Courage of the Nihilists.—They propose an Accommodation with the Government.—The Imperial Proclamation. — The Czar makes a Tour to Moscow. — Dangerous Conditions of the Journey.—Chinax and Decadence of the Nihilist Movement.—Persecution of the Jews.—The Act of Grace.—Astounding Character of the Manifesto.—Tenderness for Ordinary Criminals.—Friendly Relations of the Czar and the German Emperor.—Final Destruction of Poland. — Epoch of Spies and Police.—Difficulty of the Western Mind to understand the Condition of Russia.—Meeting of the Three Emperors.—Work of the Tribunal of Odessa. — Court of Schussellburg. — Oppressiveness of the Imperial System. — Disengagement of the People.—Question of the Zulkifer Pass.—The Trans-Caspian Railway. — Restoration of Absolutism. — Tendencies of the Russian Empire. 714-722

CHAPTER CL.—SICK MAN OF THE EAST.

Breaking up of the Janizaries.—Albanian Insurrection.—Other Revolts. — Beginning of Greek Revolution.—Leaders of the Cause. — Massacre of Scio. — The Philhellenes. — The Crisis breaks at Navarino.—Establishment of a New Government for Greece. — Reign of Otto.—Constitution of 1844.—War of the Porte with Egypt.—The Western Powers will possess the Ottoman Empire.—Druses and Maronites.—Romania constituted.—Cretan Insurrection.—Weakening of the Turkish Hold on Europe.—Russia becomes Aggressive.—Loss of Interest in the Eastern Question. — Moslem Outrages against the Christians.—The Czar demands Richess. — The London Protocol. — Russia will go to War. — Plans of Invasion. — Russians on the Danube.—Battle of Tundja Brook.—Repulse of the Russians from Plevna.—Check of the Invasion. — Defense of Shipka Pass. — Second Assault on Plevna. — The Place besieged.—Capitulation of Osman.—Campaign of Grand Duke Michael in Asia.—Kars taken by the Russians.

Progress of the Invasion.—Storming of Shimon.—
 Breaking of the Turkish Power.—Armistice.—
 Settlements on the Russian—The Great Powers
 interfere.—Treaty of San Stefano and Con-
 gress of Berlin.—Final Conditions of Settlement.—
 Eastern Rapprochement.—Hopes of the Refor-
 mation of Turkey.—Possibility of Reform.—
 Changes in the Succession.—End of Abdul-
 Aziz.—Judicial Inquiry into the Manner of his
 Death.—Accession of Murad V.—Abdul Hamid
 II.—Question of the Payment of the War Indem-
 nity.—Embarrassment of Great Britain relative
 to her.—Rebellion of Arabi Pasha.—What shall
 be his Punishment?—Questions submitted by
 the Court.—Work of Lew Wallace at Constanti-
 nople.—The Servian Railway Complication.—
 Release of the Turkish Government.—The Bul-
 garian Question.—Alexander of Battenburg raised
 to the Throne.—He is abdicated and restored.—
 Menace of Turkish Dismemberment.—Confere-
 nce of Constantinople.—General View of the Eastern
 Situation. 722-740

BOOK TWENTY-SEVENTH—MINOR AMERICAN STATES.

CHAPTER CLII.—DOMINION OF CANADA.

Geographical Position of Canada.—Provinces
 named.—Early Establishment of Feudalism in
 America.—Fifteenth of the System.—Its Abolition.—
 Shall Canada be French or English?—Earthquake
 of 1663.—Political Divisions of the
 Country.—Leadership of Quebec.—Invasion of
 1629.—Epoch of La Salle.—Restrictions of French
 Possessions in America.—Causes and Issue of the
 French and Indian War.—Attitude of Canada
 during American Revolution.—French Influence
 still Predominant.—Governmental Changes.—
 Canada used as a Base by the British.—Reforms
 of 1791.—Church of England Question.—Slow
 Growth of Canada.—Relations with the United
 States.—Rebellion of 1837.—Affair of the *Gaspe*.—
 Diversity of Interest among the Cana-
 dians.—Separation of the Provinces.—Political
 Quarrels and their Origin.—Career of Sir Francis
 Head.—Coming of Lord Durham.—His Radical
 Methods.—A Virtual Revolution proposed.—Dur-
 ham resigns under Pressure.—The Sepulchre in His
 Favor.—True Founder of the Dominion.—Rise
 of the Popular Assembly.—Administration of Lord
 Elgin.—The Act of Union.—Question of a seat of
 Government.—Ottawa chosen.—Project of uniting
 all the Provinces.—Growth of Public Sentiment
 in Favor of Union.—Story of the Fenian Inva-
 sion.—End of the Fenian Government on an
 Enlarged Scale.—Act of 1867.—Analysis of the
 Governmental System.—Analogies with the
 United States.—Provision for the Admission of
 New Provinces.—Outline of the Canadian Terri-
 tories.—Hudson Bay Company.—Political Devel-
 opment of Canada.—Organization of North-west
 Territories.—Pacification.—Industries, and Pro-
 gress.—Loyalty of Canada to Great Britain.—
 Problem in the Relations of the Dominion and
 the United States.—Advent of Fenianism.—Conces-
 sion from the Home Government.—Question of
 the Future Status of Canada in the British Em-
 pire.—Views of Bourne.—Discussion of Imperial
 Federation.—Fidelity of the System pro-

posed.—Administrations of Dufferin and Lorne.—
 Division of Political Parties.—The MacDonal-
 d Ministry.—Internal Development of the Domi-
 nion.—Institutions and Features of Quebec.—Mon-
 treal and her Public Structures.—Sketch of Mon-
 treal and her Industries.—Ottawa.—Franchise
 Bill of 1885.—Indians raised to Citizenship.—
 Story of the Riel Rebellion.—Execution of the
 Leader.—Sketch of his Life.—Resumé of the
 Fishery Question between Canada and the United
 States.—Temptation to Smuggling and Contra-
 band Trade.—Growth of Reciprocity. 745-764

CHAPTER CLIII.—MEXICO.

Different Conditions of Civilization beyond the
 Rio Grande.—Planting of European Government
 in Mexico.—Administration of Mendoza.—Rule
 of the Viceroy.—Internal Improvements of the
 Country.—Social Divisions of the People.—Policy
 of Spain with Respect to her American Provinces.—
 Effect of the Napoleonic Wars.—Sugges-
 tion of Independence.—Influence and Work of
 Hidalgo and Morelos.—Overthrow of the Natio-
 nals.—Restoration of Spanish Authority.—
 Mexican Revolution and War of Independence.—
 Project of Empire.—Santa Anna appears.—Hur-
 tle in Exile.—New Constitution of 1824.—Begin-
 ning of Political Revolutions.—Spanish Attempt
 at Reconquest.—Santa Anna takes the Presi-
 dency.—The Second Constitution.—Hostility of
 Texas.—Texan War and Independence.—Santa
 Anna again in Power.—Texas annexed to the
 United States.—Mexican War ensues.—Terms ex-
 acted by the American Government.—New Bound-
 aries between the Two Nations.—Santa Anna
 and Alvarez.—Confiscation of Church Lands.—
 Proposed Republic.—Administration of Zulo-
 aga.—Coming of Juarez.—His Boundary Pol-
 icy.—Opposition of the Clericals.—Threatened
 European Invasion.—Great Britain satisfied.—
 France makes War.—Animus of the French Em-
 peror.—Capture of Puebla by the Invaders.—
 Monarchy established.—Story of Maximilian.—

Juarez restored to Authority.—Final Banishment of Santa Anna.—Redeemion of Juarez.—His Death.—His Influence in Mexican Affairs.—Administration of Lerdo.—Hostility of the Church.—Insurrection of 1875.—Diaz Leader of the Insurgents.—Concession of the Government.—Period of Quietude.—Difficulties on the Rio Grande.—Gonzalez elected President.—He is succeeded by Diaz.—Growing Sympathies between Mexico and the United States, 764-779

CHAPTER CLIV.—SOUTH AMERICA.

Spain is supplanted by England in the New World.—Geographical Position of the Spanish-American Possessions.—Slow Growth of Civilization in South America.—The United States of Colombia.—Union with Quito and Venezuela.—Independence of Granada.—Republican Government established.—Revolutionary Period.—Treaty with the United States.—Progress of the Last Decade.—Primitive History of Venezuela.—Declaration of Independence.—Epoch of the Civil Wars.—Political Revolutions.—First Notice of Ecuador.—Spanish Yoke thrown off.—Foreign Wars and Domestic Insurrections.—Instability of Political Structure.—Peru.—Story of Pizarro.—Great Extent of the Country.—Loyalty of the Peruvians.—Bolivia becomes Independent.—Common Aspect of South American History.—Affair of the American Ships.—Castilla and San Ramon.—Adoption of Constitution.—Age of Political Violence.—Brazil.—Early Discoveries on the Coast.—Primitive Commerce.—Colony of Rio de Janeiro.—Portuguese Colonies fall to Spain.—Evil Consequences in Brazil.—The Dutch in South America.—Brazil goes back to Portugal—

Transfer of Seat of Government.—Brazil recovers the Fugitive Branganças.—The Constitution modified.—Final Separation of Brazil from Portugal.—The Former Country an Empire.—Dom Pedro I.—War with the Argentine Republic.—Political Troubles of the Emperor.—Accession of Dom Pedro II.—Epoch of Insurrections.—Alliance of Three States against Paraguay.—Death of Lopez.—Success of the Administration.—Liberal Spirit and Accomplishments of the Emperor.—He visits the United States and Europe.—Railway Development.—Establishment of Steamship Lines with North America.—Famine of 1878.—Struggle with Slavery.—Brazilian Plan of Emancipation.—Legislation against the Roman Church.—Establishment of Civil Marriage.—Cataclysm of 1889.—The Empire overthrown.—Banishment of Dom Pedro and his Family.—Proclamation of the Brazilian Republic.—Place and Importance of Argentina.—First Notices of the Country.—Viceregency established.—War with Great Britain.—Revolution of 1812.—Administration of San Martin.—Transfer of the Capital. Las Heras President.—Independence guaranteed by Foreign Powers.—Ascendency of Rosas.—His Theory of Government.—His Downfall.—Civil Commotions.—Course of Affairs in the Seventh Decade.—Greatness of the Argentine Territory.—Recent Political Changes.—Parallel between the English and Spanish Peoples.—Epoch of Railway Development.—Election of 1880.—Settlement of the Chilean Boundary.—Area and Statistics.—Educational Progress.—Geographical Position of Chili.—Her Extent and Physical Character.—Primitive History.—Outline of Events to the Present Time.—Promise of the Republic, 779-798

BOOK TWENTY-EIGHTH.—ORIENTAL NATIONS.

CHAPTER CLV.—CHINA.

Obscurity of Eastern History.—False Historical Standards.—Our Earliest View of the Chinese Empire and People.—Yu the Great.—Dynasty of Chow.—Dynasty of Tsin.—Chinese Wall.—House of Han.—First Contact of the Western Nations with China.—Tartar Inroads.—Christianity introduced.—Genghis and Kublai Khan.—Great Famine of Fourteenth Century.—House of Ming.—Invasions of Mantchu Tartars.—Tartar Dynasty established.—Interest of the West in Chinese Affairs.—British Embassy at Peking.—Napier attempts to open Communication with Chinese Coasts.—The Opium-trade and the Sequel.—Destruction of the Opium at Canton.—Declaration of War.—Canton bombarded.—Further Conquests.—Chinese purchase Peace.—Opening of the Ports.—Treaty negotiated with the United States.—Ex-

tension of Foreign Intercourse.—Renewal of Difficulties with Great Britain.—Local War at Hong Kong.—Sending out of British Squadron.—Canton bombarded.—Question of conferring with the Emperor.—New Treaties with Foreign Powers.—Continuation of the Troubles.—Lord Elgin invades the Country.—Battle of Pali-kaio.—Destruction of the Summer Palace.—Chinese Regency.—Burlingame in China.—His Great Work with the Government.—He goes Abroad as Chinese Ambassador.—Tientsin Massacre.—Story of the Anglo-French War.—Career of Gordon.—Rebellion in Yun-Nan.—The Dowager Empresses.—Break in the Mantchu-Tartar Line.—Ascendency of Li Hung Chang.—Establishment of Chinese Embassy at Washington.—Formalities of the Occasion.—Question of Chinese Immigration.—Nature of the Conditions on the Pacific Coast.—Political and Social Aspect of the Issue.—

THE GREAT EASTERN TROPICS.—THE
SOUTH-EAST ASIAN PROSPERITY, 1875-85.

CHAPTER CLVI.—JAPAN.

—The Success of the Charter of Fudai. — The
Progress of the Japanese History. — The
Famous Japanese Medical Literature. —
The First Japanese Printing. — The First
Ballad. — Introduction of Christianity. —
Customs and Dress. — The First Public
Lunch. — The First Japanese Princess. —
Prevalence of the Measles. — The First of the
Sakura Blossoms. — The Keicho. — History
of the Sakurazakura. — Wars with China. —
Yield of the Rice. — Beliefs of the Mi-
koto. — The Sengoku. — First Conquest of West-
ern Nations. — The Edo. — Era of Persecutions. —
Duties of Japanese Society. — Espionage and
Terrorism. — Social Condition of Japan at Begin-
ning of Present Century. — World-wide Progress in
Recent Times. — Treaties with Foreign Nations. —
Civil War of 1861. — Triumph of Nationality. —
Excellence of Japanese Display at American
Continental. — Rise of the Nation. — Formation of
the New Imperial Constitution. — Conditions ante-
cedent to the Event. — Awakening of States-
manship. — State of the Japanese Mind at Middle
of Present Century. — Quickness of the People to
Assimilate. — Stimulus of Foreign Intercourse. —
Abolition of Feudalism. — Ascendency of Young
Men. — Imperial Project of the New Frame of
Government. — Establishment of the *Genroin*. —
Imperial Proclamation. — The Meiji Revolution. —
Educational and Industrial Conditions. —
Analysis of the Constitution. — The Emperor and
his Place in the State. — Rights and Duties of
Subjects. — The Imperial Diet. — Parel I. with
Magna Charta. — Powers of the Two Houses. —
Duties of Ministry and Council. — Courts of Law
and Judicial Process. — Law of Expropriation.
Supplementary Provisions. — Excellence of the
Constitution. — Promise of Japan. — 819-842

CHAPTER CLVII.—AUSTRALIA.

— Early Development of Australia. — A Trans-
planted Civilization. — Advantages possessed by
such States. — Sympathy between Australia and
America. — Australian Display at Continental Ex-
position. — "Island of Continent?" — Area of the
Country. — General Character. — The Ports being
lawful. — Precipitous Mountains. — Australian Rivers.
— Number and Character of the Lakes. —
Climate. — Conditions. — Variation of Temperature
and Humidity. — Areas of Australia. — Minerals
in Particular. — Abundance of Birds. — Richness and
Variety of Agriculture. — Fishes. — Grasses and Fruits.
— Distribution of Gold. — Character of the Mines. —
The Indigenous Races. — Personal Characteristics
of the Natives. — Manners and Customs. — Rich-
ness of the Australian Fauna. — Faunal Distribu-
tion. — Marine Fauna. — First European Knowledge

of Australia. — Explorations. — Hunting and
Diplomatic Council of Botany Bay. — War of Van-
diemen. — Colonization of Queensland. — West Aus-
tralia and New Zealand. — Contrivance of Experi-
ments. — Conflict between Free Colonists and
Barral Settlements. — Opposition to Barral Colo-
nization. — Abolition of the System. — Sketch
of the Establishments. — Early Civil Administra-
tions. — Increase of the People. — Beginning of the
Sheep Industry. — Parel I. between Australian
Colonists and those of California. — Administra-
tion of Barral. — Explorations of Mitchell. —
Beginning of the Australian Cities. — Character of
the Coast. — Nature of the Industries. — Discovery
of gold. — The Rush of Miners. — Withdrawal
from Other Enterprises. — Rapid Increase of Pop-
ulation. — Reaction towards Grazing and Agricul-
ture. — Political Development of the Colonies. —
Diagnosis of Provinces. — Epoch of Explorations. —
Great Countries first explored. — Difficulty of pen-
etrating the Interior. — Towns of Cunningham
and Stuart. — Work of Leichhardt and Eyre. —
Tracing of the Australian Rivers. — Explorations
of Stuart. — Incorporation of Burke and Wills. —
The Expedition Organized. — Progress into the In-
terior. — Death of the Leaders. — Revolution of the
Continent. — Expedition of Warburton and
Gosse. — Sketch of New South Wales. — Its His-
torical Development. — Outline of the History of
Victoria. — Climate and Products. — Civil Govern-
ment. — Political Phenomena of the Country. —
Introductory of 1841. — Question of Free Trade. —
Sketch of Queensland. — Product of Gold. — Out-
line of Civil Government. — Extent of South
Australia. — Character and Conditions of the Coun-
try. — Remaining Provinces of Australia. — Insti-
tutions and Structures of Melbourne. — Sketch of
Sydney. — The University. — Adelaide. — Its Build-
ings and Enterprises. — Tasmania. — General Con-
dition of the Australian Provinces. — Relations of
Colonial and Home Government. — Question of
Federation. — Derivation of the People. — Paucity
of the Population. — Industrial Energy of the
Australians. — Extent of the Commerce. — Yield of
gold. — Product of Wool. — General Industrial De-
velopment. — Conflict with the Asiatics. — Question
of Cheap Labor. — Laws relating to Chinese Immi-
gration. — Trouble with the Home Government.
— Outline for Australian Nationality. — 843-861

CHAPTER CLVIII.—CONCLUSION.

— Beliefs of the Historian. — Leading Truths
of History. — Man ought to be Free. — The Human
Race opposes its Own Emancipation. — Evils of
Overpopulation. — Perverse Theory of Patern-
alism. — Man is entitled to Social Forms. — He
is Great when Free. — Necessity of Toleration.
— Emancipation of Women. — Universal Citizenship.
— Universal Education. — Hope of the Golden
Era. — 862-864

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS, VOLUMES XV AND XVI.

PAGE.	PAGE.
<p> PORTRAIT OF LINCOLN, <i>Frontispiece</i>, HEAD-PIECE FOR UNITED STATES, 37 JAMES MONROE, 38 FRONT VIEW OF THE CAPITAL AT WASHINGTON, 40 THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON CITY, 43 JEAN LAFFITE, 44 MARQUIS DE LAFAYETTE, 45 JOHN QUINCY ADAMS, 47 ANDREW JACKSON, 49 DANIEL WEBSTER, 50 BLACK HAWK, 51 OSCEOLA, 53 THE NEW PATENT OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 55 MARTIN VAN BUREN, 56 EVERGLADES OF FLORIDA—LAND OF THE SEM- ISLES, 57 WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, 64 JOHN TYLER, 65 BUNKER HILL MONUMENT, 66 MORMON EMIGRANTS IN THE DESERT, 67 FALL OF THE ALAMO, 69 SAMUEL F. B. MOSE, 70 JAMES K. POLK, 71 CAPTURE OF MEXICAN BATTERIES BY CAPTAIN MAY, 73 FREMONT IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS, 75 GENERAL TAYLOR COMMANDING AT BUENA VISTA, 76 BOMBARDMENT OF SAN JUAN D'ULLOA, 77 WINFIELD SCOTT, 78 MINERS OF FORTY-NINE, 82 ADVENTURERS IN ROUTE OVERLAND TO CALI- FORNIA, 83 SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION, 84 ZACHARY TAYLOR, 85 HENRY CLAY, 86 MILLARD FILMORE, 87 KANE AND HIS COMPANIONS IN THE ARCTIC RE- GIONS, 89 JOHN C. CALHOUN, 90 FRANKLIN PIERCE, 91 SAN FRANCISCO AND BAY, 92 WALKER BEFORE HIS EXECUTION, 93 STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS, 95 JAMES BUCHANAN, 96 SALT LAKE CITY, 97 LANDING OF THE ATLANTIC CABLE, 98 SAM HOUSTON, 99 WASHINGTON IRVING, 99 </p>	<p> ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS, 102 INAUGURATION OF JEFFERSON DAVIS AT MONTE- COMERY, 103 ABRAHAM LINCOLN, 105 REMOVAL OF TROOPS FROM FORT MOLLERIE TO FORT SUMTER, 106 FLAG OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES, 107 FORTRESS MONROE, 111 JEFFERSON DAVIS, 112 GUARDING BRIDGE OVER THE POTOMAC, 114 THE SAN JACINTO STOPPING THE TRENT, 116 WILLIAM H. SEWARD, 117 BATTLE OF FORT DONELSON, 118 SURRENDER OF FORT DONELSON, 119 BATTLE OF MONITOR AND MERIMAC, 120 STONEWALL JACKSON, 122 GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN, 123 ROBERT EDWARD LEE, 124 BATTLE OF MALVERN HILL, 125 STONEWALL JACKSON IN BATTLE, 127 STRUGGLE AT THE BRIDGE AT ANTIETAM, 128 AMBROSE E. BURNSIDE, 129 FEDERAL GUN-BOATS PASSING VICKSBURG, 131 GRANT AND PEMBERTON—CAPITULATION OF VICKSBURG, 133 TEARING UP A RAILWAY, 134 GEORGE H. THOMAS, 135 BATTLE OF LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN, 136 ATTACK ON FORT SUMTER, 138 JOSEPH HOOKER, 139 BATTLE OF CHANCELLORSVILLE, 140 GEORGE G. MEADE, 141 BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG, 142 PICKETT'S CHARGE AT GETTYSBURG, 144 BAILLY'S DAM ON RED RIVER, 146 GRANT WRITING ORDERS TO SHERMAN FOR THE GRAND ADVANCE, 147 JAMES B. Mc PHERSON, 148 SHERMAN'S MARCH TO THE SEA, 149 MEETING OF SHERMAN AND JOHNSON, 151 DAVID G. FARRAGUT, 152 DESTRUCTION OF THE ALBEMARLE, 154 "THE MAN ON HORSEBACK," 155 BATTLE OF PENNSYLVANIA COURT-HOUSE, 156 DEATH OF GENERAL SICARI, 157 PHILIP H. SHERIDAN, 158 SHERIDAN'S ARRIVAL AT CEDAR CREEK, 159 EXPLOSION OF THE MINE BEFORE PATERSONBURG, 160 SURRENDER OF GENERAL LEE, 162 </p>

	PAGE.		PAGE.
GENERAL LEE TAKING LEAVE OF HIS SOLDIERS,	164	DOST MOHAMMED KHAN,	294
SALMON P. CHASE,	165	AKBAR KHAN,	294
ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN,	167	SIR ROBERT AND LADY SALE,	295
LAST HOUR OF BOOTH,	168	ARRIVAL OF DR. BRYDON AT JELALABAD,	296
TOMB OF LINCOLN, SPRINGFIELD,	169	THE KHAYBER PASS,	297
ANDREW JOHNSON,	170	REUNION OF THE CAPTIVES OF CABUL,	299
REVIEW OF THE UNION ARMY AT WASHINGTON,	171	SIR ROBERT PEEL,	302
DOWN THE YUKON, ALASKA,	173	ISLE OF OTAHEITE,	304
VLYSSEUS S. GUYNE,	177	RICHARD COBDEN,	307
CENTRAL PACIFIC RAILWAY, SHREY, NEVADA,	178	THE IRISH FAMINE—SCENE AT THE GATE OF A WORK-HOUSE,	309
THE JOINT HIGH COMMISSION IN SESSION,	181	LOLD GEORGE BENTINCK,	312
BURNING OF CHICAGO,	182	EREBUS AND TERROR OUTWARD BOUND,	313
HORACE GREELEY,	184	ELISHA KENT KANE,	314
ATTACK ON PLACÉ COMMISSIONERS BY MOBDOCS,	185	WILLIAM SMITH O'BRIEN,	317
CHARLES SUMNER,	187	CRYSTAL PALACE OF 1851,	325
MAIN BUILDING, CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION,	188	DUKE OF WELLINGTON,	330
INDEPENDENCE HALL,	189	VIEW OF THE BOSPHORUS,	332
MEMORIAL HALL, CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION,	190	CHURCH OF THE HOLY SEPULCHER,	337
BATTLE OF THE BIG HORN—CUSTER'S DEATH,	191	LOLD PALMERSTON,	342
RUTHERFORD B. HAYES,	194	TICKET-OF-LEAVE,	343
PITTSBURG RIOT,	195	DIAMOND HARBOR, HOOGHLY,	345
LAUNCHING A LIFE-BOAT,	199	NATIVE OFFICERS OF THE BOMBAY ARMY,	346
JAMES A. GARFIELD,	203	BRAHMINS OF BENGAL,	347
JAMES G. BLAINE,	205	PORT OF CALCUTTA,	349
ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT GARFIELD,	206	THRONE-ROOM, PALACE OF DELHI,	351
CHESTER A. ARTHUR,	207	BENARES,	352
ROBERT T. LINCOLN,	208	SIR JOHN LAWRENCE,	353
THOMAS A. EDISON,	211	VIEW OF LABORE—THE ENGLISH CHURCH,	354
EAST RIVER BRIDGE,	214	BRITISH RESIDENCY AT LUCKNOW,	355
GENERAL WILLIAM T. SHERMAN,	220	GRAND MOSQUE AT DELHI,	359
LIEUTENANT-GENERAL PHILIP H. SHERIDAN,	221	RELIEF OF LUCKNOW,	361
GROVER CLEVELAND,	222	ATTACK ON THE ALAMBAGH,	362
WYFIELD S. HAMOCK,	224	SIR HENRY HAVELOCK,	363
JOHN A. LOGAN,	225	OUTRAM, CAMPBELL, AND HAVELOCK,	365
THOMAS A. HENDRICKS,	226	BODSON SEIZING THE KING OF DELHI,	366
SAMUEL J. THOMPSON,	226	MEMORIAL OF CAWNPORE,	367
HENRY WARD BEECHER,	227	CHARLES ROBERT DARWIN,	371
MORRISON K. WAITE,	229	GENEVA, SWITZERLAND,	387
ROSCOE CONKLING,	230	GENEVA TRIBUNAL,	388
EARTHQUAKE AT CHARLESTON,	232	PRINCE OF WALES,	392
BENJAMIN HARRISON,	237	JAMAICA INSURRECTION,	394
VIEW IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK,	240	LOLD DERBY,	396
OLD FEDERAL HALL,	242	EMPEROR THEODORE GIVING AN AUDIENCE,	404
SUB-TREASURY BUILDING, WALL STREET,	243	WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE,	407
TAIL-PIECE,	248	WILLIAM E. FOSTER,	412
HEAD-PIECE FOR GREAT BRITAIN,	253	CHARLES DICKENS,	413
WINDSOR CASTLE,	255	EMPERESS OF INDIA,	418
GEORGE IV.,	256	EARL OF BEAONSFIELD,	419
BATTLE OF NAVARINO,	259	LIBERAL MINISTRY OF 1880,	422
GEORGE CANNING,	262	COOMASSIE,	423
CATHEDRAL OF YORK,	265	SIR GARNET WOLFELEY,	424
WILLIAM IV.,	266	PONDON BRIDGE OVER THE PRAH,	425
LOLD JOHN RUSSELL,	269	CELAWAYO, IN ENGLISH GARB,	426
DANIEL O'CONNELL,	272	HINDOO KUSH MOUNTAINS,	427
VICTORIA,	276	SHIBRE ATH,	428
VIEW OF JAMAICA,	284	HAZARAH, FROM NORTHERN HIGHLANDS—AF- GHAN WARRIOR,	429
PRINCE ALBERT,	285	YAKOOB KHAN,	450
MELHNET ALI PASHA,	290		
PALACE OF MELHNET ALI,	291		

	PAGE.		PAGE.
CHARLES STEWART PARNELL,	431	METZ,	528
MARQUIS OF SALISBURY,	436	BISMARCK ACCOMPANYING THE CARRIAGE OF NAPOLEON III. TO THE CASTLE OF WIL- HELSHÖHE,	529
GLADSTONE,	438	CAMDEN PALACE, CHISELHURST,	530
ALFRED TENNYSON,	440	CATHEDRAL OF STRASBURG,	531
PALACE OF THE KHEDIVÉ,	443	FRENCH SOLDIERS BURNING THEIR FLAGS AFTER THE SURRENDER OF METZ,	532
AHMED ARABI PASHA,	444	ENTRANCE OF THE GERMANS INTO ORLEANS,	532
MODERN LIGHT-HOUSE AT ALEXANDRIA,	445	BURNING OF ST. CLOUD BY THE PRUSSIANS,	533
CHARGE OF THE HIGHLANDERS AT TEL-EL-KEBER,	446	GAMBETTA STARTING FOR TOURS,	534
ON THE WHITE Nile,	447	OVERTHROW OF BOUBRAKI,	535
WARRIORS OF THE MAHDI IN BATTLE WITH THE KHEDIVÉ'S FORCES,	449	BATTLE OF ST. QUENTIN,	536
DAVID LIVINGSTONE,	450	JULES FAVRE,	537
HENRY M. STANLEY,	451	SITTING OF THE DELEGATE GOVERNMENT AT BORDEAUX,	538
TAIL-PIECE, HOLYROOD AND ARTHUR'S SEAT,	452	INSURGENT COMMUNISTS SEIZING THE GUNS,	540
HEAD-PIECE FOR FRANCE,	457	BARRICADE OF THE PORT ST. DENIS, DURING THE COMMUNE,	541
FIELD OF WATERLOO,	458	BARRICADE, HOTEL DE VILLE,	542
LOUIS XVIII.,	459	BOMBARDMENT OF ST. DENIS,	544
JOSEPH BONAPARTE,	462	SCENE DURING THE BOMBARDMENT OF PARIS,	545
CHATEAUBRIAND,	464	FALL OF THE VENDÔME COLUMN,	546
THE ESCERIAL,	465	SUPPLYING THE HUNGRY DURING THE COM- MUNE,	547
CHARLES X.,	466	A PETROLIUSE,	548
CORONATION OF CHARLES X.,	467	DEATH OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF PARIS,	549
CHARLES FERDINAND, DUKE OF BERRY,	468	LAST SORTIE FROM PARIS,	550
CASIMIR PERIER,	471	TRANSPORT OF COMMUNIST PRISONERS IN BREST HARBOR,	552
ALGIERS,	476	MARSHAL MACMAHON,	553
MARQUIS DE LAFAYETTE,	478	LEON GAMBETTA,	554
LOUIS PHILIPPE,	479	LOUIS ADOLPHE THIERS,	555
ARRIVAL OF LOUIS PHILIPPE IN PARIS,	481	LA REPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE,	557
LOUIS PHILIPPE TAKES THE OATH,	482	LEON SAY,	558
BATTLE OF ISLY,	483	GAMBETTA IN THE TRIBUNE,	562
CAPTURE OF ABD-EL-KADER,	484	PRINCE NAPOLEON,	565
GENERAL VIEW OF LYONS,	486	COMTE DE CHAMBORD,	567
INSURRECTION IN LYONS,	487	PRESIDENT JULES GREVY,	571
MARIE CAROLINE, DUCHESS OF BERRY,	488	PRINCE DE JOINVILLE,	572
MARSHAL SOULT,	489	DEU D'AUVALE,	573
FIESCHI'S ATTEMPT TO ASSASSINATE LOUIS PHILIPPE,	490	VERSAILLES PALACE AND GARDENS,	575
GUILAUME GUIZOT,	491	HARBOR OF MARSEILLES,	578
DUKE OF ORLEANS,	494	EIFFEL TOWER,	579
DOME OF THE INVALIDES,	495	TAIL-PIECE, THE ANGELUS,	580
LAMARTINE,	496	THE SURRENDER AT SIDAN (Etching),	582
PARIS INSURRECTION OF 1848,	497	HEAD-PIECE FOR GERMANY,	583
ADELAÏDE, PRINCESS OF ORLEANS,	498	FREDERICK WILLIAM III.,	586
PROCLAIMING THE REPUBLIC OF 1848,	500	BATTLE AT THE BARRICADES IN BRUSSELS.— After the painting by Wappers,	587
GENERAL CAVIGNAC,	502	LEOPOLD, KING OF THE BELGIANS.—After the painting by Wilde,	588
ARREST OF THE DEPUTIES,	504	ALEXANDER VON HUMBOLDT,	591
VICTOR HUGO,	505	PRINCE METTERNICH,	593
NAPOLEON III.,	507	BERLIN INSURRECTION OF 1848,	594
EMPERESS EUGÉNIE,	508	HUNGARIAN VOLUNTEERS.—After the painting by A. Von Pettenkofen,	597
ATTEMPT OF ORSINI TO ASSASSINATE NAPOLEON III.,	510	ARTHUR GORCEY,	598
SUEZ CANAL,	517	LOUIS KOSSUTH,	599
HENRI ROCHEFORT,	519		
ISABELLA II., OF SPAIN,	520		
VIEW OF MADRID,	521		
PRINCE LEOPOLD OF HOHENZOLLERN,	522		
BARON LE BEUF,	524		
MARSHAL BAZAÏNE,	526		
BATTLE OF MARS-LA-TOURS,	527		

	PAGE		PAGE
LEONAS J. SEIBER,	600	EQUESTRIAN STATUE OF PETER THE GREAT,	702
OLD VON BISTADT,	606	SOCIETY,	704
STORMING OF THE PANISWALL,	607	SERASHOBEK,	705
PRINCE FREDERICK OF AUSTRIA,	609	DIRECTION OF TURKISH FIELD AT SINOP,	706
AUSTRIAN PRUSSIAN CAMPAIGN OF 1809,	610	LORD RAGLAN,	707
BATTLE OF SAISON, After the painting by W. Camphoussier,	612	BATTLE OF THE ALMA,	708
KING WILLIAM IV. AND HIS OFFICERS, After the painting by W. Camphoussier,	615	BATTLE OF BATAVIAVA,	708
VON MOELLER,	616	BEKIRMAN,	709
PRINCE FREDERICK CHARLES,	617	BATTLE OF ISKERMAN,	710
VILDE OF WITTELSBACH,	618	STORMING OF THE RIDAN,	711
INTERVIEW OF JULES FAVRE WITH BISMARCK,	619	STORMING OF THE MALAKHOE, SEPTEMBER 8, 1855, Drawn by Richard Knodt,	712
THE FIFTEENS IN PARIS,	620	CONGRESS OF PARIS, 1856,	713
PROCLAMATION OF KING WILLIAM AS EMPEROR OF GERMANY, After the painting by Anton Von Weiler,	621	ALEXANDER II,	715
GERMANS OCCUPYING PARIS,	623	ALEXANDER III,	717
EMPEROR WILLIAM REENTERING BERLIN,	624	ST. PETERSBURG, NEVSKI PROSPEKT,	719
EMPEROR WILLIAM I.,	630	GENERAL GURKO,	720
VILWS IN BERLIN,	635	CONSTANTINOPLE,	722
PRINCE BISMARCK,	639	ALI PASHA, OF JANINA,	723
THE CROWN PRINCE,	645	THE ADOPPOS, ARCH OF HADRIAN IN THE FOREGROUND, Modern View,	723
COUNT VON MOTKELE,	650	THE PHILAS, Modern View,	724
LEWARD VON MANTELFELE,	651	LORD BYRON,	725
EMPEROR FREDERICK III.,	652	QUEEN AMALIA—After E. Ronjat,	726
LEWARD EMPRESS VICTORIA OF GERMANY,	653	FOUNTAIN OF THE SERVEDICE,	727
TAI-PHUE, GERMANY,	654	PRINCE GORICHANKOFF,	728
HEAD-PIECE FOR ITALY,	655	CONSTANTINOPLE FROM SCUTARI,	729
GIUSEPPE MAZZINI,	659	SULTMAN PASHA,	730
ALESSANDRO MANZONI,	660	DEFENSE OF SUDBY PASS,	730
MOR JOKAL,	661	REFUSE OF THE GRAND ASSAULT AT PLEVNA,	731
ENTRANCE OF THE FRENCH TROOPS INTO TEBIZ, 1818,	662	GENERAL TODDEREN,	732
GIUSEPPE GARIBOLDI,	663	OSAR PASHA,	732
CAMILLO BENSO DI CAVOUR,	664	ADRIANOPLE,	733
BATTLE OF MONTELEONE,	666	CONGRESS OF BERLIN, 1878,	734
CONSOLE OF THE BRIDGE OF THE BELVEDOVA,	666	VILWS IN ATHENS,	735
BATTLE OF SOULIERE,	667	AROLA-AZIZ,	736
LANDING OF GARIBOLDI AT MARSALA, Drawn by G. Bodding,	669	SULTAN'S PALACE AND THE BOSHORUS,	739
FLORENCE,	671	TAI-PHUE,	740
DEAL PALACE, VENICE,	672	HEAD-PIECE FOR NINE AMERICAN STATES,	745
ST. PETER'S ROMAN,	674	NAGARA FALLS,	749
EDIFICIAL CONSOLE,	676	EARL OF DURHAM,	750
VICINE MANUEL,	677	LORD ELGIN,	751
EXPUSION OF JEWS FROM THEIR COLLEGE IN ROME,	678	PUNYAS ISLAND, CANADA,	753
PHOENIX,	679	MADRIS OF TORONTO,	755
LEO XIII.,	681	LORD DUFFERIN,	758
BRIDGE OF SAINT ANGELO, ROME,	683	SIR JOHN ALEXANDER MACDONALD,	759
A SETTLE IN NADIE,	688	CHAPEL AND RAMPWAYS OF QUEBEC,	760
SPAINAY OF THE SENATORIAL PALACE, ROME,	689	UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO,	761
TAI-PHUE, WISOLD LOON OF ST. MARK,	692	PARLIAMENT HOUSE OF ONTARIO,	762
HEAD-PIECE FOR EUSTIN EUROPE,	697	FOUNTAIN AND AQUEDUC, CITY OF MEXICO,	769
ALEXANDER I.,	698	MESTIZO MEXICAN,	770
COLUMB OF ALEXANDER I.,	699	ELIDIAN VII.,	771
NICHOLAS I.,	700	CITY OF MEXICO,	772
		ENTRANCE TO CATHEDRAL, CITY OF MEXICO,	775
		GENERAL PELE,	774
		EMPEROR MAXIMILIAN,	775
		STORMING OF PLEVNA BY THE FRENCH,	776
		ENTRANCE OF THE FRENCH IN THE CITY OF MEXICO,	776

	PAGE		PAGE
EVACUATION OF MAXIMILIAN AND GENERALS		SHINTO SHRINE NEAR YOKOHAMA	819
MEDIA AND MIRAMON	777	KATO KIYOMASA	820
FIRST STEAMER ON THE ORINOCO	785	BATTLE OF KUBAI KHAN WITH THE JAPANESE.—DRAWN BY F. LIX	822
GATHERING PERUVIAN BARK	786	JAPANESE WARRIORS IN ANCIENT ARMOR	823
BELLE OF PERU	787	JAPANESE WRISTLERS	825
LIMA	788	VIEW FROM THE BRIDGE OF NIPPON, TOKIO	826
ISLE OF SERPENTS, BAY OF RIO DE JANEIRO	790	JAPANESE SCHOOL	830
DOM PEDRO L.	791	MUSEUMS, MUSC.	832
SHELTER FOR TRAVELERS IN THE ANDES	797	AUSTRALIAN NATIVES AT ABORIGINAL STATION	841
TAIL-PIECE—CLIFFS OF CAPE HORN	798	CAPTAIN COOK	842
HEAD-PIECE FOR ORIENTAL NATIVES	803	AUSTRALIAN GOLD RUSH, 1851	845
CHINESE TYPES.—DRAWN BY L. BOHLE	804	MENS OF SANDHURST	846
CHINESE WALL	805	CRADLING AND PANNING—AUSTRALIAN MINES	847
PEKIN, THE TARTAR CITY	806	DEPARTURE OF THE BURKE AND WILLS EXPEDITION FROM MELBOURNE	850
A STREET IN CANTON	807	MUSLING SHEEP—AUSTRALIAN RANCH	852
PORCELAIN TOWER, NANKIN	808	LORD MELBOURNE	854
CHINESE OPIUM-SMOKERS	809	PUBLIC LIBRARY, NATIONAL GALLERY, AND MUSEUM	855
BOMBARDMENT OF CANTON BY THE BRITISH	810	COLLINS STREET, MELBOURNE	856
BATTLE OF PAI-KAO	811	THE UNIVERSITY, MELBOURNE	857
ONE OF THE GATES OF PEKIN GIVEN UP TO THE ALLIES	812	BRISBANE FROM BOWEN TERRACE	858
VIEW OF PEKIN	813	VIEW OF HOBART FROM KANGAROO POINT	859
RELIGIOUS CEREMONY IN CHINESE TEMPLE	814	TAIL-PIECE	864
PEKIN TRAGEDY	817		
CHINESE MANDARIN	818		

INTRODUCTION TO VOLUMES XV AND XVI.



If we examine the history of the times most recent we shall find it strongly discriminated from that of the ages more remote. The historical phenomena

of the NINETEENTH CENTURY are separated by a wide remove from the aspects of the eighteenth, and still more widely from those of the centuries preceding. Human events have become vastly complex and interdependent. States and nations are interlocked and cross-woven in their relations, and the various peoples of the world seem floating in a common current towards a common destiny. Here and there the surface is dotted with vortexes of agitation, and it is sometimes difficult to discern in which direction the tide is flowing; but the historian knows that all irregularity and disturbance are but seeming, and that the whirls in the river

"Are eddies in the mighty stream
That rolls to its appointed end."

The science of history is beset with the same kind of difficulty which confronts geology in considering the latest aspects of the physical world. The drift is more difficult to understand than the azoic rocks. Both the historian and the geologist are confused on account of the nearness and multiplicity of the things demanding attention and classification. But the puzzle to the historical student is greater than that which meets the student of world-formation. For to the nearness and multiplicity of the facts in the geology of the pleistocene, History must add a certain aggravation of complexity which comes of human relations and dependencies. The growing sympathies and community of interests which have become so conspicuous since the opening of the century have interlaced the selvages of the nations, until the general aspect is that

of one great fact confused with a mass of bewildering particulars.

At the time of the battle of Waterloo there was not an ocean steamer, a railway car, or a telegraph in the world. How, then, could the nations fraternize? Isolation is a result of non-intercourse. In proportion as the means of communication are multiplied the common and mutual interests of mankind are developed, apathy and suspicion are abated, and the temperature of humanity rises to the glow of enthusiasm.

It is surprising to note how in recent times the intellectual freedom and moral compass of men have widened in the triumph over the obstacles of environment. It is impossible that thought and action should ever go back again to the old standards and criteria. The movement of civilization is like that of certain kinds of machinery that can go only in one direction—like that of the power-loom or thresher, the reversal of which is unthinkable, except by crash and ruin. The threads of common sympathies carried by the shuttles of intercourse from nation to nation, from shore to shore, have bound all civilized peoples in a common fate; but this infinite union of things before distinct and separate, while it has inspired the pen of History, has greatly confused and perplexed the problems with which she has had to deal.

But internationality has not yet arrived—perhaps may never arrive. From the past the peoples of to-day have inherited repellant institutions and the instincts of segregation. The spirit of locality reasserts itself in the midst of commercial agitation, and the lasso of ancient custom holds back the flying advance, even in the era of the cosmopolite. Thus it happens that modern society, like the physical world, is balanced between two forces, the radical impulses born of intercourse and democracy, and the checks of old-time custom and race heredity.

And so, after the cataclysm of revolutionary France in 1815, a system of things somewhat resembling the ancient order out of the ancient order was resumed in Europe. On the American side of the Atlantic the promising political experiment of our fathers stood fast, and the structure of government by the people rose into strength and shapefulness. For about thirty years there followed in the general domain of History what may be called an epoch of suspense, and then the changed order of the political and social world declared itself in full force. In the next year after Waterloo the Atlantic was traversed by a steamer. With 1828-30 came the railway, and with 1845 human intelligence, perched on the lightning's wing, began to carry the messages of men from city to city, from country-place to throbbing metropolis.

What, then, shall the writer or student of History say of the present aspect and movement of the nations? That Organized Power is losing its hold, and that Man is coming to the fore. The historian still notes the separate and variable progress of States and kingdoms; but he notes with greater interest the emergence of individuality and freedom from the low grounds of ignorance and slavery. He notes—even with pride—that Nature has been admitted into the confederation of Humanity, and that Generosity is filling his cornucopia to the brim.

In the Books comprising the present Vol-


ume it shall be the aim to give, in brief outline, a narrative of the course of affairs from the Treaty of Vienna to the leading events of the current decade. The story will begin with the progress and development of the United States, and proceed to the historical movements of those nations with which our own is most intimately associated—Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Northern and Eastern Europe, the Minor American States, and finally the Oriental Empires and Australia. It will be necessary to summarize the causes, course, and results of the several terrible conflicts which have consumed such an ominous part of the substance of the century—the Civil War in the United States, the Crimean War, and the Franco-Austrian, Franco-Prussian, and Turco-Russian struggles in Europe; but as much as possible of the space of the volume will be reserved for the more cheerful record of those events in which the virtues of peace and the triumphs of knowledge are exemplified. Let the hope be cherished that the hand of him who shall in course of time take up the ever-unfinished work and carry forward the story of human achievement and aspiration into the splendors of the twentieth century, may be guided by a clearer vision—though hardly by a sincerer trust and purpose—than have moved and sustained the present effort to supply, in fair proportion and truthfulness of matter, the history of the principal hopes and sorrows of our race.

RIDPATH'S
UNIVERSAL HISTORY

VOLUME XV.

BOOK XXI. —THE UNITED STATES

BOOK XXII.—GREAT BRITAIN



MAP XXII.

SHOWING THE

ACQUISITION OF TERRITORY

AND ITS DISTRIBUTION AMONG

POLITICAL DIVISIONS

1776—1884.



Book Twenty-First.

THE UNITED STATES.

CHAPTER CXXII.—AMERICAN MIDDLE AGES.



SHOULD the observer take his stand in any conspicuous station in Western Europe and view the historical landscape, in the summer of 1815, he would behold around the horizon the subsidence

of a storm which had prevailed for more than a quarter of a century. A period of forty years had elapsed since the outbreak of the American Revolution, and of twenty-six years since the assembly of the States General in France. Through this very considerable extent of time the elemental warfare had increased in violence to the close. The battle of Waterloo may be regarded as the last burst of the tempest, the last tremendous effort of the human storm. After this event the clouds rolled heavily back, and the light of peace, which had already illumined for some time the shores of the New World, began to shine fitfully along the coasts of Europe.

There was an immediate and great change in the condition of both the Old World and the New. The treaties of Vienna and Ghent marked the close of a historical epoch. There

was, at least for the present, an end of commotion and the incoming of political quietude. A sort of calm, half-ominous in its character, supervened, as if the nations would seek rest from the tempests to which they had been exposed. The date to which we have just referred may be properly used as the beginning of another era in the movement of modern civilization. It is here that we take our stand, in order to consider, in the current Volume, the evolution of the new order of society, under the general head of **THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.**

In the present Volume it will be our purpose to note the course of events, first in the United States, and afterwards in the European nations, from the overthrow of Napoleon Bonaparte to the current annals of our own day. The reader will, perhaps, from the first be struck with what may be called the heroic character of the narrative. Tragedy may be said to disappear for a time from history, and, though comedy does not take its place, we shall look in vain for the repetition, even incidentally, of the exciting acts which characterized the great drama of the Revolutionary era. None the less, the

new open glass we are now to enter, will be found open to wide interest. It will be read and perused with a glow, and we may hope a new human regard. The nineteenth century may be said to have yielded itself somewhat to the influence of a more benign genius than that which dominated the close of the eighteenth; so that the reader may not be obliged to explore pages of recent annals some sources of inspiration, and perhaps some fountains of profusion. Let us, therefore,



JAMES MONROE.

enter upon the history of our own country from the date of the treaty of Ghent, and note the success of the fathers in planting and nurturing a new nationality on this side of the sea.

Great and rapid was the progress of the United States of North America, considered as an infant republic. The scheme of government carried by the Revolutionary patriots and statesmen, as we have seen, to the highest degree. The work of forming a great nationality in the West, on a grander aspect of physical

grandeur to the civilization planted on this side of the sea, in the vindication of free political institutions as the best form of human government, has in the present century and in our own land far outstripped any previous achievement of like kind in the history of the human race. In the present chapter we shall give a sketch in outline of the prodigious growth and promise of our country. It will be remembered that in the preceding Book the history of the United States was extended to the

close of the War of 1812 and the establishment of peace by the treaty of Ghent. We shall in this place resume the narrative with the administration of Monroe, the fifth President of the Republic.

James Monroe was a Virginian, being the fourth and last of the so-called Virginia Dynasty of Presidents. All the chief magistrates thus far, with the exception of the elder Adams, had been taken from the Old Dominion. Monroe was born on the 28th of April, 1758. His education was obtained chiefly at William and Mary College, from which institution he went out, in 1776, to become a soldier of the Revolution. He was in the battle of Trenton, and received a British ball in his shoulder. He took part, under Lord Stirling, in the campaigns of 1777 and 1778, being in the battles of Brandywine, Germantown, and Monmouth. In course of time he studied law with Thomas Jefferson, governor of Virginia. He served in the Virginia Assembly, and at the age of twenty-three was a member of the Executive Council. In 1783 he was sent to Congress, and while in his service as delegate he became convinced of the invalidity of the Articles of Confederation as a form of government for the Colonies. He was one of the earliest, though among the youngest, of those patriots who exerted themselves in behalf of a better Constitution for the United States.

Monroe was a member of the Constitutional

Convention, and in 1790 was elected Senator of the United States. In 1794 he was sent as plenipotentiary to France, and was one of those who negotiated with the French Government the purchase of Louisiana. Afterwards he was sent as minister plenipotentiary to the court of St. James. In course of time his views underwent some change from the Federal towards the Democratic type, and he is generally ranked in the same category of statesmen with Jefferson and Madison. In 1811 he was elected governor of Virginia, and when Madison ascended to the Presidency was appointed Secretary of State. His election to the Presidency has already been sketched in the previous chapter. The electoral vote in his favor was 183, out of a total of 217. His Cabinet was composed as follows: John Quincy Adams, Secretary of State; William H. Crawford, Secretary of the Treasury; John C. Calhoun, Secretary of War; Benjamin W. Crowninshield, Secretary of the Navy; William Wirt, Attorney-General.

In its principles and methods the new Administration was Democratic. In general, the policy of Madison was adopted and continued by his successor; but the stormy times which Madison had experienced in the vicissitudes of the war gave place to years of unbroken peace. The animosities and party strifes which had prevailed since the accession of John Adams seemed for a season to subside. The statesmen who were in the lead in Congress and the nation devoted themselves assiduously to the payment of the national debt. The young Republic found herself burdened, after the treaty of Ghent, with the accumulated expenses of the war, and the task of liquidating the debt was of herculean proportions. But commerce soon revived. The Government was economically administered. Population rapidly increased. At length wealth began to flow in, and in a few years the debt was fully and honestly discharged.

In the summer of 1817 a complication of some importance arose between the United States and the little kingdom of Hayti, in the northern part of San Domingo. There were grounds to suspect that Louis XVIII., the newly restored Bourbon king of France, would endeavor to obtain the sovereignty of the island, and perhaps proclaim its annexation to

the French Kingdom. Under the Napoleonic ascendancy Hayti had, as we have seen, been for a time under the dominion of France, and there was an attempt to maintain, under the restoration, what had been won by the sword of Bonaparte.


In this state of affairs, Christophe, the sovereign of Hayti, became anxious to secure from the United States a recognition of the independence of his government. The President met the overtures of the Haytian king with favor. An agent was sent out in the frigate *Congress* to conclude a treaty of amity and commerce with the kingdom. The President had taken pains, however, that the agent so sent should not rank with plenipotentiaries. On this score the Haytian authorities were offended, and would not negotiate with an American agent who was not properly accredited to their government. For this reason the mission resulted in failure and disappointment.

The attempt, in the same year, to form a treaty with the Indian nations of the Territory North-west of the River Ohio was attended with better success. The important tribes inhabiting this region, and concerned in the new compact, were the Wyandots, the Delawares, the Senecas, and the Shawnees. Other prominent Indian nations, including the Chippewas, the Ottowas, and the Pottawattamies, were also interested in the treaty and in some degree parties thereto. The subject matter of the new compact had relation to the Indian lands lying north of the Ohio River, mostly in what was afterwards the State of Ohio. It was at this time that the Indian title to the valley of the Maumee was obtained. The cession and purchase of about four millions of acres in all were accomplished in the treaty, and it may well surprise, in the light of subsequent values, to know that the purchase sum paid for this vast and fertile tract did not exceed fourteen thousand dollars. In addition to the purchase money, however, the Delawares were to receive an annuity of five hundred dollars, while the Wyandots, the Senecas, the Shawnees, and the Ottowas were guaranteed ten thousand dollars annually, in perpetuity. The Chippewas and Pottawattamies were given an annuity of three thousand three hundred dollars, for fifteen

years. Certain tracts were also reserved by the Red men, amounting in the aggregate to about three hundred thousand acres. The theory of the Government was that in course of time the Indians, living on their reservations and surrounded by vast and progressive settlements of White men, would be assimilated to civilized life, and gradually absorbed as a part of the nation. It was not long, however, until it was discovered that the Indians had little sympathy with American farms and villages and American methods of life. The habits of barbarism were too strongly

Illinois to the Gulf, brought under the sway of the Republic.

During this same year the Government was obliged to give attention to a nest of buccaners, who had established themselves on Amelia Island, off the north-eastern coast of Florida. The piratical establishment had its origin in the revolutionary movements which had been going on in New Grenada and Venezuela. A certain Gregor McGregor, who held a commission from the insurrectionary authorities of New Grenada, had gathered up a band of freebooters, recruiting his forces, for



FRONT VIEW OF THE CAPITOL AT WASHINGTON.

fixed, through ages of heredity, and no aptitude for the anticipated change was seen on the part of the sequestered aborigines.

The admirable working of the American system, by which new States could be added to the Republic, was again shown in 1817. At the close of that year the western portion of what had been the Mississippi Territory was organized as the State of Mississippi, and formally admitted. The new commonwealth contained an area of forty-seven thousand square miles, and had acquired a population of sixty-five thousand. Thus was the whole eastern bank of the Mississippi, from the junction of the

the most part, from Charleston and Savannah. With these he had fortified Amelia Island, and made it a rendezvous for slave-traders and South American privateers.

It was perhaps dimly believed by the audacious rascals that the well-known sympathy of the United States for republics, and particularly for the republican tendencies shown in South America, would save them from disturbance. Since the buccaners seemed to act in the cause of South American liberty, they hoped to escape attack from the Government of the United States. They accordingly proceeded to blockade the fort of St. Augustine,

and to demean themselves as if there were no civilization and no retribution which they had cause to fear. The Federal Government, however, took the matter under advisement. A fleet was sent against the pirates, and the lawless establishment was broken up. A similar assemblage of freebooters on the island of Galveston, off the coast of Texas, was suppressed in like manner.

It was at the beginning of the Monroe Administration that the question of the internal improvement of the country first presented itself as a practical issue to the American mind. The population of the Republic had now taken its western course, and was pouring through the passes of the Alleghenies, rapidly filling up the country as far as the Father of Waters. The necessity for thoroughfares and for other physical means of intercourse and commerce was upon the people. The territorial vastness of the country brought with it the necessity of devising suitable means of communication. Without thoroughfares and canals it was evident that the products of the vast interior, which civilization was about to open up, could never reach a market. It was also evident that in a country where no capital had as yet accumulated the necessary improvements could not be effected by private enterprise. But had Congress, under the Republican Constitution, the right to vote money for the needed improvements?

The Democratic party had from the first been a party of strict construction. It was claimed that what was not positively conceded and expressed in the Constitution had no existence in the American system. The Federalists, on the other hand, had claimed that the Constitution of the United States was pregnant with implied powers, which might be evoked under the necessities of the situation and directed to the accomplishment of desired results. Jefferson and Madison had held to the doctrine of strict construction, and had opposed internal improvements under the national patronage. Monroe held similar views, and the propositions in Congress to make appropriations for the internal improvement of the country were either voted down or vetoed.

Only in a single instance at this epoch did the opposite principle prevail. A bill was passed appropriating the necessary means for

the construction of a National Road across the Alleghenies, from Cumberland to Wheeling. This was the great thoroughfare which had already been extended from Peninsular Virginia to Cumberland, and which was afterwards carried, though without completion, from Wheeling westward through Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois to St. Louis. This done, the question of internal improvements was referred to the several States, as a concession to their rights. Under this reference, New York took the lead by constructing a magnificent canal from Buffalo to Albany, a distance of three hundred and sixty-three miles. The cost of this important work was more than seven and a-half million dollars, and the whole period of Monroe's administration was occupied in completing it.

Another important event of the year 1817 was the outbreak of the Seminole war. The Indians known as Seminoles occupied the frontiers of Georgia and Alabama. It has frequently been difficult, in the history of our country, to ascertain the exact causes of Indian hostilities. It might not be far from truth to allege that the hereditary instincts of war on the part of the savage races sought expression at intervals in bloody and devastating scenes; but the land question may, on the whole, be ascribed as the cause of the larger part of Indian hostilities. In the case of the Seminole outbreak some considerable bodies of half-savage negroes, and also of Creek Indians, joined in the depredations of their countrymen. General Gates, commandant of the post on Flint River, was ordered by the Government into the Seminole country, and made some headway against them; but after destroying a few villages, his forces were found inadequate to suppress the savages. General Jackson, of Tennessee, was thereupon ordered to collect from his own and adjacent States a sufficient army to reduce the Seminoles to submission. The General, however, paid but little attention to his instructions, but proceeded to gather up out of West Tennessee a band of about a thousand riflemen, with whom he marched against the Seminoles, and in the following spring overran the hostile country, with little opposition. It was at this time that General Jackson was given the sobriquet of *Big Knife* by the Indians, among

whom his name and fame had inspired a wholesome dread.

Important consequences followed upon this episode of the Seminole war. General Jackson, while engaged in his expedition against the Indians, had entered Florida and taken possession of a Spanish post at St. Marks. He gave as an excuse for so doing that the place was necessary as a base of operations against the savages. The Spanish garrison which had occupied St. Marks was removed to Pensacola. At the time of the capture of the place two Englishmen, named Arbuthnot and Ambrister, were found in St. Marks, and charges were preferred against them of having incited the Seminoles to insurrection.

Nor is it improbable that the charges were founded in fact. The Englishmen were tried, under Jackson's direction, were convicted of treacherous acts in connection with the war, were condemned and executed. Jackson then proceeded against Pensacola, took the town, besieged the fortress of Barrancas, at the entrance of the bay, and compelled the Spanish authorities to take ship for Havana. These were the events which first excited the animosity of many of the peace-loving people of the United States against General Jackson, and he was subjected by his enemies to unmeasured condemnation. The President and Congress, however, justified him in his somewhat reckless proceedings, and his reputation was increased rather than diminished by his arbitrary conduct. A resolution of censure which was introduced into the House of Representatives was suppressed by a large vote.

When the news from Florida was borne to Spain, the king entered complaints against Jackson, but his remonstrance was unheeded. Such were the circumstances which induced the Spanish monarch to give up the hope of maintaining his provinces in the New World. He perceived that the defense of Florida was likely to cost him more than the country was worth. He accordingly proposed to cede the country to the United States. For this purpose negotiations were opened at Washington City, and on the twenty-second of February, 1819, a treaty was concluded, by which both the Florida and the outlying islands were surrendered to the United States. In consideration of the cession, the American Government

agreed to relinquish all claims to the territory of Texas, and to pay American citizens for depredations committed by Spanish vessels a sum not exceeding five million dollars. By the same treaty the boundary-line between Mexico and the United States was fixed at the River Sabine.

The year 1819 may be cited as the date of the first great financial crisis in the United States. The American Republic had been poor, and the people, as a rule, small property-holders, to whom capital, as that term is understood in more recent times, was a stranger. At length, however, wealth increased to a certain extent, and financial institutions grew into such importance as to make possible a crisis in monetary and commercial affairs. In 1817 the Bank of the United States had been re-organized. With that event improved facilities for credit were obtained, and consequent upon the facilities for credit came the spirit and the fact of speculation. With the entering in of speculation, dishonesty and fraud followed, and the circle of finance ran its usual course, until the strain was broken in a crisis. The control of the important Branch Bank of the United States at Baltimore was obtained by a band of unscrupulous speculators, who secured the connivance of the officers in their schemes. About two millions of dollars were withdrawn from the institution over and above its securities. President Cheves, however, who belonged to the Superior Board of Directors, adopted a policy by which the prevailing rashness of the concern was exposed. An end was thus put to the system of unlimited credits, and in course of time the business of the country swung back into its accustomed channels. But for a season the financial affairs of the United States were thrown into great confusion, and the parent Bank itself was barely saved from suspension and bankruptcy.

The admission of Mississippi into the Union has already been mentioned. Other States rapidly followed. In 1818 Illinois, the twenty-first in number, was organized and admitted. The new commonwealth embraced an area of over 55,000 square miles. The population at the time of admission had reached 47,000. In December, 1819, Alabama was added to the


Union. The new State came with a population of 125,000, and an area of nearly 51,000 square miles. About the same time the Territory of Missouri was divided, and the southern part was organized into Arkansas Territory. In 1820 the province of Maine, which had been under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts since 1652, was separated from that Government and admitted into the Union as an independent State. The population of Maine at the time of admission reached 298,000, and its territory embraced nearly 32,000 square miles. In August, 1821, the great State of Missouri, with an area of 67,000 square miles, and a population of 74,000, was admitted, as the twenty-fourth member of the Union. But this addition to the Republic was attended with a political agitation so violent as to threaten the peace of the Union, and to foretoken a long series of events, the effects of which have not yet disappeared from the current history of our country.

The difficulty in question was the presence of slavery in Missouri. In February, 1819, the bill to organize the Territory was brought up in Congress. Meanwhile, slaveholders had gone into Missouri, carrying their human chattels with them. The issue was at once raised in Congress whether a new State should be admitted with the system of slave-labor prevalent therein; or whether, by Congressional action, slaveholding should be prohibited. A motion in amendment of the Territorial Bill was introduced by James Tallmadge, of New York, forbidding any further introduction of slaves into Missouri, and granting freedom to all slave children on reaching the age of twenty-five.

The bill as thus amended became the organic law of the Territory. A few days afterwards, when Arkansas was presented for territorial organization, John W. Taylor, of

New York, moved the insertion of a clause similar to that in the Missouri Bill. A heated debate thereupon ensued, and the proposed amendment was struck out. Taylor then made a motion that hereafter in the organization of Territories out of that part of the national domain which had come with the Louisiana purchase, slavery should be interdicted in all those portions north of parallel 36° 30'. This proposition was also lost, after a heated discussion. Meanwhile, Tallmadge's amendment to the Missouri Bill was taken to the Senate, and defeated. As a consequence, the new Territories were organized *without restrictions* in the matter of slavery.

When the Enabling Act was passed, the



THE WHITE HOUSE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

people of Missouri adopted their State Constitution in conformity therewith, and in January, 1820, the formal admission of the Territory as a State was brought up in Congress. The proposition to admit was opposed by the large and growing party of those who favored the exclusion of slavery from the public domain. At that time, however, the new free State of Maine was presented for admission into the Union. This gave the pro-slavery party the advantage; for they might oppose the admission of Maine as a free State until the admission of Missouri as a slave State should be agreed to. An angry debate ensued, lasting until the 16th of February, when a bill coupling the two new States together, one with and the other without slavery, was

passed. Thereupon Senator Thomas, of Illinois, made a motion that henceforth and forever slavery should be excluded from all that part of the Louisiana cession, Missouri excepted, lying north of the parallel of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes. Such was the celebrated Missouri Compromise, one of the most important acts of American legislation—a measure chiefly supported by the genius, and carried through Congress by the persistent efforts of Henry Clay.

The principal conditions of the plan were



JEAN LAFITTE.

these: *First*, the admission of Missouri as a slaveholding State; *secondly*, the division of the rest of the Louisiana purchase by the parallel of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes; *thirdly*, the admission of new States, to be formed out of the territory south of that line, with or without slavery, as the people might determine; *fourthly*, the prohibition of slavery in all the new States to be organized out of territory north of the dividing-line. By this compromise the slavery agitation was allayed until 1849.

By the time of which we are here speak-

ing the effects of the ravages of the War of 1812 were measurably obliterated. The great resources and possibilities of the country began to appear. Peace and plenty did their beneficent work in the rapid development of the nation. The first term of Monroe in the Presidency was an epoch so prosperous that the Administration grew into high favor with the people. In the fall of 1820 he was re-elected with great unanimity. Mr. Tompkins, the Vice-President, was also chosen for a second term. Perhaps at no other time in the history of our country has the bitterness of partisanship so nearly expired as in the year and with the event here mentioned.

The excitement over the admission of Missouri into the Union had scarcely subsided when the attention of the Government was called to an alarming system of piracy, which sprung up in the early years of the present century in the West Indies. Commerce became so unsafe in all those regions into which the piratical craft could make their way that an armament was sent out for protection. Early in 1822 the frigate *Congress*, with eight smaller vessels, sailed for the West Indies, and during that year

more than twenty pirate ships were run down and captured. In the following summer Commodore Porter was dispatched with a still larger fleet to cruise about Cuba and the neighboring islands. In course of time the retreats of the sea-robbers, who had for their chieftain the great buccaneer Jean Lafitte, were all discovered, and their piratical establishments completely broken up. Not a buccaneer was left afloat to disturb the peaceful commerce of the seas.

At this period in our national history the Government of the United States was first

brought into relation with the countries of South America. The so-called Republican States in our neighboring continent were distracted with continuous revolutions. From the days of Pizarro the States in question had been, for the most part, dependencies of European monarchies; but the ties which bound them were broken, ever and anon, with declarations of independence and patriotic struggles for liberty. The situation was so similar to that which had existed between the United States and Great Britain in the time of the Revolution that the American Republic fell into natural and inevitable sympathy with the patriots of the Southern Continent. Many of the leading statesmen of the time found exercise for their faculties and sentiments in speaking and writing in behalf of the struggling Republics beyond the Isthmus of Darien.

Among these Mr. Clay was especially prominent. He carried his views into Congress, and succeeded in committing that body to the principles which he advocated. In March of 1822 a bill was passed, recognizing the new States of South America, which had declared, and virtually achieved, their independence. The President himself sympathized with these movements, and in the following year took up the question in his annual message. He finally reduced the principle by which his Administration should be governed to the following declaration: That for the future the American continents were not to be considered as subjects for colonization by any European power. The declaration thus made became famous at the time, and has ever since been known in the politics and diplomacy of the United States as the **MONROE DOCTRINE**, a doctrine by which the entire Western Hemisphere may be said to be theoretically consecrated to free institutions.

A social incident in the summer of 1824 gave great joy to the American people, and afforded them an opportunity to revive and express their gratitude to France for her sympathy and aid in the Revolution. The venerable Marquis de Lafayette, now aged and gray, returned once more to visit the land for whose freedom he had given the energies of his youth, and had indeed shed his blood. Many of the honored patriots with whom he had fought side by side came forth to greet him, and the younger heroes, sons of the Rev-



MARQUIS DE LAFAYETTE

olution, crowded around him. In every city and on every battle-field which he visited he was surrounded by a throng of shouting freemen. His journey from place to place was a continuous triumph. One of the chief objects of his coming was to visit the tomb of Washington. Over the dust of the Father of his Country the patriot of France paid the homage of his tears. He remained in the country until September of 1825, when he bade a final adieu to the American people who had made him their guest, and sailed

back for his native land. At his departure the frigate *Benbow*—a name significant for him—was prepared to bear him away. While liberty remains to cheer the West, the name of Lafayette will be hallowed with patriotic recollections.¹

Before the sailing away of the illustrious Frenchman, another Presidential election had been held. Political excitement had reappeared in the country, and there was a strong division of sentiment. Unfortunately, too, the division appeared to be largely sectional in its character. Strong personalities likewise appeared in the contest. For the first time the names of South and East and West were heard, and the patriotic eye might discern the symptoms of danger in the political phraseology of the day. John Quincy Adams was put forward as the candidate of the East; William H. Crawford, of Georgia, as the choice of the South; and Henry Clay and Andrew Jackson as the favorites of the West. The election was held, but neither candidate received a majority of the electoral votes. Thus, for the second time in the history of the country, the choice of President was, according to a Constitutional provision, referred to the House of Representatives. By that body Mr. Adams, though not the foremost candidate, was duly elected. For Vice-President, John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, had been chosen by the Electoral College. Thus came to a conclusion the eight years of the Presidency of James Monroe.

It is probable that in talents and accomplishments the new chief magistrate was the superior of any man who had occupied the Presidential chair before or after him. It is not meant that in force of character or ability to meet great emergencies he was the equal of Washington or Lincoln or Grant; but he had genius, scholarship, great attainments. From his boyhood he had been educated to the career of a statesman. At the age of eleven he accompanied his father, John Adams,

to Europe. At Paris, Amsterdam, and St. Petersburg, the son continued his studies, and thus became acquainted with the manners and politics of the Old World. The vast opportunities of his youth were improved to the fullest extent. He was destined to a public career. He served his country as ambassador to the Netherlands, to Portugal, to Prussia, to Russia, and to England. Even in early life his abilities were such as to draw from Washington the extraordinary praise of being the ablest minister of which America could boast. From 1774 to 1817 his life was devoted almost wholly to diplomatic services at the various European Capitals.

At this time the relations of the United States were critical in the extreme. Indeed, the new Republic had hardly yet been fully established as a separate power among the nations. The genius of John Quincy Adams secured the adoption of treaty after treaty. Such was his acumen and patriotism, that in every treaty the rights and dignity of the United States were fully asserted and maintained. In 1806 Adams was honored with the professorship of Rhetoric and Belles Lettres in Harvard College, of which he was an alumnus. He also held the office of United States Senator from Massachusetts. On the accession of Monroe to the Presidency, he was appointed Secretary of State. All the antecedents of his life were such as to produce in him the rarest qualifications for the Presidency, to which he was now called.

In one respect the administration of Adams was less successful than that of his predecessor. The revival of partisanship, the animosity of great party leaders, conspired to distract the country, to keep the public mind from the calm pursuits of peace, or at least to mar the harmony of the nation. From this time forth politics began to become, what it has ever since been, a despicable trade, in which the interests of the people of the United States have been hawked and torn, bartered and sold, at the dictation of unscrupulous ambition and for mere personal ends.

The adherents of General Jackson and Mr. Crawford united in opposition to the policy of President Adams, and there was a want of unanimity between the different departments of the Government. The supporters of the

¹The Centennial year called out again the memory of the greatest of those French patriots who gave the aid in the War for Independence; and the fine bronze statue of Lafayette, standing on the south side of Union Square, in New York City, was reared to express the affection of the people for the brave youth who came to us in the dark days of the Revolution.

Administration were in a minority in the Senate, and their majority in the Lower House was overthrown at the close of the first session of Congress. The President favored the policy of internal improvements, and recommended the same in his inaugural address. But that system of policy was antagonized by the followers of Jackson, Crawford, and Calhoun, and their principles obtained an ascendancy in the House of Representatives. As a consequence, the recommendations of the President were neglected or condemned in Congress; and the system of internal improvements, to the advocacy of which Mr. Clay gave the full resources of his genius, was checked.

Up to this time the native Indians held considerable portions of territory east of the Mississippi. In Georgia they had a wide domain. Here dwelt the Creeks, with whom the White men had had relations since the founding of the first colonies. In 1802 Georgia had relinquished her claim to the Mississippi territory, and the General Government agreed to purchase and to surrender to the State all the Creek lands lying within her borders; but this pledge had never been fulfilled. Georgia became seriously dissatisfied at the neglect of the Government to carry out the compact. The difficulty became alarming, and the Government was thus constrained to enter into a new treaty with the Creek chiefs, by which a cession of their lands in Georgia was finally obtained. At the same time, the Creeks entered into an agreement to remove from their ancient haunts to new settlements beyond the Mississippi. In all these difficulties the same principle was involved. The Indians have been, as a rule, unwilling to recognize the validity of pledges made by their ancestors relative to their national lands. Such a thing as ownership in fee simple was unknown originally among the native races. They recognized the right of quit-claim, by which those now occupying the lands could alienate *their own* title, but not alienate the title of *their descendants*. For this reason the extinction of land-titles by the Government for the domains purchased from the Indians has always been difficult.

An incident of the summer of 1826 is worthy of special mention. This was the death, on the fourth of July of that year, of Thomas Jefferson and John Adams, both Ex-Presidents of the United States. It might well impress the American mind that just fifty years to a day from the adoption of the Declaration of Independence the great author of that famous document and its principal promoter in Congress should have passed away at nearly the same hour. They were the two most conspicuous patriots of the Revolutionary epoch. They, more than perhaps any other



JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

two men, had agitated the question of independence, and promoted its adoption as a policy for the united Colonies. Both had lifted their voices for freedom in the earliest and most perilous days of the Revolutionary era. Both had lived to see their country's independence achieved. Both had served that country in its highest official station. Both had reached extreme old age; Adams was ninety; Jefferson, eighty-two. Though opposed to each other as it respected many political principles, both were as one in patriotism and loyalty to the Republic. While the cannon were booming for the fiftieth anniversary of the nation, the

gray and blooded patriots passed from among the living, but their influence and work remained permanently imbedded in the constitutional structure and principles of the American Republic.

In September of the same year a serious social disturbance occurred in the State of New York. William Morgan, a resident of the western portion of that commonwealth, having threatened to publish the secrets of the fraternity of Free and Accepted Masons, of which order he was a member, suddenly disappeared and was never heard of afterwards. Though many rumors of his whereabouts were heard, none could ever be traced to an authentic source, and the belief was common that either his life had been taken outright or that he had been privately and permanently exiled into the obscurity of some foreign country. The Masons fell under the suspicion of having abducted him, and a great clamor was raised against them in New York, extending into other parts of the country. The issue between the Masons and their enemies became a political one, and many prominent men were embroiled in the controversy. For several years the Antimasonic party exercised a considerable influence in the elections of the country. DeWitt Clinton, one of the most prominent and valuable statesmen of New York, had to suffer much in loss of reputation from his membership in the Masonic order. His last days were clouded with the odium which for the time being attached to the name of the fraternity.

Now it was that in the Congressional debates the question of the tariff was raised and constantly debated. The discussions began with the year 1828. By a tariff is understood a duty levied on imported goods. The object of the same is twofold: first, to produce a revenue for the Government; secondly, to raise the price of the article on which the duty is laid, in order that the domestic manufacturer of the thing taxed may be able to compete with the foreign producer. In a subsequent part of the present Work a full discussion of this question will be presented. For the present, it is sufficient to note that when a customs duty is levied for the purpose of raising

the price of the article on which the duty is laid, it is called a protective tariff.

Whether it is sound policy for a nation thus to protect its industries is an issue which has been much agitated in nearly all of the civilized countries. As a rule, in the earlier parts of a nation's history protective tariffs are employed, even to the extent of preventing all foreign competition; but with the lapse of time and the accumulation of capital in the given country the tendency is in the opposite direction. The mature peoples, as a rule, have inclined to the principle of free trade and open competition among all nations. In the Congressional debates of 1828 the friends of Mr. Adams decided in favor of the tariff, and in that year a schedule of customs was prepared, by which the duties on fabrics made of wool, cotton, linen, and silk, and those on articles manufactured of iron, lead, etc., were much increased. This was done, not so much with a view of augmenting the revenues of the United States, as of stimulating the manufacturing interests of the country. The question of the tariff has always in our country assumed a somewhat sectional aspect. At the first the people of the Eastern and Middle States, where factories abounded, were favorable to protective duties, while in the agricultural regions of the South and West such duties were opposed.

The Administration of John Quincy Adams may be cited as the time when the influences of the Revolution subsided and the sentiments of a new era began to prevail. It was the beginning of the second epoch in the history of the United States, considered as a nation. The Revolutionary sages had fallen out of the ranks of leadership, and a new class of statesmen, born after the era of Independence, began to attract the attention of the people and direct the course of the Government. Even the War of 1812, with its bitter party antagonisms, its defeats and victories, and its absurd ending, was fading from the memories of men. New dispositions and new tastes appeared among the people. New issues confronted the public. New methods prevailed in the halls of legislation. The old party lines could no longer be traced with clearness, and old party names were reduced to a jargon. Already the United States had surpassed in

¹ See pp. 215-219.

growth and development the most sanguine expectations of the fathers. But with the extension of territory, the incoming of new States, the springing up of new questions of national policy, conflicting opinions and interests divided the people into parties; and the stormy debates in Congress announced the presence of that danger in the American system which the Father of his Country had foreseen, and against which he uttered his most solemn warnings.

President Adams did not succeed in securing a second term. The national election in the fall of 1828 was especially exciting. Adams, supported by Clay, who was then Secretary of State, was put forward for reelection. During the whole of the current Administration the mind of the Opposition, or Democratic party—for the distinction between Whig and Democrat began now to be clearly drawn—was turned to Andrew Jackson as the standard-bearer in the contest. In the previous election Jackson had received a larger electoral vote than Adams; but the House of Representatives, disregarding the popular preference, had chosen Adams. Now, however, the people were determined to have their way. Jackson was triumphantly elected, receiving one hundred and seventy eight electoral votes, against eighty-three for his opponent. As soon as the election was over, the excitement which had attended the campaign subsided, and the thoughts of the people were turned to other interests.

Andrew Jackson was a native of North Carolina. He was born on the Waxhaw, March 15, 1767. Even in his boyhood the evidences of a belligerent and stormy nature were apparent. His mother's plan of devoting him to the ministry was hopelessly defeated by his conduct. At the age of thirteen he took up arms, and was present at Sumter's defeat, at Hanging Rock. Soon afterwards he was captured by the British, was maltreated by them—left to die of small-pox. But his mother secured his release from prison, and his life was saved. After the Revolution, having acquired the meagre rudiments of an education, he began the study of law, and at the age of twenty-one removed to Nashville. In 1796 he was chosen to the National House of Representatives from the State of Tennessee.

Here his turbulent and willful disposition manifested themselves in full force. In the next year he was promoted to the Senate, where he remained for a year, without making a speech or casting a vote! Dissatisfied with Senatorial life, he resigned his seat and returned to Tennessee. His subsequent career is a part of the history of the country, particularly of the South-west, with which section his name was identified. He came to the Presidential office as a military hero; but he was more than that—a man of great native powers and inflexible honesty. His talents were strong, but unpolished. His integrity




ANDREW JACKSON

was unassailable, and his will like iron. He was one of those men for whom no toils are too arduous, no responsibilities too great. His personal character was strongly impressed upon his Administration. Believing that public affairs would be best conducted by such means, he removed nearly seven hundred office-holders, and appointed in their stead his own political friends. In defense of his course, the precedent established by Jefferson was pleaded.

Jackson's accession to the Presidency was in some measure a revolution, not only in the political, but in the social, tone of the Administration. Hitherto all the Presidents had

been men of accomplishments. They had been gentlemanly, educated and experienced in public affairs. They had been promoted from grade to grade of responsibility, not only in civil service, but in military affairs as well. Coarseness and vulgarity had been unknown in Government circles during the first five Presidencies. With the rise of Jackson, however, the under side of American life rose to the surface. The debonair and stylish demeanor which had marked the former Administrations disappeared from the Presidential mansion, and in some measure from the other departments of the Government. Jackson made no pretensions to culture or refinement,



DANIEL WEBSTER

and many of the coarse and ferocious elements of his former life obtruded themselves in the very seat of political power. It would be erroneous to say that all dignity was wanting in his manners and administration. On the contrary, there was much that was respectable, dignified, severe, in his methods and proceedings. But his accession to the Presidency was, on the whole, derogatory to the refinement and culture and propriety which had previously prevailed about the Presidential mansion.

The re-chartering of the Bank of the United States was the first issue which confronted the new Administration. The Presi-

dent took strong grounds against issuing a new charter to that institution. Believing the Bank to be both inexpedient and unconstitutional, he recommended that its charter be allowed to expire, by limitation, in 1836. But it could not be expected that a concern so strong and far-reaching in its influence would yield without a struggle. In 1822 a bill was brought forward in Congress to re-charter the Bank, and the measure was passed. The President, however, vetoed the bill; and since a two-thirds' majority could not be secured in its favor, the proposition for a new charter failed, and the Bank ceased to exist.

It was at the time of Jackson's first Presidential term that the partisan elements of the United States resolved themselves into the form which they were destined to hold for more than a quarter of a century. The people became divided into the two great factions of *Whig* and *Democrat*. The old Federal party, under whose direction the Government had been organized, had lost control of national affairs with the retracy of John Adams. The party, however, continued to be an organized force until after the War of 1812, when the odium arising from its connection with the Hartford Convention gave it a final quietus. Adherents of the ancient party still asserted themselves as late as the slavery debates of 1820.

We have already seen how, during Monroe's second term, an "Era of Good Feeling," as it was called, came about, during which partisanship seemed ready to expire. Meanwhile, the old Antifederalists had been metamorphosed, first into *Republicans*, a name given in the time of John Adams to the American champions of France as against Great Britain. But this name was soon exchanged for that of *Democrats*; and under this title the party came into power with Jefferson. Then followed the Administrations of Madison, Monroe, and John Quincy Adams, under the same political banner. Under Adams, however, the new political forces were already at work. When Jackson became President, his arbitrary measures alarmed the country, and drove all the elements of the opposition into a phalanx, under the leadership of Clay and Webster. To this new party organization the name *Whig* was given, a name taken from the old Scotch

Covenanters of the seventeenth century, worn by the patriots of the American Revolution to distinguish them from Tories, and finally adopted as the permanent title of the opponents of Jeffersonian Democracy.


With the beginning of Jackson's term of the Presidency the tariff question was reopened, and produced great excitement. In the session of 1831-32, additional duties were levied upon manufactured goods imported from abroad. By this measure the manufacturing districts were again favored, at the expense of the agricultural States. South Carolina was specially offended. The excitement culminated in a convention of her people, and it was resolved that the tariff law of Congress was unconstitutional, and therefore null and void. Open resistance was threatened in case there should be an attempt to collect the revenues in the harbor of Charleston. One division of the Democratic statesmen took a firm stand in support of South Carolina.

The doctrine of nullification, and even of secession, was boldly advanced in the United States Senate. On that issue occurred the famous debate between the eloquent Colonel Hayne, Senator from South Carolina, and Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, perhaps the greatest master of American oratory. The former appeared as the champion of the doctrine of State rights; the latter as the advocate of Constitutional supremacy over all the Union.

The question, however, was not decided by debate. The President took the matter in hand, and issued a proclamation denying the right of any State to nullify the laws of Congress. But Mr. Calhoun, the Vice-President, resigned his office, to accept a seat in the Senate, where he might better advocate the doctrine and purpose of his State. The President first warned the people of South Carolina against the consequences of pushing further the doctrine of nullification. He then ordered a body of troops, under General Scott, to proceed to Charleston, and sent thither a man-of-war. At this display of force the leaders of the nullifying party quailed, and receded from their position. Bloodshed was happily avoided, and in the following spring the excitement was allayed by a compromise. Mr. Clay brought forward, and secured the passage of,

a bill providing for the gradual reduction of the duties complained of, until, at the end of ten years, they should reach a standard which would be satisfactory to the South.

While these measures were occupying the attention of Congress an Indian war broke out on the Western frontier. The Sacs, Foxes, and Winnebagos, of Wisconsin Territory, became hostile and took up arms. They were incited and led by their famous chief, Black Hawk. Like Tecumtha, and many other sachems who had preceded him, he believed in the possibility of uniting all the Indian na-



BLACK HAWK

tions in a confederacy against the Whites. The lands of the Sacs and the Foxes, lying in the Rock River country of Illinois, had been purchased by the Government twenty-five years previously, but the Indians had not removed from the ceded territory. At length, however, the white settlements approached, and the Indians were required to give possession. But a new race of warriors had now arisen, who did not feel the force of a compact made by their fathers. They accordingly refused to give up their lands, and became hostile. The Government insisted on the fulfillment of the treaty, and war broke out.

The government of Illinois called out the militia. General Scott was sent, with nine companies of artillery, to the site of Chicago. His force was overtaken with the cholera, which had made its appearance in the country, and Scott was unable to cooperate with General Atkinson. The latter, however, carried on a vigorous campaign against the Indians, defeated them in several actions, and made Black Hawk prisoner. The captured chieftain was taken to Washington and other great cities of the East, where his understanding was opened as to the power of the nation against which he had been foolish enough to lift his hatchet. He was then liberated. Returning to his own country, he advised his people of the uselessness of making war on the United States. The Indians soon abandoned the disputed lands, and removed into Iowa.

Difficulties next arose with the Cherokees, of Georgia. These people had reached a tolerable degree of civilization, and were certainly the most humane of all the Indian tribes. To a considerable extent they had adopted the manners and customs of the whites. They had opened farms, built towns, established schools, set up printing-presses, and formulated a code of laws. As previously stated, the Government had promised the State of Georgia to extinguish the title of the Indian lands within her borders, in compensation for her cession to the General Government of the territory of Mississippi. This pledge, however, had not been fulfilled; and the Legislature of Georgia, growing tired of the delay in the removal of the Indians, passed a statute abrogating the Indian governments within the borders of the State, and extending the laws of the Commonwealth over all the Indian domain.

It was also enacted that the Cherokees and Creeks should not have the privilege of using the State courts in the attempt to maintain their rights. The Supreme Court of the United States, however, declared the latter act unconstitutional. The Indians made an appeal to the President, but he refused to interfere. On the contrary, he recommended the removal of the Cherokees to the lands beyond the Mississippi. Such were the circumstances which led, in the year 1834, to the organization of the *INDIAN TERRITORY*, as a sort of national reservation for the broken tribes.

It was with great reluctance that the Cherokees yielded to necessity. Though they had been paid more than five million dollars for their homes, they still clung to the land of their fathers. It was only when General Scott was ordered to remove them by force that they yielded to the inevitable, and took up their march for their new homes in the West.

The conflict with the Seminoles of Florida was still more serious. In this case also the difficulty arose from the attempt of the Government to remove the nation to a domain beyond the Mississippi. Hostilities broke out in 1835, and continued, with little interruption, for four years. The chief of the Seminoles was Osceola, a half-breed of great talents and audacity. Acting under the old Indian theory, he and Micanopy, another chieftain of the nation, declared that the Seminole treaty, by which the lands of the people had been ceded to the General Government, was invalid; that the fathers could only quit-claim their own rights, and could not alienate the rights of their descendants. So haughty was the bearing of Osceola that General Thompson, the agent of the Government, ordered his arrest, and put him in irons. Osceola dissembled his purpose, gave his assent to the old treaty, and was set free. But, as might have been foreseen, he immediately entered into a conspiracy to slaughter the Whites and devastate the country.

In the meantime, General Clinch had made his way into the interior of Florida, and fixed his head-quarters at Fort Drane, seventy-five miles south-west of St. Augustine. The Indians gathered in such numbers as to threaten this post, and Major Dade, with a hundred and seventeen men, was sent out from Fort Brooke, at the head of Tampa Bay, to succor General Clinch. After marching about half the distance, the division of Dade fell into an ambuscade, and all were slaughtered except one man. On the same day Osceola, with another band of warriors, prowling around Fort King, on the Ocklawaha, surrounded a store-house, where General Thompson was dining with a company of friends. The Indians poured in a murderous fire, and rushed forward and scalped the dead, before the garrison, only two hundred and fifty yards away,

could bring support. General Thompson's body was pierced by fifteen balls, and four of his nine companions were killed. General Clinch now marched out from Fort Drane, and on the 31st of December fought a hard

ing from the west with a force of a thousand men, for the relief of Clinch. While on the march he was attacked by the Seminoles, near the battle-field where Clinch had fought. The Indians made a furious assault, but were re-



OSCEOLA.

battle with the Indians on the banks of the Withlacoochie. The savages were repulsed, but Clinch fell back to Fort Drane.

In the following February, General Scott took command of all the forces in Florida. In the meantime, General Gaines was advanc-

pulsed with severe losses. Two months later, the struggling Creeks, who still remained in the country, began hostilities, but they were easily subdued, and compelled to seek their reservation beyond the Mississippi. The Seminoles, however, held their own in the interior,

and in October of 1836 Governor Call, of Florida, marched against them, with an army of two thousand men. He overtook the Indians in the Wahoo swamp, a short distance from the scene of Dade's massacre. Here a battle was fought, and the Indians were defeated with heavy losses. They were obliged to seek refuge in the Everglades, but soon afterwards sallied forth, and fought another battle on nearly the same ground. A second time they were defeated, though not decisively, and the war continued into the following Administration.

Turning to civil affairs, we find that the animosity of the President against the United States Bank had given a quietus to that institution. His veto of the re-charter of the Bank has already been mentioned. Not satisfied with this, he determined that the surplus funds which had accumulated in its vaults should be distributed among the States. He had no warrant of law for such a course, but believing himself to be in the right, he did not hesitate to take the responsibility. In October, 1833, he gave orders that the accumulated funds of the great Bank, amounting to fully ten million dollars, should be distributed among certain State Banks which he designated. The measure was high-handed in the last degree, and evoked the most violent opposition. The Whigs denounced the measure as of incalculable mischief, unwarranted, arbitrary, dangerous. A coalition was formed in the Senate, under the leadership of Calhoun, Clay, and Webster, and the President's distributing officers were rejected. A measure of censure was also passed against him, but the proposition failed in the House of Representatives. Such was the outcry throughout the country that the Administration appeared for a season to be almost ingulfed. But the President was as fearless as he was self-willed and stubborn. He held on his course unmoved by the clamor. The resolution of censure stood on the journals of the Senate for four years, and was then expunged from the record through the influence of Senator Thomas H. Benton, of Missouri.

The distribution of the surplus funds to the various State Banks was followed, in 1836-37, by a financial panic, the most serious which had yet occurred in the history of

the country. Whether the removal of the funds and the panic stood to each other in the relation of cause and effect was one of the political questions of the day. While the Whigs charged that the arbitrary measures of the President, by disturbing the finances of the country, had precipitated the crisis, the Democrats answered that the Bank of the United States, with its multifarious abuses, was itself the cause of the financial distress. It was claimed by the latter party that such an institution was too powerful and despotic to exist in a free Government. The President himself was but little concerned with the wrangling over this question. He had but recently been re-elected for a second term, with Martin Van Buren for Vice-President, instead of Mr. Calhoun.


Before the end of his first term in the Presidency, the strong will of Jackson was exhibited in full force in a complication with France. During the Napoleonic wars the commerce of the United States had suffered in several instances, through the recklessness of French commanders, and certain claims were thus held by the American Government against the French Kingdom. The question of a settlement had been agitated many times, and in 1831 the king of France had agreed to pay five million dollars for the alleged injuries; but the authorities of the kingdom were dilatory in making payment. The matter was postponed and neglected until the wrath of the American President broke out, and he sent a recommendation to Congress to make reprisals on the French commerce. He also directed the American minister at Paris to demand his passports and come home. These measures had the desired effect, and the indemnity was promptly paid. About the same time the Government of Portugal was brought to terms in a similar manner.

We may here pause to note some of the calamities with which the country was afflicted in the decade extending from 1830 to 1840. Several of those statesmen and leaders who remained from the Revolutionary epoch fell, in those years, under the hand of death. On the fourth of July, 1831, Ex-President Monroe passed away. He, like Adams and Jefferson, died amid the rejoicings of the national anniversary. In the following year Charles Car-

roll, of Carrollton, the last surviving signer of the Declaration of Independence, died, at the age of ninety-six. A short time afterwards Philip Freneau, the poet of the Revolution, departed from the land of the living. The bard had reached the age of eighty. On the twenty-fourth of June, 1833, John Randolph of Roanoke died in Philadelphia. He was a man admired for his talents, dreaded for his wit and sarcasm, and respected for his integrity. In 1835, Chief-Justice Marshall breathed his last, at the age of fourscore years, and in

valuable buildings more noble and imposing structures—which are likely to outlast the century—were soon erected.

During this decade two additional States came into the Union. In June, 1836, Arkansas, with its fifty-two thousand square miles and population of seventy thousand, was admitted. In the following January, Michigan Territory was organized as a State, and added to the Union. The new commonwealth brought a population of one hundred and fifty-seven thousand, and an area of fifty-six



THE NEW PATENT OFFICE, WASHINGTON.

the next year Ex-President Madison, worn with the toils of eighty-five years, passed away. To these losses of life must be added two great disasters to property. On the sixteenth of December, 1835, a fire broke out in the lower part of New York City, and laid in ashes thirty acres of buildings. Five hundred and twenty-nine houses, and property valued at eighteen million dollars, were consumed. Just one year afterward, the Patent-office and Post-office at Washington were destroyed in the same manner. But upon the ruins of these

thousand square miles. It was already the close of the Administration. Jackson followed the example of Washington in issuing a farewell address. The document was characterized by that stern patriotism which had marked the man in his Administration. The dangers of discord and sectionalism among the States were set forth with all the masculine energy of the Jacksonian dialect. The people of the United States were again solemnly warned, as they had been by the Father of his Country, against the baneful influence of dema-

gogues. The horrors of disunion were portrayed in the strongest colors, and the people of every rank and section were exhorted to maintain and defend the American Union as they would the last fortress of human liberty. Such was the last public paper contributed by Andrew Jackson to the political literature of the age. Meanwhile, in the preceding autumn, Martin Van Buren had been elected President. The opposing candidate was General William H. Harrison, of Ohio, who re-

served the office of Governor of his native State, and six years afterwards, by supplanting DeWitt Clinton, became the recognized leader of the Democracy in New York. In 1821, and again in 1827, he was chosen United States Senator; but in the first year of his second term he resigned the office to accept the governorship of his native State. Under Jackson he became Secretary of State, but soon resigned that place to become Minister Plenipotentiary to England. When his appointment to the latter position came before

the Senate, Vice-President Calhoun, assisted by the Whig leaders Clay and Webster, succeeded in rejecting the appointment. Van Buren returned from his unfulfilled mission, became the candidate for the Vice-Presidency in 1832, and was elected. Four years later he led the powerful party to which he belonged, and succeeded General Jackson in the highest office of the nation.

The Seminoles of Florida had not yet been subdued. The command of the army in that region was transferred, in 1837, from General Scott to General Jessup. In the fall of that year Osceola came to the American camp under a flag of truce; but, being suspected of treachery, was seized by the authorities and sent to Fort Moultrie as a prisoner. Here he languished for a year and died. The Sem-



MARTIN VAN BUREN.

ceived the support of the new Whig party. As to the Vice-presidency, no one secured a majority in the Electoral College, and the choice devolved on the Senate. By that body Colonel Richard M. Johnson, of Kentucky, was duly elected.

Martin Van Buren was born at Kinderhook, New York, on the 5th of December, 1782. His education was limited. He studied law and became a politician. In his thirtieth year he was elected to the Senate of his na-

tives. In 1812 he was elected Governor of his native State, and six years afterwards, by supplanting DeWitt Clinton, became the recognized leader of the Democracy in New York. In 1821, and again in 1827, he was chosen United States Senator; but in the first year of his second term he resigned the office to accept the governorship of his native State. Under Jackson he became Secretary of State, but soon resigned that place to become Minister Plenipotentiary to England. When his appointment to the latter position came before the Senate, Vice-President Calhoun, assisted by the Whig leaders Clay and Webster, succeeded in rejecting the appointment. Van Buren returned from his unfulfilled mission, became the candidate for the Vice-Presidency in 1832, and was elected. Four years later he led the powerful party to which he belonged, and succeeded General Jackson in the highest office of the nation. The Seminoles of Florida had not yet been subdued. The command of the army in that region was transferred, in 1837, from General Scott to General Jessup. In the fall of that year Osceola came to the American camp under a flag of truce; but, being suspected of treachery, was seized by the authorities and sent to Fort Moultrie as a prisoner. Here he languished for a year and died. The Seminoles were greatly disheartened by the loss of their chieftain, but continued the war. In December, 1838, Colonel Zachary Taylor, with a force of over a thousand men, penetrated the Everglades of Florida, and routed the savages from their lairs. After unparalleled sufferings, he overtook the main body, on Christmas day, near Lake Okechobee. Here a hard battle was fought, and the Indians were defeated, but not until a hundred and thirty-nine of the Whites had fallen. For

more than a year Taylor continued his campaign in the swamps. The spirit of the Red men was finally broken, and in 1839 the chiefs sent in their submission. They signed an additional treaty; but, after all, their removal to the West was made with much reluctance and delay.

The first year of the new Administration was marked by another financial crisis in the country. There had been a brief interim of

issues of irredeemable paper were issued to increase the opportunities for fraud.

It was a time when the new lands were rapidly taken up. The paper money of the banks was receivable at the various land-offices, and speculators made a rush, with a plentiful supply of bills, to secure the best lands. General Jackson, still President, seeing that an unsound currency received in exchange for the national domain was likely to defraud the



EVERGLADES OF FLORIDA.—LAND OF THE SEMINOLES

great prosperity. The national debt had been entirely liquidated. A surplus of nearly forty million dollars had accumulated in the treasury of the United States. We have already seen how this surplus was distributed by the Government among the several States. Money became suddenly abundant, and speculations of all sorts grew rife. The credit system sprang up and prevailed in every department of business. The banks of the country were multiplied to nearly seven hundred, and vast

Government out of millions of dollars, issued his so-called *SPECIE CIRCULAR*, by which the land agents were directed to receive nothing but coin in payment for the lands. The effects of this measure fell upon the country in the first year of Van Buren's Administration. The interests of the Government had been secured, but the business of the country was prostrated by the shock. The banks at once suspended specie payment. Mercantile houses tottered and fell. The disaster swept through

every avenue of trade. In March and April of 1837 the failures in New York and New Orleans amounted to nearly one hundred and fifty million dollars. A committee of the business men of the former city besought the President to rescind the specie circular and call a special session of Congress. The former request was refused and the latter complied with, but not until the disasters of the country, rather than the clamor of the committee, had appealed to the Executive.

When Congress convened, in the following September, many measures of relief were brought forward. A bill authorizing the issue of treasury notes, not to exceed an aggregate of ten million dollars, was passed, as a temporary expedient. The President proposed, and had presented to Congress, his plan, under the title of the **INDEPENDENT TREASURY BILL**. By the provisions of this remarkable project, the public funds of the nation were to be kept on deposit in a treasury to be established for that special purpose. It was argued by Mr. Van Buren and his friends that the surplus money of the country would drift into the Independent Treasury and lodge there; that by this expedient the speculative mania would be effectually checked. It was thought that extensive speculations could not be carried on without a superfluous currency. The philosophical basis of the President's plan was a separation between the business of the Government and the general business of the country.

The Independent Treasury Bill, however, though it passed the Senate, was defeated in the House of Representatives. But in the following regular session of Congress the bill was a second time presented, and passed. In the meantime, however, the business of the country had in a measure revived. During the year 1838 a majority of the banks resumed specie payments. Commercial affairs assumed their wonted aspect. But trade was still paralyzed. Enterprises of all kinds languished, and merchants and traders were discouraged from all manner of ventures. Discontent prevailed among the people, and the Administration was blamed with everything.

The well-known policy of Washington, to have no entanglements with foreign States, was carefully adhered to during the first half-

century of our national existence. In 1837 a slight disturbance occurred which involved to a certain extent the relations between the United States and Canada. A portion of the people of that Province had become dissatisfied with British rule, and a revolt was organized, with a view of the possible establishment of independence. The movement excited the sympathy, and even the aid, of many of the American people. In New York some special encouragement was given to the insurgents. From that State a party of seven hundred men, having taken up arms, seized and fortified Navy Island, in the Niagara River. The Loyalists of Canada attempted to capture the place, but failed. They succeeded, however, in setting on fire the *Cacalia*, the supply-ship of the adventurers. Her moorings were cut, and the burning vessel was sent over Niagara Falls, a spectacle to men. The event created much excitement and the peaceful relations of the United States and Great Britain were somewhat endangered. The President, however, issued a proclamation of neutrality, disavowing the action of those who had given aid to the Canadian rebels, and forbidding interference with the affairs of Canada. General Wool was sent to the Niagara frontier, with a sufficient force to quell the disturbance in that quarter, and to punish the disturbers. The New York insurgents on Navy Island were obliged to surrender, and order was presently restored.

The event just mentioned was one of the most exciting of Van Buren's Administration. For the rest, the period was commonplace. The political parties were left to supply the materials of popular agitation. The question as to Van Buren's successor in the Presidency was raised at an early date. The canvass of candidates was waged in a bitter spirit. The measures of the Administration had been of a character to provoke the sharpest political antagonisms. The Whigs were now animated with the hope of victory, and made haste, nearly a year before the election, to nominate General Harrison for the Presidency. On the Democratic side Martin Van Buren had no competitor; but the unanimity of his party could hardly compensate for the blunders and unpopularity, not to say misfortunes, of his Administration.

- 61-65. Lincoln's administration.
 61. Hannibal Hamlin, Vice-president.
 62. The Confederate government organized.
 61-65. The great Civil War.
 Capture of Fort Sumter.
 Battles of Bull Run and Ball's Bluff.
 62. Battles of Pittsburg Landing, Murfreesborough.
 63. The Emancipation Proclamation.
 The Seven Days battles and Antietam.
 Siege of Vicksburg.
 Battle of Chickasaw.
 Battle of Chancellorsville.
 Lee invades Pennsylvania.
 Battle of Gettysburg.
 64. Grant in command of the army.
 Sherman's march to the sea.
 Election of Lincoln.
 65. Capture of Richmond and end of the Civil War.
 Assassination of Lincoln.
 65-68. Johnson's Administration.
 Reconstruction of the Southern States undertaken.
 Amnesty Proclamation.
 66. Tennessee readmitted.
 67. Purchase of Alaska.
 Admission of Nebraska.
68. Impachment of the President.
 The Fort Leavenworth conspiracy adopted.
 The Southern States restored to the Union.
 69-71. Grant's Administration.
 Secretary of War, Grant, Vice-president.
 69. Completion of the Pacific Railway.
 Great monetary panic.
 70. Ninth Census of the United States.
 71. Treaty of Washington.
 Great development of the railroad system.
 Burning of Chambersburg.
 72. Settlement of the North-west boundary.
 Re-election of Grant.
 The Mexican War.
 73. Civil disturbances in Louisiana.
 Distressful financial panic.
 75. Admission of Colorado.
 76. Celebration of the Centennial Year.
 The disputed presidential election.
 77. War with the Sioux.
 77-81. Administration of Hayes.
 77. The railroad strike.
 78. Re-monetization of silver.
 The yellow fever epidemic.
 79. Resumption of specie payments.
58. Lakewood relieved Mar. 2.
 59. Ward, Terry, dies. Palmonston Liberal, premier.
 60. Lord Minto, Viscount, and assessor, dies. a. 59.
 61. Peace with the A. Prince of Wales visits United States.
 62. The loss of the great fleet of great ships.
 63. Edinburgh Barrack, Revolution, breaks out. a. 32, June 29.
 64. Prince Albert consort dies. a. 43, Jan. 14.
 62. Great distress in Lancashire on account of failure of cotton supplies.
 63. Arthur Hugh Clough, poet, dies. a. 4, Nov. 17.
 64. Lord Elgin, governor general, dies. a. 68, Nov. 27.
 65. William Mackenzie Bowden, first Canadian prime minister, dies. a. 2.
 65. Troubles in Ireland. John Bull, the dog, dies.
 65. Corps composed in England.
 65. Lord Lytton, first viceroy, dies. a secret plot.
 65. Atlantic Telegraph cable successfully laid from Valentia Bay, Ireland, to Heart's Content, Newfoundland.
67. Passage of Reform Bill.
 Michael Faraday, chemist, dies. a. 78.
 Massacre of Andros.
 War against Abyssinia.
 Famine outbreaks in Ireland.
 68. Death of Lord Beaconsfield.
 68. 1. The Abyssinian war.
 Benjamin Disraeli leaves office as premier.
 69. Bill passed for promotion of education.
 71. Sides of commission for the annexation of Texas.
 71. Victoria claims a commission for the annexation of Texas.
 71. W. E. Gladstone, prime minister.
 72. Census of the United Kingdom. Population, 17,000,000.
 Passage of the Ballot Act.
 Newfoundland.
68. Republicanism announced at Geneva.
 War declared against Prussia.
 69. Liberal gains the elections.
 70. Great battles of the Franco-Prussian war.
 71. Battle of Orléans, Franco-Prussian war.
 71. Provisional Republican government formed.
 Concessions made by Napoleon toward constitutional government.
 71. Siege of Paris by the Germans.
 71. Treaty of Peace with Prussia.
 The Plebscites.
 71. Thiers elected president.
70. The Spanish crown offered to Prince Leopold.
 Outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war.
 The German armies invade France.
 71. King William proclaimed emperor at Versailles.
 71. Expulsion of the Jesuits from Germany.
67. Emperor elected king of Hungary and crowned king at Keszthely enters Hungarian diet.
 Archduke Maximilian shot in Mexico.
 68. The Carlists declare themselves hostile to the civil law.
 Disasters of the Jews in Poland.
 69. Outbreak in Poland.
 70. The Carlists changed to "The Austro-Hungarian Mountebank."
 71. Treaty stipulations with Germany established.
 72. Measures adopted to nationalize representation.
67. Formation of the German Zollverein.
 68. Baden proposes the union of the Southern States with the Confederation.
 70. North German States support Prussia in the war with France.
 71. The German Confederation merged into the empire.
 King William receives the Imperial crown.
 67. Attempt to assassinate the emperor.
 67. Unfriendly relations with Austria and Turkey.
 Death of Prince Metternich, dies. a. 91, July 15.
 70. Commercial treaty with China.
 Russia demands modification of the treaty of Paris.
 71. Polish and various languages prohibited.
 Riots in Odessa.
 72. Celebration of the two hundredth anniversary of Peter the Great.
67. Garibaldi invades Papal States from Italy; is stopped by Italian government, taken prisoner, and invasion ceases.
 68. Italian over Mount Cenis opened.
 68. Tax riots.
 Rome annexed to Italy.
 Rome made the capital of the kingdom.
 72. Death of Giuseppe Garibaldi.
 Great eruption of Mount Vesuvius.
68. Revolution led by Frim and Serrano.
 Isabella takes refuge in Paris.
 70. Isabella abdicates.
 70. Prince Amadeo of Savoy becomes king.
 Frim assassinated.
 72. Tax riots in Barcelona.
70. New constitution adopted.
 71. Denmark offers to cede the islands of St. Thomas and St. John to United States.
 The Carlsberg brewery opens military shop.
 70. Denmark renounces neutral to Franco-Prussian war.
 72. Great expansion of Scandinavian industries at Copenhagen.
61. King dies, a. 66.
 61. **William I.** succeeds Jan. 2.
 62. War with Austria as ally of Italy.
 65. Hanover allied to Prussia, and king dethroned; also elector of Saxe, Duchy of Nassau and free city of Frankfurt.
 64. Hungarian diet opened by emperor.
 66. War with Italy, a. 11, July 4.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, June 24.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 2.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 3.
 Prussians in all victories.
 66. Treaty of peace between Austria and Prussia. Austria waives all claim to Sicily with Sardinia, with draws from Germany, and yields North Saxony to Prussia, Aug. 29.
64. Scelling, philosopher, dies, a. 79.
 61. Schlosser, historian, dies, a. 85.
 64. Maximilian, king of Bavaria, dies.
 Succeeded by Son, **Ludwig II.**
 66. Formation of North German Confederation.
 Leadership of Prussia. Hanover annexed.
 64. Great build-up in Prussia. Military governor at Warsaw, a. 88 established.
 61. Prince Adolphus of Prussia, dies, a. 91, July 15.
 62. Jews admitted to privileges in Russia, Jan. 20.
 62. Count Nesselrode, statesman, dies, a. 92, Mar. 21.
 63. Introduction of serfs in Poland who had not taken part in rebellion.
 65. Russia advances into Central Asia.
69. War with Naples and Sicily, which votes to join Sardinia.
 61. Sardinia, Lombardy, Tuscany, Modena, Parma, Romagna, Naples, and Sicily form kingdom of Italy.
 61. Revolution in England.
 61. **Count Casimir**, statesman, dies, a. 82.
 62. Garibaldi republican invades Papal States, and conquers Sicily and Naples.
 66. War with Austria, June 15.
 66. Emperor of France gives to Italy province of Venetia, which was ceded to him by Austria.
69. 100,000 serfs.
 61. St. Thomas annexed.
 62. Ross, statesman, dies, a. 73, Feb. 1.
 62. San Marino, a republic, dies, a. 82, May 29.
 66. Prussian annexation.
 66. Marshal O'Donnell dies.
74. Silesia occupied by Austrians and Prussians, Feb. 9.
 64. Duppel besieged by Austrians and Prussians.
 64. Paris defeated and a victory by Austrians, March 18.
 64. Prussian victory at Wagram, Aug. 5.
 Naval battle of Hogland, May 9.
 War ended. Denmark ceding to Prussia and Austria the duchies of Silesia and Holstein August
67. Turkey. Peace in '56.
 a. 61.
 Central and statesman, dies, a. 59.
 empire, dies, a. 59.
 Austria. Both captures, a. 59.
 (reigns) Derby, Tory premier.
 67. Fremont captures, a. 59.
 captured by Sir John Campbell.
 Lord Clyde.
 67. Intervention in Mexico, Oct. 31.
 67. War with Mexico.
 67. War in Cochin China adds to French Provinces.
 62. Brocton, dies, a. 88.
 63. Despretz, system, dies, a. 71, Mar. 15.
 66. Intervenes and causes cessation of war between Prussia, Italy, and Austria.
 French withdrawal from Mexico, March 6.
 67. Intervenes in behalf of Papal States, and causes cessation of invasion by the defeat of invaders at Rome of 1849, near Rome.
 International Exposition opens at Paris.
61. King dies, a. 66.
 61. **William I.** succeeds Jan. 2.
 62. War with Austria as ally of Italy.
 65. Hanover allied to Prussia, and king dethroned; also elector of Saxe, Duchy of Nassau and free city of Frankfurt.
 64. Hungarian diet opened by emperor.
 66. War with Italy, a. 11, July 4.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, June 24.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 2.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 3.
 Prussians in all victories.
 66. Treaty of peace between Austria and Prussia. Austria waives all claim to Sicily with Sardinia, with draws from Germany, and yields North Saxony to Prussia, Aug. 29.
64. Scelling, philosopher, dies, a. 79.
 61. Schlosser, historian, dies, a. 85.
 64. Maximilian, king of Bavaria, dies.
 Succeeded by Son, **Ludwig II.**
 66. Formation of North German Confederation.
 Leadership of Prussia. Hanover annexed.
 64. Great build-up in Prussia. Military governor at Warsaw, a. 88 established.
 61. Prince Adolphus of Prussia, dies, a. 91, July 15.
 62. Jews admitted to privileges in Russia, Jan. 20.
 62. Count Nesselrode, statesman, dies, a. 92, Mar. 21.
 63. Introduction of serfs in Poland who had not taken part in rebellion.
 65. Russia advances into Central Asia.
69. War with Naples and Sicily, which votes to join Sardinia.
 61. Sardinia, Lombardy, Tuscany, Modena, Parma, Romagna, Naples, and Sicily form kingdom of Italy.
 61. Revolution in England.
 61. **Count Casimir**, statesman, dies, a. 82.
 62. Garibaldi republican invades Papal States, and conquers Sicily and Naples.
 66. War with Austria, June 15.
 66. Emperor of France gives to Italy province of Venetia, which was ceded to him by Austria.
69. 100,000 serfs.
 61. St. Thomas annexed.
 62. Ross, statesman, dies, a. 73, Feb. 1.
 62. San Marino, a republic, dies, a. 82, May 29.
 66. Prussian annexation.
 66. Marshal O'Donnell dies.
74. Silesia occupied by Austrians and Prussians, Feb. 9.
 64. Duppel besieged by Austrians and Prussians.
 64. Paris defeated and a victory by Austrians, March 18.
 64. Prussian victory at Wagram, Aug. 5.
 Naval battle of Hogland, May 9.
 War ended. Denmark ceding to Prussia and Austria the duchies of Silesia and Holstein August
67. Turkey. Peace in '56.
 a. 61.
 Central and statesman, dies, a. 59.
 empire, dies, a. 59.
 Austria. Both captures, a. 59.
 (reigns) Derby, Tory premier.
 67. Fremont captures, a. 59.
 captured by Sir John Campbell.
 Lord Clyde.
 67. Intervention in Mexico, Oct. 31.
 67. War with Mexico.
 67. War in Cochin China adds to French Provinces.
 62. Brocton, dies, a. 88.
 63. Despretz, system, dies, a. 71, Mar. 15.
 66. Intervenes and causes cessation of war between Prussia, Italy, and Austria.
 French withdrawal from Mexico, March 6.
 67. Intervenes in behalf of Papal States, and causes cessation of invasion by the defeat of invaders at Rome of 1849, near Rome.
 International Exposition opens at Paris.
61. King dies, a. 66.
 61. **William I.** succeeds Jan. 2.
 62. War with Austria as ally of Italy.
 65. Hanover allied to Prussia, and king dethroned; also elector of Saxe, Duchy of Nassau and free city of Frankfurt.
 64. Hungarian diet opened by emperor.
 66. War with Italy, a. 11, July 4.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, June 24.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 2.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 3.
 Prussians in all victories.
 66. Treaty of peace between Austria and Prussia. Austria waives all claim to Sicily with Sardinia, with draws from Germany, and yields North Saxony to Prussia, Aug. 29.
64. Scelling, philosopher, dies, a. 79.
 61. Schlosser, historian, dies, a. 85.
 64. Maximilian, king of Bavaria, dies.
 Succeeded by Son, **Ludwig II.**
 66. Formation of North German Confederation.
 Leadership of Prussia. Hanover annexed.
 64. Great build-up in Prussia. Military governor at Warsaw, a. 88 established.
 61. Prince Adolphus of Prussia, dies, a. 91, July 15.
 62. Jews admitted to privileges in Russia, Jan. 20.
 62. Count Nesselrode, statesman, dies, a. 92, Mar. 21.
 63. Introduction of serfs in Poland who had not taken part in rebellion.
 65. Russia advances into Central Asia.
69. War with Naples and Sicily, which votes to join Sardinia.
 61. Sardinia, Lombardy, Tuscany, Modena, Parma, Romagna, Naples, and Sicily form kingdom of Italy.
 61. Revolution in England.
 61. **Count Casimir**, statesman, dies, a. 82.
 62. Garibaldi republican invades Papal States, and conquers Sicily and Naples.
 66. War with Austria, June 15.
 66. Emperor of France gives to Italy province of Venetia, which was ceded to him by Austria.
69. 100,000 serfs.
 61. St. Thomas annexed.
 62. Ross, statesman, dies, a. 73, Feb. 1.
 62. San Marino, a republic, dies, a. 82, May 29.
 66. Prussian annexation.
 66. Marshal O'Donnell dies.
74. Silesia occupied by Austrians and Prussians, Feb. 9.
 64. Duppel besieged by Austrians and Prussians.
 64. Paris defeated and a victory by Austrians, March 18.
 64. Prussian victory at Wagram, Aug. 5.
 Naval battle of Hogland, May 9.
 War ended. Denmark ceding to Prussia and Austria the duchies of Silesia and Holstein August
67. Turkey. Peace in '56.
 a. 61.
 Central and statesman, dies, a. 59.
 empire, dies, a. 59.
 Austria. Both captures, a. 59.
 (reigns) Derby, Tory premier.
 67. Fremont captures, a. 59.
 captured by Sir John Campbell.
 Lord Clyde.
 67. Intervention in Mexico, Oct. 31.
 67. War with Mexico.
 67. War in Cochin China adds to French Provinces.
 62. Brocton, dies, a. 88.
 63. Despretz, system, dies, a. 71, Mar. 15.
 66. Intervenes and causes cessation of war between Prussia, Italy, and Austria.
 French withdrawal from Mexico, March 6.
 67. Intervenes in behalf of Papal States, and causes cessation of invasion by the defeat of invaders at Rome of 1849, near Rome.
 International Exposition opens at Paris.
61. King dies, a. 66.
 61. **William I.** succeeds Jan. 2.
 62. War with Austria as ally of Italy.
 65. Hanover allied to Prussia, and king dethroned; also elector of Saxe, Duchy of Nassau and free city of Frankfurt.
 64. Hungarian diet opened by emperor.
 66. War with Italy, a. 11, July 4.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, June 24.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 2.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 3.
 Prussians in all victories.
 66. Treaty of peace between Austria and Prussia. Austria waives all claim to Sicily with Sardinia, with draws from Germany, and yields North Saxony to Prussia, Aug. 29.
64. Scelling, philosopher, dies, a. 79.
 61. Schlosser, historian, dies, a. 85.
 64. Maximilian, king of Bavaria, dies.
 Succeeded by Son, **Ludwig II.**
 66. Formation of North German Confederation.
 Leadership of Prussia. Hanover annexed.
 64. Great build-up in Prussia. Military governor at Warsaw, a. 88 established.
 61. Prince Adolphus of Prussia, dies, a. 91, July 15.
 62. Jews admitted to privileges in Russia, Jan. 20.
 62. Count Nesselrode, statesman, dies, a. 92, Mar. 21.
 63. Introduction of serfs in Poland who had not taken part in rebellion.
 65. Russia advances into Central Asia.
69. War with Naples and Sicily, which votes to join Sardinia.
 61. Sardinia, Lombardy, Tuscany, Modena, Parma, Romagna, Naples, and Sicily form kingdom of Italy.
 61. Revolution in England.
 61. **Count Casimir**, statesman, dies, a. 82.
 62. Garibaldi republican invades Papal States, and conquers Sicily and Naples.
 66. War with Austria, June 15.
 66. Emperor of France gives to Italy province of Venetia, which was ceded to him by Austria.
69. 100,000 serfs.
 61. St. Thomas annexed.
 62. Ross, statesman, dies, a. 73, Feb. 1.
 62. San Marino, a republic, dies, a. 82, May 29.
 66. Prussian annexation.
 66. Marshal O'Donnell dies.
74. Silesia occupied by Austrians and Prussians, Feb. 9.
 64. Duppel besieged by Austrians and Prussians.
 64. Paris defeated and a victory by Austrians, March 18.
 64. Prussian victory at Wagram, Aug. 5.
 Naval battle of Hogland, May 9.
 War ended. Denmark ceding to Prussia and Austria the duchies of Silesia and Holstein August
67. Turkey. Peace in '56.
 a. 61.
 Central and statesman, dies, a. 59.
 empire, dies, a. 59.
 Austria. Both captures, a. 59.
 (reigns) Derby, Tory premier.
 67. Fremont captures, a. 59.
 captured by Sir John Campbell.
 Lord Clyde.
 67. Intervention in Mexico, Oct. 31.
 67. War with Mexico.
 67. War in Cochin China adds to French Provinces.
 62. Brocton, dies, a. 88.
 63. Despretz, system, dies, a. 71, Mar. 15.
 66. Intervenes and causes cessation of war between Prussia, Italy, and Austria.
 French withdrawal from Mexico, March 6.
 67. Intervenes in behalf of Papal States, and causes cessation of invasion by the defeat of invaders at Rome of 1849, near Rome.
 International Exposition opens at Paris.
61. King dies, a. 66.
 61. **William I.** succeeds Jan. 2.
 62. War with Austria as ally of Italy.
 65. Hanover allied to Prussia, and king dethroned; also elector of Saxe, Duchy of Nassau and free city of Frankfurt.
 64. Hungarian diet opened by emperor.
 66. War with Italy, a. 11, July 4.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, June 24.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 2.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 3.
 Prussians in all victories.
 66. Treaty of peace between Austria and Prussia. Austria waives all claim to Sicily with Sardinia, with draws from Germany, and yields North Saxony to Prussia, Aug. 29.
64. Scelling, philosopher, dies, a. 79.
 61. Schlosser, historian, dies, a. 85.
 64. Maximilian, king of Bavaria, dies.
 Succeeded by Son, **Ludwig II.**
 66. Formation of North German Confederation.
 Leadership of Prussia. Hanover annexed.
 64. Great build-up in Prussia. Military governor at Warsaw, a. 88 established.
 61. Prince Adolphus of Prussia, dies, a. 91, July 15.
 62. Jews admitted to privileges in Russia, Jan. 20.
 62. Count Nesselrode, statesman, dies, a. 92, Mar. 21.
 63. Introduction of serfs in Poland who had not taken part in rebellion.
 65. Russia advances into Central Asia.
69. War with Naples and Sicily, which votes to join Sardinia.
 61. Sardinia, Lombardy, Tuscany, Modena, Parma, Romagna, Naples, and Sicily form kingdom of Italy.
 61. Revolution in England.
 61. **Count Casimir**, statesman, dies, a. 82.
 62. Garibaldi republican invades Papal States, and conquers Sicily and Naples.
 66. War with Austria, June 15.
 66. Emperor of France gives to Italy province of Venetia, which was ceded to him by Austria.
69. 100,000 serfs.
 61. St. Thomas annexed.
 62. Ross, statesman, dies, a. 73, Feb. 1.
 62. San Marino, a republic, dies, a. 82, May 29.
 66. Prussian annexation.
 66. Marshal O'Donnell dies.
74. Silesia occupied by Austrians and Prussians, Feb. 9.
 64. Duppel besieged by Austrians and Prussians.
 64. Paris defeated and a victory by Austrians, March 18.
 64. Prussian victory at Wagram, Aug. 5.
 Naval battle of Hogland, May 9.
 War ended. Denmark ceding to Prussia and Austria the duchies of Silesia and Holstein August
67. Turkey. Peace in '56.
 a. 61.
 Central and statesman, dies, a. 59.
 empire, dies, a. 59.
 Austria. Both captures, a. 59.
 (reigns) Derby, Tory premier.
 67. Fremont captures, a. 59.
 captured by Sir John Campbell.
 Lord Clyde.
 67. Intervention in Mexico, Oct. 31.
 67. War with Mexico.
 67. War in Cochin China adds to French Provinces.
 62. Brocton, dies, a. 88.
 63. Despretz, system, dies, a. 71, Mar. 15.
 66. Intervenes and causes cessation of war between Prussia, Italy, and Austria.
 French withdrawal from Mexico, March 6.
 67. Intervenes in behalf of Papal States, and causes cessation of invasion by the defeat of invaders at Rome of 1849, near Rome.
 International Exposition opens at Paris.
61. King dies, a. 66.
 61. **William I.** succeeds Jan. 2.
 62. War with Austria as ally of Italy.
 65. Hanover allied to Prussia, and king dethroned; also elector of Saxe, Duchy of Nassau and free city of Frankfurt.
 64. Hungarian diet opened by emperor.
 66. War with Italy, a. 11, July 4.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, June 24.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 2.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 3.
 Prussians in all victories.
 66. Treaty of peace between Austria and Prussia. Austria waives all claim to Sicily with Sardinia, with draws from Germany, and yields North Saxony to Prussia, Aug. 29.
64. Scelling, philosopher, dies, a. 79.
 61. Schlosser, historian, dies, a. 85.
 64. Maximilian, king of Bavaria, dies.
 Succeeded by Son, **Ludwig II.**
 66. Formation of North German Confederation.
 Leadership of Prussia. Hanover annexed.
 64. Great build-up in Prussia. Military governor at Warsaw, a. 88 established.
 61. Prince Adolphus of Prussia, dies, a. 91, July 15.
 62. Jews admitted to privileges in Russia, Jan. 20.
 62. Count Nesselrode, statesman, dies, a. 92, Mar. 21.
 63. Introduction of serfs in Poland who had not taken part in rebellion.
 65. Russia advances into Central Asia.
69. War with Naples and Sicily, which votes to join Sardinia.
 61. Sardinia, Lombardy, Tuscany, Modena, Parma, Romagna, Naples, and Sicily form kingdom of Italy.
 61. Revolution in England.
 61. **Count Casimir**, statesman, dies, a. 82.
 62. Garibaldi republican invades Papal States, and conquers Sicily and Naples.
 66. War with Austria, June 15.
 66. Emperor of France gives to Italy province of Venetia, which was ceded to him by Austria.
69. 100,000 serfs.
 61. St. Thomas annexed.
 62. Ross, statesman, dies, a. 73, Feb. 1.
 62. San Marino, a republic, dies, a. 82, May 29.
 66. Prussian annexation.
 66. Marshal O'Donnell dies.
74. Silesia occupied by Austrians and Prussians, Feb. 9.
 64. Duppel besieged by Austrians and Prussians.
 64. Paris defeated and a victory by Austrians, March 18.
 64. Prussian victory at Wagram, Aug. 5.
 Naval battle of Hogland, May 9.
 War ended. Denmark ceding to Prussia and Austria the duchies of Silesia and Holstein August
67. Turkey. Peace in '56.
 a. 61.
 Central and statesman, dies, a. 59.
 empire, dies, a. 59.
 Austria. Both captures, a. 59.
 (reigns) Derby, Tory premier.
 67. Fremont captures, a. 59.
 captured by Sir John Campbell.
 Lord Clyde.
 67. Intervention in Mexico, Oct. 31.
 67. War with Mexico.
 67. War in Cochin China adds to French Provinces.
 62. Brocton, dies, a. 88.
 63. Despretz, system, dies, a. 71, Mar. 15.
 66. Intervenes and causes cessation of war between Prussia, Italy, and Austria.
 French withdrawal from Mexico, March 6.
 67. Intervenes in behalf of Papal States, and causes cessation of invasion by the defeat of invaders at Rome of 1849, near Rome.
 International Exposition opens at Paris.
61. King dies, a. 66.
 61. **William I.** succeeds Jan. 2.
 62. War with Austria as ally of Italy.
 65. Hanover allied to Prussia, and king dethroned; also elector of Saxe, Duchy of Nassau and free city of Frankfurt.
 64. Hungarian diet opened by emperor.
 66. War with Italy, a. 11, July 4.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, June 24.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 2.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 3.
 Prussians in all victories.
 66. Treaty of peace between Austria and Prussia. Austria waives all claim to Sicily with Sardinia, with draws from Germany, and yields North Saxony to Prussia, Aug. 29.
64. Scelling, philosopher, dies, a. 79.
 61. Schlosser, historian, dies, a. 85.
 64. Maximilian, king of Bavaria, dies.
 Succeeded by Son, **Ludwig II.**
 66. Formation of North German Confederation.
 Leadership of Prussia. Hanover annexed.
 64. Great build-up in Prussia. Military governor at Warsaw, a. 88 established.
 61. Prince Adolphus of Prussia, dies, a. 91, July 15.
 62. Jews admitted to privileges in Russia, Jan. 20.
 62. Count Nesselrode, statesman, dies, a. 92, Mar. 21.
 63. Introduction of serfs in Poland who had not taken part in rebellion.
 65. Russia advances into Central Asia.
69. War with Naples and Sicily, which votes to join Sardinia.
 61. Sardinia, Lombardy, Tuscany, Modena, Parma, Romagna, Naples, and Sicily form kingdom of Italy.
 61. Revolution in England.
 61. **Count Casimir**, statesman, dies, a. 82.
 62. Garibaldi republican invades Papal States, and conquers Sicily and Naples.
 66. War with Austria, June 15.
 66. Emperor of France gives to Italy province of Venetia, which was ceded to him by Austria.
69. 100,000 serfs.
 61. St. Thomas annexed.
 62. Ross, statesman, dies, a. 73, Feb. 1.
 62. San Marino, a republic, dies, a. 82, May 29.
 66. Prussian annexation.
 66. Marshal O'Donnell dies.
74. Silesia occupied by Austrians and Prussians, Feb. 9.
 64. Duppel besieged by Austrians and Prussians.
 64. Paris defeated and a victory by Austrians, March 18.
 64. Prussian victory at Wagram, Aug. 5.
 Naval battle of Hogland, May 9.
 War ended. Denmark ceding to Prussia and Austria the duchies of Silesia and Holstein August
67. Turkey. Peace in '56.
 a. 61.
 Central and statesman, dies, a. 59.
 empire, dies, a. 59.
 Austria. Both captures, a. 59.
 (reigns) Derby, Tory premier.
 67. Fremont captures, a. 59.
 captured by Sir John Campbell.
 Lord Clyde.
 67. Intervention in Mexico, Oct. 31.
 67. War with Mexico.
 67. War in Cochin China adds to French Provinces.
 62. Brocton, dies, a. 88.
 63. Despretz, system, dies, a. 71, Mar. 15.
 66. Intervenes and causes cessation of war between Prussia, Italy, and Austria.
 French withdrawal from Mexico, March 6.
 67. Intervenes in behalf of Papal States, and causes cessation of invasion by the defeat of invaders at Rome of 1849, near Rome.
 International Exposition opens at Paris.
61. King dies, a. 66.
 61. **William I.** succeeds Jan. 2.
 62. War with Austria as ally of Italy.
 65. Hanover allied to Prussia, and king dethroned; also elector of Saxe, Duchy of Nassau and free city of Frankfurt.
 64. Hungarian diet opened by emperor.
 66. War with Italy, a. 11, July 4.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, June 24.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 2.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 3.
 Prussians in all victories.
 66. Treaty of peace between Austria and Prussia. Austria waives all claim to Sicily with Sardinia, with draws from Germany, and yields North Saxony to Prussia, Aug. 29.
64. Scelling, philosopher, dies, a. 79.
 61. Schlosser, historian, dies, a. 85.
 64. Maximilian, king of Bavaria, dies.
 Succeeded by Son, **Ludwig II.**
 66. Formation of North German Confederation.
 Leadership of Prussia. Hanover annexed.
 64. Great build-up in Prussia. Military governor at Warsaw, a. 88 established.
 61. Prince Adolphus of Prussia, dies, a. 91, July 15.
 62. Jews admitted to privileges in Russia, Jan. 20.
 62. Count Nesselrode, statesman, dies, a. 92, Mar. 21.
 63. Introduction of serfs in Poland who had not taken part in rebellion.
 65. Russia advances into Central Asia.
69. War with Naples and Sicily, which votes to join Sardinia.
 61. Sardinia, Lombardy, Tuscany, Modena, Parma, Romagna, Naples, and Sicily form kingdom of Italy.
 61. Revolution in England.
 61. **Count Casimir**, statesman, dies, a. 82.
 62. Garibaldi republican invades Papal States, and conquers Sicily and Naples.
 66. War with Austria, June 15.
 66. Emperor of France gives to Italy province of Venetia, which was ceded to him by Austria.
69. 100,000 serfs.
 61. St. Thomas annexed.
 62. Ross, statesman, dies, a. 73, Feb. 1.
 62. San Marino, a republic, dies, a. 82, May 29.
 66. Prussian annexation.
 66. Marshal O'Donnell dies.
74. Silesia occupied by Austrians and Prussians, Feb. 9.
 64. Duppel besieged by Austrians and Prussians.
 64. Paris defeated and a victory by Austrians, March 18.
 64. Prussian victory at Wagram, Aug. 5.
 Naval battle of Hogland, May 9.
 War ended. Denmark ceding to Prussia and Austria the duchies of Silesia and Holstein August
67. Turkey. Peace in '56.
 a. 61.
 Central and statesman, dies, a. 59.
 empire, dies, a. 59.
 Austria. Both captures, a. 59.
 (reigns) Derby, Tory premier.
 67. Fremont captures, a. 59.
 captured by Sir John Campbell.
 Lord Clyde.
 67. Intervention in Mexico, Oct. 31.
 67. War with Mexico.
 67. War in Cochin China adds to French Provinces.
 62. Brocton, dies, a. 88.
 63. Despretz, system, dies, a. 71, Mar. 15.
 66. Intervenes and causes cessation of war between Prussia, Italy, and Austria.
 French withdrawal from Mexico, March 6.
 67. Intervenes in behalf of Papal States, and causes cessation of invasion by the defeat of invaders at Rome of 1849, near Rome.
 International Exposition opens at Paris.
61. King dies, a. 66.
 61. **William I.** succeeds Jan. 2.
 62. War with Austria as ally of Italy.
 65. Hanover allied to Prussia, and king dethroned; also elector of Saxe, Duchy of Nassau and free city of Frankfurt.
 64. Hungarian diet opened by emperor.
 66. War with Italy, a. 11, July 4.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, June 24.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 2.
 66. *Attila*, with Prussia, July 3.
 Prussians in all victories.
 66. Treaty of peace between Austria and Prussia. Austria waives all claim to Sicily with Sardinia, with draws from Germany, and yields North Saxony to Prussia, Aug. 29.
64. Scelling, philosopher, dies, a. 79.
 61. Schlosser, historian, dies, a. 85.
 64. Maximilian, king of Bavaria, dies.
 Succeeded by Son, **Ludwig II.**
 66. Formation of North German Confederation.
 Leadership of Prussia. Hanover annexed.
 64. Great build-up in Prussia. Military governor at Warsaw, a. 88 established.
 61. Prince Ad

The campaign of 1840 was the most exciting which had yet occurred in the history of the United States. Van Buren was blamed with everything. The financial distresses were laid at his door. Extravagance, bribery, corruption—everything bad was charged upon him. Men of business advertised to pay six dollars a barrel for flour if Harrison should be elected, three dollars a barrel if Van Buren should be successful. The Whig orators tossed about the luckless Administration through all the figures and forms of speech, and the President himself was shot at with every sort of dart that partisan wit and malice could invent. The enthusiasm in the ranks of the opposition rose higher and higher, and Van Buren was overwhelmingly defeated. He received only sixty electoral votes, against two hundred and thirty-four for General Harrison. After controlling the destinies of the Government for nearly forty years, the Democratic party was thus temporarily routed. For Vice-President, John Tyler, of Virginia, was the successful candidate.

In the last year of Van Buren's Administration was completed the sixth census of the United States. The tables were, as usual, replete with the evidences of growth and progress. The national revenues for the year 1840 amounted to nearly twenty millions of dollars. At this time that important statistical information, for which the subsequent reports have been noted, began to appear in its full value. The center of population had in the last ten years moved westward along the thirty-ninth parallel of latitude from the south fork of the Potomac to Clarksburg, in the present State of West Virginia, a distance of fifty-five miles. The inhabited area of the United States now amounted to eight hundred and seven thousand square miles, being an increase for the decade of twenty-seven and six-tenths per cent. The frontier line circumscribing the population passed through Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and the western borders of Missouri, Arkansas, and Louisiana, a distance of three thousand three hundred miles. The population had reached an aggregate of seventeen million souls, being an increase, since 1830, of more than six millions. It was found from the tables that eleven-twelfths of the people lived outside of the larger cities and

towns, showing a strong preponderance of the agricultural over the manufacturing and commercial interests. One of the most cheering lessons of the census was found in the fact that the wonderful growth of the United States was in *extent* and *area*, and not in *accumulation*—in the *spread* of civilization rather than in an increase of *intensity*. For since 1830 the average of the population of the country had not increased by so much as *one person to the square mile!*

The common judgment has been that the Administration of Van Buren was weak and inglorious. Doubtless it was characterized by few important episodes, and was controlled by principles some of which were bad; but he and his times were unfortunate rather than vicious. He was the victim of the evils which followed hard upon the relaxation of the Jacksonian methods of government. He had neither the will nor the disposition to rule as his predecessor had done. Nor were the people and their representatives any longer in the humor to suffer that sort of government. The period was unheroic; it was the ebb-tide between the belligerent excitements of 1832 and the War with Mexico. The financial panic added opprobrium to the popular estimate of imbecility in the Government. "The Administration of Van Buren," said a bitter satirist, "is like a parenthesis; it may be read in a low tone of voice or altogether omitted *without injuring the sense!*" But the satire lacked one essential—truth.

William Henry Harrison was by birth a Virginian. He was the son of Benjamin Harrison, signer of the Declaration of Independence; the adopted son of Robert Morris, financier of the Revolution. He was a graduate of Hampden-Sidney College, and afterwards a student of medicine. Attracted by the military life, he entered the army under St. Clair; was rapidly promoted; became Lieutenant-Governor, and then Governor of Indiana Territory, which office he filled with great ability. His military career in the North-west has been already narrated. He was inaugurated President on the 4th of March, 1841, and began his duties by issuing a call for a special session of Congress, to consider "sundry important matters connected with the finances of the country." An able Cabinet

was organized, at the head of which was Daniel Webster as Secretary of State.

Everything promised well for the new Whig Administration; but before Congress could convene, the venerable President, bending under the weight of sixty-eight years, fell sick and died, just one month after his inauguration. It was the first time that such an event had occurred in American history. Profound and universal grief was manifested at the sad event.

On the 6th of April, 1841, John Tyler took the oath of office and became President



WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON.

of the United States. He was a statesman of considerable distinction, a native of Virginia, a graduate of William and Mary College. At an early age he left the profession of law to enter upon a public career. He was chosen a member of Congress, and in 1825 was elected Governor of Virginia. From that position he was sent to the Senate of the United States; and now, at the age of fifty-one, was called to the Presidency. He had been put upon the ticket with General Harrison through motives of expediency; for, although a Whig in most of his political principles, he was known to be hostile to the United States Bank. And this

hostility was soon to be manifested in a remarkable manner.

On the convening of the special session of Congress the Whigs were in high spirits. One of the first measures proposed at the session, which lasted from May to September, was the repeal of the Independent Treasury Bill. A general bankrupt law was also brought forward and passed, by which a great number of insolvent business men were released from the disabilities under which they had fallen in the recent financial crash. The next measure—a favorite scheme of the Whigs—was the re-chartering of the Bank of the United States. The old charter had expired in 1836, but the bank had continued in operation, under a charter granted by the State of Pennsylvania. A bill to rehabilitate the institution in its national character was now brought forward and passed. The President interposed his veto. Again the bill was presented, in a modified form, and received the sanction of both Houses, only to be rejected by the Executive. This action produced a fatal rupture between the President and the party which had elected him. The indignant Whigs, baffled by the want of a two-thirds' majority in Congress, turned upon him with storms of invective. All the members of the Cabinet except Mr. Webster resigned their seats, and he retained his place only because of a pending difficulty with Great Britain.

A contention had arisen relative to the north-eastern boundary of the United States. The territorial limit in that direction had not been clearly defined in the treaty of 1783, and the commissioners at Ghent, in 1814, had contributed little to the solution of the difficulty. Like most of the other matters which were presented for the consideration of that polite and easily satisfied convention, the fixing of the boundary in question had been postponed rather than settled. It was agreed, however, at that time, to refer the establishment of the entire line between the United States and Canada to the decision of three commissions, which were to be formed under the auspices of the two Governments. The first of these bodies accomplished its work successfully, by

awarding the United States the islands in the bay of Passamaquoddy. The third commission performed its duty by fixing the true boundary-line from the intersection of the forty-fifth parallel of latitude with the river St. Lawrence to the western point of Lake Huron. To the second commission was assigned the more difficult task of settling the boundary from the Atlantic to the St. Lawrence; and this work they failed to accomplish.

Thus, for nearly twenty-five years, the boundary of the United States on the north-east remained indeterminate. At times the difficulty became so serious as to endanger the peace of the two nations. Finally the whole matter was referred to Lord Ashburton, acting on the part of Great Britain, and Daniel Webster, the American Secretary of State.

The discussion between the two diplomatists was as able as the subject was intricate. Finally the boundary was definitely established as follows: From the mouth of the river St. Croix, ascending that stream to its western fountain; from that fountain due north, to the St. John's; thence with that river to its source on the watershed between the Atlantic and the St. Lawrence; thence in a south-westerly direction, along the crest of the highlands, to the north-western source of the Connecticut; and thence down that stream to and along the forty-fifth parallel to the St. Lawrence. By a second agreement of the commissioners, the boundary was established

from the western point of Lake Huron, through Lake Superior, to the north-western extremity of the Lake of the Woods; thence—confirming the treaty of October, 1818—southward to the forty-ninth parallel of latitude; and thence with that parallel to the Rocky Mountains. This important settlement, known as the WEBSTER-ASHBURTON TREATY, was completed on the 9th of August, 1842, and was




JOHN TYLER

ratified by the Senate on the 20th of the same month.

In the year 1843 a peculiar domestic trouble arose in the State of Rhode Island. For nearly two centuries the government of that Commonwealth had rested upon the old charter granted by Charles II. There had been in Rhode Island, since the earlier Colonial times, a certain residue of loyalism unfavorable to

republican institutions. Among other things a clause in the ancient charter restricting the right of suffrage to property-holders of a certain grade still kept its place. With the development of free institutions under our national Government the spirit of democracy gained the ascendancy, and the proposition was made to abolish the restriction on the suffrage in the Constitution of the State. The event showed that the people were almost unanimous for the change. But in respect to the *manner* of making the same there was a serious division. One faction, known as the Law and Order party, proceeded, in accordance with the old Constitution, to choose Samuel W. King as Governor.



BUNKER HILL MONUMENT.


The other faction, called the Suffrage party, acting in an irregular way, elected Thomas W. Dorr.

In May of 1842 both parties met and organized their rival governments. The Law and Order party undertook to suppress the faction of Dorr. The latter in turn made an attempt to capture the State arsenal. The militia under Governor King's officers, however, drove the assailants away. About a month later the adherents of Dorr again took up arms; but this time they were dispersed by a detachment of national troops, which had come into the State. Dorr thereupon fled from Rhode Island, but soon afterwards returned, when he was caught, tried for treason,

convicted, and sentenced to imprisonment for life. He was offered pardon on condition of taking the oath of allegiance to the established authorities. This he stubbornly refused to do, and was kept in confinement until June of 1845, when he was liberated without conditions.

In the year 1842 was completed the Bunker Hill Monument. As might well be expected, the event called forth an unbounded enthusiasm, not only in Boston and Massachusetts, but throughout the country. The foundation of the great shaft had been laid on the 17th of June, 1825; the corner-stone being put in place by the venerable Lafayette, who was then visiting in the United States. Daniel Webster, at this time young in years and fame, delivered the oration, while two hundred Revolutionary veterans—forty of them survivors of the battle fought on that hill-crest just fifty years before—gathered with the throng to hear him. But the work of erection went on slowly. More than a hundred and fifty thousand dollars were expended, and seventeen years elapsed, before the grand shaft commemorative of the heroes living and dead was finished. The column was of Quincy granite, thirty-one feet square at the base, and two hundred and twenty-one feet in height. The dedication was postponed until the next succeeding anniversary of the battle. On the 17th of June, 1843, an immense multitude of people, including most of the survivors of the Revolutionary War, gathered from all parts of the Republic to participate in the ceremonies. Mr. Webster, now full of years and honors, was again chosen to deliver the address. The dedicatory oration was one of the most able and eloquent ever pronounced in the United States. New luster was added to the fame of the orator. The exercises were concluded with a public dinner, given in Faneuil Hall, the cradle of American liberty.

In the last years of Tyler's Administration the State of New York was the scene of a serious social disturbance, arising from certain disputed land-titles, and going back in its origin to the Dutch occupation of New Netherland. Until the year 1840, the descendants of Van Rensselaer, one of the old Dutch patroons, had held a claim on certain lands in the counties of Rensselaer, Columbia, and Del-



MOHMON EMIGRANTS IN THE DESERT.

aware. In liquidation of this claim, they had continued to receive from the farmers owning the lands certain trifling rents. But at length the farmers were warned with the payment, and rebelled. From 1840 to 1844 the question was much debated in the Legislature of New York. In the latter year the Anti-rent party became so bold as to attack those of their fellow-tenants who made the payments. The paying renters were coated with tar and feathers, and driven from the settlements. Officers were sent to apprehend the rioters, and then they killed. Time and again the authorities of the State were invoked to quell the disturbances, and the excitements at length subsided. To the present time, however, there has never been any formal adjustment of the difficulty.

To the same epoch of our history belongs the beginning of the troubles with the Mormons. The latter, under the leadership of their prophet, Joseph Smith, made their first important settlements in Jackson County, Missouri. Here their numbers increased to fifteen hundred. Elated with the success of their colony, they began to say that the great West was to be their inheritance. The anti-Mormon people of the surrounding country became excited, and determined to rid themselves of their neighbors. The militia was at length called out, and the Mormons were obliged to leave the State. In the spring of 1839 they crossed the Mississippi into Illinois, and on a high plateau overlooking the river, laid out a new city, to which they gave the name of Nauvoo, meaning *The Beautiful*.

Here they built a splendid temple. Again i

the numbers of the Saints increased by additions from different parts of the United States and from Europe. The settlement at length attained a population of ten thousand. The rapid increase of the Mormons and their peculiar principles aroused the antagonism of the region round about, and the two parties became hostile. Some laws enacted by Smith's followers were contrary to the statute of Illinois. The Mormons were charged with certain thefts and murders, and it was believed that the courts about Nauvoo were powerless to convict the criminals.

With the rise of the excitement and the outbreak of violence, Smith and his brother were arrested, taken to Carthage, and put in jail. On the 27th of June, 1844, a mob gathered, broke open the jail doors, and killed the prisoners. Hostilities continued during the summer. In the following year the charter of Nauvoo was annulled by the Legislature. The Mormons despaired of maintaining their foothold in Illinois, and the great majority determined to exile themselves beyond the limits of civilization. In 1846 they began their march to the far West. In September, Nauvoo was cannonaded for three days, and the remnant of the Mormons who had remained were driven forth to join their companions in exile. They came up with the main company at Council Bluffs, Iowa. Thence they dragged themselves wearily westward, crossed the Rocky Mountains, reached the basin of the Great Salt Lake, and founded Utah Territory. Such were the beginnings of a complication, which, after the lapse of nearly fifty years, has not yet yielded to the force of logic, or the logic of force.


713

CHAPTER CXXIII—MEXICAN WAR AND SIXTH DECADE.



IN the meantime, a still more serious agitation had arisen in the United States, relative to the Republic of Texas. From 1821 to 1836, this imperial country, lying between Louisiana and Mexico, had been a province of the latter republic. It had been the policy of

Spain, and of Mexico afterwards, to keep Texas uninhabited, with a view to interposing an impassable country between the aggressive American race and the Mexican borders. At length, however, a large land-grant was made to Moses Austin, of Connecticut, on condition that he would settle three hundred American families within the limits of his domain. The grant was confirmed to his son Stephen, with the privilege



Copyrighted 1866, O. M. Dunham.

FALL OF THE ALAMO.

of establishing five hundred additional families of immigrants. It was thus that the foundations of English civilization were laid within the borders of Texas.

Owing to the oppressive policy of the Mexican Government, and perhaps to the independent spirit of the Texans themselves, the latter, in the year 1835, raised the standard of rebellion. War broke out between the parent State and the revolted province. Many adventurers and some heroes from the United States rushed to the scene of action, and espoused the Texan cause. In the first battle, fought at Gonzales, a thousand Mexicans were defeated by a Texan force of half the number.



SAM HOUSTON

On the sixth of March, 1836, a Texan fort called the Alamo was surrounded by a Mexican army of eight thousand men, under the command of Santa Anna, President of Mexico. The feeble garrison, after a heroic defense, was overpowered and massacred, under circumstances of great atrocity. Here the daring David Crockett, an ex-Congressman of Tennessee, and a famous hunter of beasts and men, was killed. In the following month was fought the decisive battle of San Jacinto, in which a small American army, commanded by General Sam Houston, annihilated the hosts of Santa Anna, and achieved the freedom of Texas at a blow. The independence of the

new State was acknowledged by the United States, by Great Britain, and by France.

From the first there was an ulterior object on the part of the Texans to gain admission into the American Union. No sooner had they become independent than they applied for a place as a State in our Republic. At first the proposition was declined by President Van Buren, who feared a war with Mexico. In the last year of Tyler's Administration the question of the annexation of Texas was again agitated. The population of that Republic had now increased to more than two hundred thousand souls. The territory embraced an area of two hundred and thirty-seven thousand square miles, a domain more than five times as great as the State of Pennsylvania. It was like annexing an empire.

The issue here presented became political in its bearing. It was the great question on which the people divided in the Presidential election of 1844. Nor will the thoughtful reader, nearing the close of the century, fail to discern in this old question of annexation the profound problem of slavery. Freedom and the free States had found a vent in the North-west, looking even beyond the Rocky Mountains and to the Pacific; but slavery and the slave States seemed to be hampered on the south-west. Would not Texas open to the "peculiar institution" a field as broad and promising as that possessed by the Northern States? Could not the equipoise between the two parts of the Union be thus maintained?

In all this we may see the bottom reason why the people of the South as a rule favored the annexation, and why the proposition was received with such coldness in the North. Again, the project was favored by the Democrats and opposed by the Whigs; so that here we have the beginning of that sectionalism in party politics which has not yet disappeared from the nation. At this time the two parties were nearly equally matched in strength, and the contest of 1844 surpassed in excitement anything which had hitherto been known in the country. James K. Polk, of Tennessee, was put forward as the Democratic candidate, while the Whigs chose their favorite leader, Henry Clay. The former was elected, and the hope of the latter of reaching the Presidency was forever eclipsed. For


Vice-President, George M. Dallas, of Pennsylvania, was chosen.

An incident of these days is worthy of special mention. On the 29th of May, 1844, the news of the nomination of Polk was sent to Washington City from Baltimore by the magnetic telegraph. It was the first despatch ever so transmitted, and the event marks an era in the history of civilization. The inventor of the telegraph, which has revolutionized the method of transmitting information and introduced a new epoch in history, was Professor Samuel F. B. Morse, of Massachusetts. The magnetic principle on which the invention depends had been known since 1774, but Professor Morse was the first to apply that principle to the benefit of men. He began his experiments in 1832, and five years later succeeded in obtaining a patent on his invention. He had, in the meantime, to contend with every species of prejudice and ignorance which the low grade of human intelligence could produce. After the issuance of the patent there was a long delay, and it was not until the last day of the session of Congress in 1843 that he obtained an appropriation of thirty thousand dollars. With that appropriation was constructed, between Baltimore and Washington, the first telegraphic line in the world. Perhaps no other single invention has exercised a more beneficent influence on the welfare, advancement, and happiness of mankind.

With the convening of Congress in December, 1844, the proposition to admit Texas into the Union was formally brought forward. During the winter the question was constantly debated, and on the 1st of March the bill for annexation was passed. The President immediately gave his assent, and the Lone Star took its place in the constellation of American States. On the day before the inauguration of Polk, bills for the admission of Florida and Iowa were also signed; but the latter State, the twenty-ninth member of the Union, was not formally admitted until the following year.

James Knox Polk was a native of North Carolina, born November 2, 1795. At the age of eleven he removed with his father to Tennessee. In 1818 he was graduated from

the University of North Carolina. In the years of his earlier manhood he was the *protégé* of Andrew Jackson. His first public office was a membership in the Legislature of the State. He was afterwards elected to Congress, where he served as member and Speaker for fourteen years. In 1839 he was chosen governor of Tennessee, and from that position was called, at the early age of forty-nine, to the Presidential chair. At the head of the new Cabinet was placed James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania. It was an office requiring high abilities; for the threatening question with



JAMES K. POLK

Mexico came at once to a crisis. As soon as the resolution to annex Texas was adopted by Congress, Almonte, the Mexican Minister at Washington, demanded his passports, and indignantly left the country.

On the 4th of July, 1845 the Act of Annexation was ratified by the Legislature of Texas, and the union was an accomplished fact. But the Texan authorities knew well the course which the Government of Mexico would pursue. A deputation was sent at once to the President of the United States, requesting that an army be immediately despatched for the protection of the new State. It was in ob-

dience to this petition that General Zachary Taylor was ordered to march from Camp Jessup, in Western Louisiana, to occupy Texas.

The real question at issue between that State and Mexico was one of boundaries. Perhaps the bare fact of the annexation of Texas to the United States would have been borne by the Mexican Republic, if she could have dictated the boundary-line between her own territories and those of Texas. The foundation of the quarrel had been laid as early as the Mexican Revolution of 1821. By that event Mexico had shaken off her dependence on Spain, and had rearranged her civil administration to suit herself. In doing so she had united in one the two provinces of Coahuila and Texas. These were the frontier Mexican States east of the Rio Grande. Over the united provinces she had established a common government, and this government was maintained until the Texan Rebellion of 1836. Texas, being successful in that struggle with Mexico, naturally claimed that her own independence, so achieved, carried with it the independence of Coahuila, and that therefore the territory of the latter province became, by the act of revolution, an integral part of the new Texan Republic.

The same views were held by the people of Coahuila. The joint Legislature of that province and of Texas passed a statute, in December of 1836, declaring the integrity of the two States, under the name of Texas. Mexico, however, insisted that Texas *only*, and not Coahuila, had revolted against her authority, and that therefore the latter State was still rightfully a part of the Mexican dominions.

It thus happened that Texas, now a State in the American Union, claimed the Rio Grande as the western limit, while Mexico was determined to have the Nueces as the separating line. The territory between the two rivers was in dispute. The Government of the United States made a proposal to have the difficulty settled by negotiation, but Mexico scornfully refused. The refusal was construed by the Americans as a virtual confession that the Mexican Government was in the wrong, and, upon this conviction, continued to claim the Rio Grande as the true boundary. Instructions were sent to General Taylor to advance his army as near to that river as cir-

cumstances would warrant, and to hold it against aggression. Under these orders the American army was moved forward to Corpus Christi, at the mouth of the Nueces, where a camp was established; and there Taylor concentrated his forces to the number of four thousand five hundred men. Such was the situation of affairs at the close of the year 1845.

At the beginning of the following year a critical step was taken. General Taylor was ordered to move forward to the Rio Grande. It was known that the Mexican Government had resolved not to receive an American ambassador sent thither to negotiate a settlement. It was also learned that a Mexican army had been gathered in the northern part of the Republic for the invasion of Texas, or, at any rate, to occupy the disputed territory between the two rivers. On the 8th of March the American army was thrown forward from Corpus Christi to Point Isabel, on the Gulf of Mexico. At that place Taylor established a *dépôt* of supplies, and thence pressed forward to the Rio Grande. He arrived at that river a short distance above the mouth, and took a station at the town of Matamoras, where he erected a fortress, named Fort Brown.

On the 26th of April, General Arista, who had arrived at Matamoras on the day before Taylor's approach, and had taken command of the Mexican forces on the frontier, notified the American commander that hostilities had begun. On that day a company of American dragoons, under command of Captain Thornton, was attacked by a body of Mexicans who had crossed the Rio Grande into the disputed territory. The Americans lost sixteen men in killed and wounded, and were obliged to surrender.

Such was the outbreak of the war. While the troop of Mexicans just referred to crossed the river above the American camp, other bodies made a crossing below, and threatened Taylor's communications. That General, fearing for his supplies at Point Isabel, hastened to the place and strengthened the defenses. The fort opposite Matamoras was left under command of Major Brown, with a garrison of three hundred men. The return of Taylor to Point Isabel was witnessed by the Mexicans across the river, who supposed the Americans

were retreating from the country. Great jubilation ensued. The *Republican Monitor*, a Mexican newspaper of Matamoras, published a flaming editorial, declaring that the cowardly invaders of Mexico had fled, like a gang of poltroons, to the sea-coast, and were using every exertion to get out of the country before the thunderbolt of Mexican vengeance should fall upon them. Arista himself shared the common delusion, believing that the Americans had receded from the contest, and that it was only necessary for him to bombard Fort Brown in order to end the war.

In the mean time Taylor had strengthened his situation at Point Isabel, and set out with trains and an army of two thousand men to return to Fort Brown. The Mexicans had now, to the number of six thousand, crossed the Rio Grande and taken possession of Palo Alto. This place lay directly in Taylor's route. At noon, on the 8th of May, the Americans came up, and the battle was opened. A severe engagement ensued, lasting five hours, in which the Mexi-

cans were driven from the field, with the loss of a hundred men. The American artillery was specially efficient. It was observed from the first that the fighting of the Mexicans was clumsy and ineffectual. Four Americans were killed and forty wounded, among the former the gallant Major Ringgold, of the artillery.

The battle of Palo Alto was indecisive. On the following day General Taylor took up his march for Fort Brown. Within three miles of that place he again came upon the Mexicans, who had rallied in full force to dispute his advance. The place selected for their second battle was called Resaca de la Palma. Here an old river-bed, dry and overgrown with cactus, lay across the road along which the Americans were advancing. The

Mexican artillery was planted to command the approach, and for a while the American lines were severely galled. A charge was ordered, however, under Captain May, who commanded the dragoons. The Mexican batteries were captured, and General La Vega was taken at the guns. The Mexicans, abandoning their batteries, flung away their accoutrements and fled. Nor did they pause until they had put the Rio Grande between themselves and their pursuers. General Taylor again took up his march, and reached Fort Brown without further molestation. He found that that place had been constantly bombarded from Matamoras during his absence. A brave defense had been made, but Major Brown, the



CAPTURE OF MEXICAN BATTERIES BY CAPTAIN MAY.

commandant, had fallen. Such was the beginning of the Mexican War, a struggle destined to be replete with disasters to the Mexicans and with victories to the American forces.

The news of what was done on the Rio Grande carried wild excitement throughout the United States. The war spirit flamed high. Even party dissensions were for a while hushed, and Whigs and Democrats alike rushed forward to fill the ranks. The President, in a message to Congress, threw the onus of the conflict on the lawless soldiery of Mexico, alleging that they had shed the blood of American soldiers on American soil. Congress promptly responded, and on the 11th of May, 1846, declared that "war already existed by the act of the Mexican Government."

Ten millions of dollars were promptly placed at the disposal of the President, and he was authorized to accept the services of fifty thousand volunteers. In all the States war meetings were held, and such was the zeal for the conflict that three hundred thousand men are said to have offered themselves for the service.

A plan for the invasion of Mexico was made by General Scott, Commander-in-chief of the army. The American forces were organized in three divisions: the ARMY OF THE WEST, under General Kearney, to cross the Rocky Mountains and conquer the northern Mexican provinces; the ARMY OF THE CENTER, under General Scott himself, to march from the Gulf coast into the heart of the enemy's country; and the ARMY OF OCCUPATION, commanded by General Taylor, to subdue and hold the districts on the Rio Grande.

To General Wool was assigned the duty of mustering in the volunteers. By midsummer he had succeeded in despatching to General Taylor a force of nine thousand men. He then established his head-quarters and camp at San Antonio, Texas, from which point he sent forward the various divisions of recruits to the field. Meanwhile active operations had been resumed on the Rio Grande. Ten days after the battle of Resaca de la Palma, General Taylor crossed the river and captured Matamoras. He then began his march up the right bank of the river into the interior. The Mexicans had now felt the impact of American metal, and grew wary of their antagonists. They fell back to the old town of Monterey, which place they fortified, and against which Taylor now began to advance. The latter, however, was unable to leave the Rio Grande with the weak army under his command, and was obliged to tarry until August before his forces were sufficiently strong to justify the advance. At the latter date he found himself at the head of over six thousand men, and proceeded against Monterey. He reached the place on the 19th of September, and immediately began an investment.

Monterey was held by a Mexican army of ten thousand men, under General Ampudia, but the small American force besieged the place with great vigor. On the 21st of the

month an assault was made, in which the Americans, led by General Worth, carried the heights in the rear of the town. Here was situated the Bishop's Palace, a strong building commanding the entrance to Monterey; but the place was carried on the 22d of September. On the morning of the 23d, Monterey was assailed in front by the divisions of Generals Quitman and Butler. The American storming parties charged irresistibly into the streets, and reached the Grand Plaza, or public square. In a short time they hoisted the flag of the Union, and then routed the Mexican forces from the buildings in which they had taken refuge. They broke open doors, charged up dark stairways, traversed the flat roofs of the houses, and drove the enemy to an ignominious surrender. Ampudia, however, was granted the honors of war, on condition that he vacate the city, which he did on the morrow. The news of this signal victory of General Taylor and his army still further aroused the enthusiasm and war spirit of the American people.

After the taking of Monterey, news was carried by the Mexicans to Taylor that negotiations for peace were in progress at the capital. He accordingly agreed to an armistice of eight weeks, during which hostilities should cease by both parties. But the matter was a mere ruse on the part of the enemy. They desired to gain time for warlike preparations. It was at this juncture that the celebrated General Antonio Lopez de Santa Anna was called home from Havana, where he had been living in exile. He was at once made President of the country and Commander-in-chief of the Mexican armies.

In the course of the autumn a force of twenty thousand Mexicans was raised and sent into the field. When the armistice had expired, General Taylor again moved forward. On the 15th of November the town of Saltillo, seventy miles south-west from Monterey, was captured by the Americans under General Worth. Soon afterwards, Victoria, a city of Tamaulipas, was taken by a division under General Robert Patterson. To that place General Butler pressed forward from Monterey, on a march against Tampico. The latter place had, however, in the meantime, capitulated to Captain Conner, commander of an American flotilla.

General Wool now set forward in person from San Antonio, Texas; entered Mexico, and took a position within supporting distance of Monterey. General Scott arrived at this juncture, and assumed the command-in-chief of the American armies.

In the meantime, the Army of the West, under General Kearney, had set out for the conquest of New Mexico and California. After a long, wearisome march, this division reached Santa Fé, and on the 18th of August captured

On that far coast stirring events had meanwhile happened. For four years Colonel John C. Fremont had been exploring the region west of the Rocky Mountains. He had hoisted the American flag on the highest peak of that great range, and then set out for Salt Lake, and afterwards for Oregon. From the latter territory he turned southward into California, where, on arriving, he received despatches informing him of the impending war with Mexico. The great adventurer thereupon assumed all



FREMONT IN THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS.

and garrisoned the city. There was no further resistance within the limits of New Mexico. From Santa Fé as a base, General Kearney, with a body of four hundred dragoons, set out on his march to the Pacific coast. After proceeding three hundred miles, he was joined by the famous Kit Carson, who brought him intelligence that California had been already subdued. Kearney thereupon sent back the larger part of his forces, and with only a hundred men, made his way to the Pacific.

responsibilities, and began to arouse the American residents of California to a rebellion against the authority of Mexico. In this work he was successful. The frontiersmen of the Sacramento Valley gathered around his standard, and the campaign was undertaken against the Mexican authorities. In several minor engagements the Americans were uniformly successful, and the authority of Fremont was rapidly extended over the greater part of Upper and Central California.

While these events were happening in the North-west, Commodore Sloat, of the American Navy, had undertaken a similar work in the South. Arriving at the town of Monterey, on the coast, about eighty miles south of San Francisco, he captured the place. At the extreme southern part of the State, Commodore Stockton captured San Diego, and then assumed command of the Pacific Squadron. It was the news of these events which inspired Fremont to exertions in the North and Center. He hoisted the American flag everywhere; joined Sloat and Stockton, and advanced against Los Angeles, which was taken with little opposition.



GENERAL TAYLOR COMMANDING AT BUENA VISTA.

Before the end of the summer, California was conquered. In November, General Kearney, with a hundred dragons, arrived, and joined his forces with those of Fremont and Stockton. About a month later the Mexicans, seeing the meagreness of the forces by which they had been overawed, rose in rebellion, and the Americans were obliged to take the field. On the 8th of January, 1847, a decisive battle was fought at San Gabriel, in which the Mexicans were completely defeated, and the authority of the United States established on a permanent basis. Thus was the imperial domain of California wrested from the Mexican Government by a handful of courageous adven-

tures, marching from place to place with their lives in their hands.


On leaving New Mexico, Kearney had left behind Colonel Doniphan in command of the American forces. He, too, became an adventurer. With a body of seven hundred men, he marched across the enemy's country from Santa Fé *en route* to Saltillo, a distance of more than eight hundred miles. On arriving at the Rio Grande, he fought a battle with the Mexicans, on Christmas day, at Bracito. He then crossed the river, captured El Paso, and in two months pressed his way to within twenty miles of Chihuahua. On the banks of Sacramento Creek he met the Mexicans in overwhelming numbers, and on the 28th of November, inflicted upon them a disastrous defeat. He then marched unopposed into Chihuahua, a city of more than forty thousand inhabitants, and finally reached the division of General Wool in safety.

Meanwhile General Scott, on his arrival in Mexico, had drawn down the river a large part of the Army of Occupation, to join him on the Gulf, for the conquest of the Mexican capital. After the withdrawal of these troops from Taylor, and while the remainder were left in an exposed condition, Santa Anna, perceiving his advantage, immediately moved against Taylor with an army of twenty thousand men. The American General was able to oppose to this tremendous force not more than six thousand men. After furnishing garrisons for Saltillo and Monterey, Taylor's effective forces in the field amounted to but four thousand eight hundred men; but with this small and resolute army he marched out boldly to meet the Mexicans. A favorable battle-ground was chosen at Buena Vista, four miles south of Saltillo. Here Taylor posted his army, and awaited the onset.

On the 22d of February the Mexicans came

pouring through the gorges and over the hills, from the direction of San Luis Potosí. On approaching, Santa Anna demanded a surrender, but was met with defiance. The real battle began on the morning of the 23d. The Mexicans first attempted to outflank the American position, but the attempt was thwarted by the troops of Illinois. A heavy division was next thrown against the American center, but this attempt was also repelled, chiefly by the effectiveness of Captain Washington's artillery. The Mexicans then fell with

with volleys of grape-shot. A successful charge was then made by the American cavalry, in which the losses were severe. Against tremendous odds the battle was fairly won. On the following night the Mexicans, having lost nearly two thousand men, made a precipitate retreat. The American loss amounted, in killed, wounded, and missing, to seven hundred and forty-six. This was, however, the last of General Taylor's battles. He soon after left the field and returned to the United States, where he was received with great en-



BOMBARDMENT OF SAN JUAN D'ULLOA.

great force on the American left, where the Second Regiment of Indianians, acting under a mistaken order, gave way, and the army was for a while in peril; but the troops of Kentucky and Mississippi were rallied to the breach; the men of Illinois and Indiana came bravely to the support, and the onset of the enemy was again hurled back. In the crisis of the struggle the Mexicans made a furious charge upon the batteries of Captain Bragg; but the gunners stood to their work, and the columns of Mexican lancers were scattered

thusiasm. He was indeed, in the popular estimation, the hero of the war.

On the 9th of March, 1847, General Scott, having collected a compact army of twelve thousand men, landed to the south of Vera Cruz, and entered upon the last campaign of the war. In three days Vera Cruz was invested. Batteries were opened at a distance of eight hundred yards, and a cannonade was begun. On the water-side, Vera Cruz was defended by the celebrated castle of San Juan d'Ulloa, which had been erected by Spain in the early

part of the sixteenth century, at a cost of four millions of dollars. For four days the place was shrouded with shot and shell from the fleet of Commodore Conner and the land batteries which Scott had planted on the shore. Life and property were swept away in a common ruin. The Americans were on the eve of assaulting the town, when the humbled authorities came out and surrendered.

This was opened a route for the American advance from the coast to the capital. On the 8th of April the first division, under General Twiggs, set out on the road to Jalapa. General Scott, at the head of the main army, im-



WINFIELD SCOTT

mediately followed. For several days the forces moved forward without serious opposition, but on the 12th of the month the Americans came upon Santa Anna, with an army of fifteen thousand men, strongly posted on the heights and rocky pass of Cerro Gordo. The position appeared impregnable; but unless it should be carried, further advance was an impossibility. The army was accordingly arranged for an assault, which by all the rules of war promised only disaster and ruin; but such was the spirit and impetuosity of the troops that the General did not hesitate to take the risk. On the morning of the 18th of April the attack was made, and before

noonday every position of the Mexicans was successfully stormed. They were hurled from their fortifications and driven into a precipitate rout. Nearly three thousand prisoners were captured, together with forty-three pieces of bronze artillery, five thousand muskets, and accoutrements enough to supply an army. The American loss in killed and wounded amounted to four hundred and thirty-one; that of the Mexicans to fully a thousand. Santa Anna barely escaped with his life, leaving behind his private papers and his *wooden leg!*

The way thus opened, the victorious army pressed onward to Jalapa. On the 22d of the month the strong castle of Perote, crowning the peak of the Cordilleras, was taken without resistance. Here the Americans captured another park of artillery and a vast amount of warlike stores. From this point General Scott turned to the south, and led his army against the ancient and sacred city of Puebla. Though the place contained a population of eighty thousand, no defense was made or attempted. It is one of the striking episodes of modern history that a handful of invaders, two thousand miles from their homes, should thus march unopposed through the gates of a great foreign city. On the 15th of May the army was quartered in Puebla. General Scott now found his forces reduced to five thousand men, and deemed it prudent to pause until reinforcements could reach him from Vera Cruz.

At this juncture negotiations were again attempted; but the foolish hardihood of the Mexicans prevented satisfactory results. By mid-summer General Scott's reinforcements arrived, swelling his numbers to eleven thousand men. Leaving a small garrison in Puebla, he set out, on the 7th of August, on his march for the capital. The route now lay over the crest of the Cordilleras. Strong resistance had been expected in the passes of the mountains; but the advance was unopposed, and the American army, sweeping over the heights, looked down on the valley of Mexico. Never had a soldiery in a foreign land beheld a grander scene. Clear to the horizon stretched a most living landscape of green fields, villages, and lakes—a picture too beautiful to be torn with the dread machinery of war.

Fifteen miles from the capital lay the

town of Ayotla. To this place the army now pressed forward, descending from the mountains. Thus far the march had been along the great national road from Vera Cruz to Mexico. The remainder of the route, however, was occupied with fortifications both natural and artificial, and it seemed impossible to continue the direct march further. The army accordingly wheeled to the south from Ayotla, around lake Chalco, and thence westward to San Augustine. By this means the army was brought within ten miles of the capital. From San Augustine the approaches to the city were by long causeways across marshes and the beds of bygone lakes. At the ends of these causeways were massive gates, strongly defended. To the left of the line of march were the almost inaccessible positions of Contreras, San Antonio, and Molino del Rey. To the front and beyond the marshes, and closer to the city, lay the powerful bulwarks of Churubusco and Chapultepec. The latter was a castle of great strength, and seemed impregnable. These various outposts of the city were occupied by Santa Anna, with a force of fully thirty thousand Mexicans. The army of General Scott was not one-third as great in numbers, and yet with this small force he continued to press on against the capital.

The first assaults were made on the 19th of August, by Generals Pillow and Twiggs, at Contreras. About night-fall the line of communications between this fortress and Santa Anna's army was cut, and in the darkness of the following night an assailing column, led by General Persifer F. Smith, moved against the enemy's position. The attack was delayed until sunrise, but at that hour the American column rushed forward with impetuosity, and six thousand Mexicans were driven in rout and confusion from the fortifications. The American division numbered fewer than four thousand. This was the *first* victory of the memorable 20th of August. A few hours later General Worth advanced on San Antonio, compelled an evacuation of the place, and routed the flying garrison. This was the *second* victory. Almost at the same time General Pillow led a column against one of the heights of Churubusco. Here the Mexicans had concentrated in great force; but after a terrible assault the position was taken by storm, and

the enemy scattered like chaff. This was the *third* triumph. The division of General Twiggs added a *fourth* victory by storming and holding another height of Churubusco, while the *fifth* and last was achieved by Generals Shields and Pierce. The latter confronted Santa Anna, who was coming with a large army to reinforce his garrisons, and turned him back with large losses. The whole of the Mexican army was now driven into the fortifications of Chapultepec.

On the following morning the alarm and treachery of the Mexican authorities were both strongly exhibited. A deputation came out to negotiate; but the intent was merely to gain time for strengthening the defenses. The terms proposed by the Mexicans were preposterous when viewed in the light of the situation. General Scott, who did not consider his army vanquished, rejected the proposals with scorn. He, however, rested his men until the 7th of September before renewing hostilities. On the morning of the 8th General Worth was thrown forward to take Molino del Rey and Casa de Mata, which were the western defenses of Chapultepec. These places were defended by about fourteen thousand Mexicans; but the Americans, after losing a fourth of their number in the desperate onset, were again victorious. The batteries were now turned on Chapultepec itself, and on the 13th of September that frowning citadel was carried by storm. This exploit opened an avenue into the city. Through the San Cosme and Belen gates the conquering army swept resistlessly, and at nightfall the soldiers of the Union were in the suburbs of Mexico.

During the night Santa Anna and the officers of the Government fled from the city, but not until they had turned loose from the prisons two thousand convicts, to fire upon the American army. On the following morning, before day-dawn, a deputation came forth from the city to beg for mercy. This time the messengers were in earnest; but General Scott, wearied with trifling, turned them away with disgust. "*Forward!*" was the order that rang along the American lines at sunrise. The war-worn regiments swept into the beautiful streets of the famous city, and at seven o'clock the flag of the United States floated over the halls of the Montezumas. It was the triumphant

ending of one of the most brilliant and striking campaigns of modern history.

The American army, as compared with the hosts of Mexico, had been but a handful. The small force which had left Vera Cruz on the march to the capital had lost considerably by battle and disease. Many detachments had been posted *en route* to hold the line of communications, and for garrison duty in places taken from the enemy. The army had thus dwindled until, after the battles of Churubuseo and Chapultepec, *fewer than six thousand men* were left to enter and hold the capital. The invasion had been remarkable in all its particulars. The obstacles which had to be overcome seemed insurmountable. There were walled cities to be taken, fortified mountain-passes to be carried by storm, and frowning castles with cannon on the battlements to be assailed by regiments whose valor and impetuosity were their only protection and warrant of victory. Yet the campaign was never seriously impeded. No foot of ground once taken from the Mexicans was yielded by false tactics or lost by battle. The army which accomplished this marvel, penetrating a far-distant and densely peopled country, held by a proud race, claiming to be the descendants of Cortez and the Spanish heroes of the sixteenth century, and denouncing at the outset the American soldiers as "barbarians of the North," was, in large part, an army of volunteers—a citizen soldiery—which had risen from the States of the Union and marched to the Mexican border under the Union flag.

Santa Anna, on leaving his conquered capital, turned about with his usual treachery, and attacked the American hospitals at Puebla. At this place about eighteen hundred of the American sick had been left in charge of Colonel Childs. For several days a gallant resistance was made by the enfeebled garrison, but the besiegers held out until General Joseph Lane, on his march to the capital, fell upon them and drove them away. It was the closing stroke of the war—a contest in which the Americans had gained every single victory from first to last.

The war ended with the complete overthrow of the military power of Mexico. Santa Anna, the President, was a fugitive. It was manifest to all the world that the war had

ended, and it only remained to determine the conditions of peace. Never was a nation more completely prostrated than was the Mexican Republic. In the winter of 1847-48 American ambassadors met the Mexican Congress, in session at Guadalupe Hidalgo, and on the 2d of February a treaty was concluded between the two nations. The terms were promptly ratified by the two governments, and on the 4th of the following July, President Polk issued a proclamation of peace. By this important treaty the boundary-line between Mexico and the United States was fixed as follows: The Rio Grande, from its mouth to the southern limit of New Mexico; thence westward along the southern, and northward along the western boundary of that Territory to the river Gila; thence down that river to its confluence with the Colorado; thence westward to the Pacific Ocean. Thus was the whole of New Mexico and Upper California relinquished to the United States. Mexico guaranteed the free navigation of the Gulf of California and the river Colorado from its mouth to the confluence of the Gila. In consideration of these territorial acquisitions and privileges, the United States agreed to surrender the places occupied by the American army in Mexico, to pay that country fifteen million dollars, and to assume all debts due from the Mexican Government to American citizens, said debts not to exceed three million five hundred thousand dollars. It was thus that the territory of the United States was spread out in one broad belt from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

On the north, however, the boundary-line between the American Republic and the dominions of Great Britain had never been definitely determined. The next question which the United States had to confront was the determination of this line, and in doing so they were obliged to deal with an adversary very different in character from Mexico. The Oregon boundary had been in dispute from the first decade of the century. By the terms of the treaty of 1818 the international line between the United States and the British Dominions had been carried westward from the north-western extremity of the Lake of the Woods to the crest of the Rocky Mountains, but from that point to the Pacific no agreement could be reached. As early as

1807, and again in 1818 and 1826, the United States had formally claimed the parallel of fifty-four degrees and forty minutes; but this boundary Great Britain refused to accept.

By a convention held in August of 1827, it was agreed by the two powers that the vast belt of territory west of the Rocky Mountains and between the parallels of forty-nine degrees and fifty-four degrees and forty minutes should remain open indefinitely and impartially for the joint occupancy of British and American citizens. Great Britain named the forty-ninth parallel as the true boundary, and stoutly maintained it. By the agreement just referred to the difficulties between the two nations were obviated for sixteen years; but thoughtful statesmen, both British and American, became alarmed lest a question of so much importance, not settled on any permanent basis, should yet involve the two nations in war.

Negotiations were accordingly renewed. In 1843 the American minister resident at St. James again proposed the parallel of fifty-four degrees and forty minutes; but the proposition was rejected. In the following year the British ambassador at Washington again suggested the forty-ninth parallel as the true boundary; but to this the American Government refused to accede. At this juncture war with Mexico broke out, and with it came the prospective extension of the territory of the United States to the south-west. The views of the Administration in regard to the north-western boundary were relaxed with the prospect of Texas, New Mexico, and California. Here again we see underlying the controversy the still greater question of American slavery. If the United States had maintained its claim to fifty-four degrees and forty minutes as her north-western boundary, they would have acquired a territory in that region, inaccessible to slavery, and extensive enough for ten free States as large as Indiana. The Government, then strongly dominated by pro-slavery sentiments, looked with little or no enthusiasm upon this prospective enlargement of free territory, so that while the Administration was struggling, by the Mexican War and by purchase, to procure a south-western empire for the spread of human slavery, she permitted the opportunity to obtain a free north-western empire to pass unimproved.

The matter involved came to an issue on the 15th of June, 1846, when the question was definitely settled by a treaty. Every point in the long-standing controversy was decided in favor of Great Britain. In the many diplomatic contentions between that country and our own, the United States have always been able to maintain their position, with this single exception of the north-western boundary. The complete surrender to the British Government in this particular was little less than ignominious, and can be accounted for only on the ground that the Government of the United States, as it then was, was indifferent to the extension of her domains in the direction of freedom. However this may be, the forty-ninth parallel was established as the international boundary, from the summit of the Rocky Mountains to the middle of the channel which separates the Continent from Vancouver's Island; thence southerly through the middle of said channel and through Fuca's Straits, to the Pacific. Vancouver's Island itself was awarded to Great Britain, and the free navigation of the Columbia River was granted to the Hudson Bay Company and other British subjects on the same conditions as those imposed on citizens of the United States. The treaty was totally unfavorable to the interests of the American Republic, and was denounced by many as actually dishonorable. It is certain that better terms might have been demanded and obtained.¹

Within a few days after the signing of the treaty of peace with Mexico, an event occurred in California which spread excitement throughout the civilized world. A laborer employed by Captain Sutter to cut a mill-race on the American Fork of Sacramento River discovered some pieces of gold in the sand where he was digging. With further search, other particles were found. The news spread as if borne on the wind. From all quarters adventurers came flocking. Other explorations led to further revelations of the precious metal. For a while there seemed no end to the discov-

¹Such was the indignation of the opponents of this treaty—especially the leaders of the Whig party—that the political battle-cry of "*Fifty-four Forty, or Fight!*" became almost as popular a motto as "*Free Trade and Sailors' Right!*" had been in the War of 1812.

eries—no limit to the quantity of gold, which might be had for picking up. Straggling gold-hunters sometimes gathered in a few hours the value of five hundred dollars. The intelligence went flying through the States to the Atlantic, and then to the ends of the world. Men thousands of miles away were crazed with excitement. Workshops were shut up, business houses abandoned, fertile farms left tenantless, offices deserted. As yet the over-

has never been overestimated. Nor is their richness yet exhausted.

In the year 1846 an Act was passed in Congress for the organization of the SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION at Washington City. Twenty-two years previously an eminent Englishman, a chemist and philanthropist, named James Smithson,¹ had died at Genoa, bequeathing, on certain conditions, a large sum of money to the United States. In the fall of



MINERS OF FORTY-NINE

land routes to California were scarcely discovered; nevertheless, thousands of eager adventurers started from the States on the long, long journey across the mountains and plains. Before the end of 1850, San Francisco had grown from a miserable Spanish village of huts to a city of fifteen thousand inhabitants. By the close of 1852, California had a population of more than a quarter of a million. The importance of the gold-mines of California to the industries of the country

1838, by the death of Smithson's nephew, the proceeds of the estate, amounting at that time to \$515,000, were secured by the agent of the National Government, and deposited in the mint. It had been provided in Smithson's will that the bequest should be used for the

¹ Until after his graduation at Oxford, in 1786, this remarkable man was known by the name of *James Louis Meeke*. Afterward, of his own accord, he chose the name of his reputed father, Hugh Smith, Duke of Northumberland.

establishment at Washington City of "an institution for the increase and diffusion of knowledge among men." In order to carry

The Act of Establishment provided that the institution should be founded from *Smithson's bequest* should be named, in his honor, the Smithsonian Institution; that the same should be under the immediate control of a board of regents, composed of the President, Vice-president, Judges of the Supreme Court, and other principal officers of the National Government; that the entire Smithsonian fund, amounting at that time, with accrued interest, to \$655,000, should be loaned forever to the United States at six per cent; that out of the proceeds, together with Congressional appro-



ADVENTURERS EN ROUTE OVERLAND TO CALIFORNIA.

out the great designs of the testator, an ample plan of organization was prepared by John Quincy Adams, laid before Congress, and, after some modifications, adopted.

priations and private gifts, buildings should be provided suitable to maintain a museum of natural history, a cabinet of minerals, a chemical laboratory, a gallery of art, and a library.

Professor Joseph Henry, of Princeton College, was chosen secretary of the institution, and the plan of organization was speedily and successfully carried out. The result has been the establishment in the United States of one of the most beneficent institutions known in the history of mankind. The *Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge* already amount to nearly thirty volumes quarto, and the future is destined to yield still richer results in widening the boundaries of human thought and increasing the happiness of men.

On the 8th of June, 1845, Ex-President Andrew Jackson died at his home, called the



SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

Hermitage, near Nashville. The veteran warrior and statesman had lived to the age of seventy-eight. On the 23d of February, 1848, Ex-President John Quincy Adams died, at the City of Washington. After his retirement from the Presidency he had been chosen to represent his district in Congress. In that body he had displayed the most remarkable abilities and patriotism. There he acquired the well-earned sobriquet of the "Old Man Eloquent." At the time of his decease he was a member of the House of Representatives. He was struck with paralysis in the very seat from which he had so many times electrified the nation with his fervid and cogent oratory.

In 1848, Wisconsin, the last of the five great States formed from the Territory northwest of the river Ohio, was admitted into the Union. The new commonwealth came with a population of two hundred and fifty thousand, and an area of nearly fifty-four thousand square miles. In the establishment of the western boundary of the State, by an error of surveying, the St. Croix River, instead of the Mississippi, was fixed as the line, by which Wisconsin lost to Minnesota a considerable district rightfully belonging to her territory.

The vast extension of the National domain and the increase of internal interests in the United States, now fully justified the establishment of a new Cabinet office, known as the Department of the Interior. This was done near the close of Polk's Administration. To the three original departments of the Government as organized under the Administration of Washington had already been added the offices of Postmaster-General and Secretary of the Navy. The Attorney-General of the United States had also come to be recognized as a member of the Cabinet. The duties assigned to the Departments of State and Treasury had now become

so manifold as to require a division of labor and the establishment of a separate office. A certain part of these duties were accordingly assigned to what was at first known as the Home Department, and soon afterwards the Department of the Interior. In the beginning of the following Administration, the new Secretaryship was first filled by General Thomas Ewing, of Ohio.

Such were the leading events of the Administration of Polk. Near its close the people became, as usual, much excited about the succession to the Presidential office. Instead of two candidates, three well-known personages were presented for the suffrages of the people.

General Lewis Cass, of Michigan, was nominated by the Democrats, and General Zachary Taylor by the Whigs. Meanwhile, the accession of vast and unoccupied territories had aroused to considerable vigor the anti-slavery sentiment of the country. At first this sentiment was expressed in simple opposition to the *extension* of slavery into the then unoccupied national domains. As the representative of this sentiment, and the party founded thereon, Ex-President Martin Van Buren was brought forward as the Free-Soil candidate for the Presidency. The particular circumstances which gave rise to the new party, destined in future times to play so important a part in the history of the country, may well be narrated.

Most of the issues on which the Free-Soil party was based grew out of the Mexican War and the terms of the treaty with which it was concluded. In 1846, David Wilmot, of Pennsylvania, introduced into Congress a bill to *prohibit slavery* in all the territory which might be secured by treaty with Mexico. This proposition was the key to all that ensued on the line of opposition to the extension of slavery. The bill was defeated; but the advocates of the measure, thenceforth called the WILMOT PROVISOR, formed themselves into a party, and in June of 1848 nominated Van Buren for the Presidency. The real contest, however, lay between Generals Cass and Taylor. The position of the Whigs and the Democrats on the question of slavery, especially in its relation to the Territories, had not as yet been clearly defined, and as a consequence the election was left, in considerable measure, to turn on the personal popularity of the two candidates. The memory of General Taylor's recent victories in Mexico, and the democratic aspects of his character in general, prevailed, and he was elected by a large majority. As Vice-President, Millard Fillmore, of New York, was chosen. Thus closed the agitated and not inglorious Administration of President Polk.

Zachary Taylor was a Virginian by birth, a Kentuckian by breeding, a soldier by profession, a Whig in politics. He was born on the 24th of September, 1784. His father was Colonel Richard Taylor, an officer in the Rev-

olutionary War. In the year 1785 the family removed to Kentucky, where the father died. In the War of 1812 young Taylor distinguished himself in the North-west, especially in the defense of Fort Harrison against the Indians. In the Seminole War he bore a conspicuous part. But his greatest renown was won in Mexico. In that conflict, according to the popular estimation, he outshined General Scott, and his popularity made easy his way to the Presidency. His reputation, which was strictly military, was enviable, and his character above reproach. His Administration began with a renewal of the question




ZACHARY TAYLOR

about slavery in the Territories. California, the Eldorado of the West, was the origin of the dispute, which now broke out with increased violence.

In his first message the new President expressed his sympathy with the Californians, and advised the formation of a State Government preparatory to admission into the Union. The people of California promptly accepted the suggestion, and a convention of delegates was held at Monterey, in September of 1849. A constitution prohibiting slavery was framed, submitted to the people, and adopted with but little opposition. Under this instrument Peter

H. Burnett was elected governor. Members of a General Assembly were chosen, and on the 20th of December, 1850, the new government was organized at San José. At the same time a petition, in the usual form, was forwarded to Congress asking for the admission of California as a State.

The presentation of this petition in Congress was the signal for a bitter controversy. The scenes attendant upon the admission of Missouri were now re-enacted; but the parts were reversed. As in that great debate, Congress and the people were sectionally divided. The proposition to admit California was in general supported by the representatives of the North



HENRY CLAY

and opposed by those of the South. The ground of opposition was that the Missouri Compromise Line, in its extension to the Pacific, crossed California, whereby a part of the proposed State was open to the institution of slavery, and this by an Act of Congress which no Territorial legislation could abrogate. For this reason the Southern Congressmen generally claimed that California ought to be rejected until the restriction on slavery should be removed. The reply of the Northern Representatives was more moral, but less logical. They said that the argument of the opponents of the bill for admission could apply only to a *part*, and not the whole, of California; that

the Missouri Compromise had respect only to the Louisiana Purchase, and that California could not be regarded as included in that purchase; that the people of the proposed State had, in any event framed their Constitution to suit themselves. Such was the issue. The debates grew more and more violent, until the stability of the Union was seriously threatened.

Meanwhile, other difficulties arose with respect to the territory obtained by the Mexican treaty. Texas set up a claim to New Mexico as a part of her domains; but the claim was resisted by the people of Santa Fé, who desired a separate government. A serious issue was thus raised between the State and the Territory, requiring the interference of Congress. By this time the people of the South in general had begun to clamor loudly and bitterly with respect to the escape of fugitive slaves. It was claimed that the bondmen of the South fleeing from service were received, on crossing the borders of the free States, by Abolitionists, and were aided in effecting a final escape from their masters. A counter-cry was raised by the opponents of slavery, who demanded that in the District of Columbia at least, where the national authority was paramount, where no State Constitution guaranteed the existence of the institution, the slave-trade should be abolished. The controversy increased in heat along the whole line, and there was everywhere manifested between the parties a spirit of suspicion, recrimination, and anger.

It was at this epoch that the illustrious Henry Clay appeared for the last time as a conspicuous figure in the councils of his country. He came, as he had come before, in the character of a peacemaker. His known predilection for compromise, especially on sectional questions within the United States, was once more manifested in full force. In the spring of 1850, while the questions above referred to were under hot discussion in Congress, Clay was appointed chairman of a committee of thirteen, to whom all the matters under discussion were referred. On the 9th of May in that year he reported to Congress the celebrated **OMNIBUS BILL**, covering most of the points in dispute. The provisions of this important bill were as follows: *First*, the

admission of California as a free State, under the Constitution already adopted; *second*, the formation of new States, not exceeding four in number, out of the Territory of Texas, said States to permit or exclude slavery, as the people thereof should determine; *third*, the organization of Territorial Governments for New Mexico and Utah, without conditions on the question of slavery; *fourth*, the establishment of the present boundary-line between Texas and New Mexico, and the payment to Texas, for surrendering New Mexico, the sum of ten million dollars from the national treasury; *fifth*, the enactment of a more rigorous law for the recovery of fugitive slaves; *sixth*, the abolition of the slave-trade in the District of Columbia.

With the report of the Omnibus Bill to Congress the debates broke out anew, and seemed likely to be interminable. In the midst of the discussion that ensued, and while the issue was still undecided, President Taylor fell sick and suddenly died, on the 9th of July, 1850. In accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, Mr. Fillmore at once took the oath of office and entered upon the duties of the Presidency. A new Cabinet was also formed, with Daniel Webster at the head as Secretary of State. Notwithstanding the death of the chief magistrate, the Government, as in the case of the decease of Harrison, again moved on without disturbance.

In Congress the discussion of the Compromise measures continued until autumn, when the views of Mr. Clay, sustained as they were by his own eloquence, at length prevailed. On the 18th of September the last clause was adopted, and the whole received the sanction of the President. Hereupon the excitement throughout the country rapidly abated, and the distracting controversy seemed at an end. Viewed in the light of subsequent events, however, the peaceful condition that ensued was only superficial. The deep-seated evil remained. At this time there were very few, if any, American statesmen who had discerned the bottom of the trouble which had arisen from time to time for more than a quarter of a century, and which was destined, in spite of all compromise, to appear and reappear until

it should be cut from the body of American life with the keen edge of the sword.

For the present, however, there was quiet. The Compromise acts of 1850 were the last, and perhaps the greatest, of those temporary, pacific measures which were originated and carried through Congress by the genius of Henry Clay. Shortly afterwards he bade adieu to the Senate, and sought at his beloved Ashland a brief rest from the arduous cares of public life.

The passage of the Omnibus Bill was strictly a *political* settlement. The event soon



MILLARD FILLMORE

showed that the *moral* convictions of few men were altered by its provisions. Public opinion was virtually the same as before. In the North appeared a general, indefinite, and growing hostility to slavery; in the South, a fixed and resolute purpose to defend and to *extend* that institution. To the President, whose party was in the ascendancy in most of the Free States, the measure was fatal. For, although his Cabinet had advised him to sign the bill, the Whigs were at heart opposed to the Fugitive-Slave Law; and when he gave his assent, they turned coldly from him. In the Whig Convention two years afterwards, although the

policy of President, with the usual political opposition, was indorsed and approved—having a vote in its favor of 227 against 69—not a majority could be obtained in the Northern States for his re-nomination. Thus do political parties punish their leaders for hesitating to espouse a principle which the parties themselves are afraid to avow.

While the debates on the Compromise measures were still in progress in Congress, the attention of the country was turned with some interest to the affairs of Cuba. A lawless attempt was made by a few American adventurers to gain possession of that island. It was thought by the insurrectionists that the Cubans were ready to throw off the Spanish yoke and to appeal to the United States for annexation. In order to encourage such a movement General Narciso Lopez, a Spanish American soldier, organized an expedition in the South, and on the 19th of May, 1850, effected a landing, with a considerable body of followers, at Cardenas, a port of Cuba. There was, however, no uprising in his favor. Neither the Cubans themselves nor the Spanish soldiers in the island joined the insurgent's standard, and Lopez was obliged to seek safety by returning to Florida. But he was not satisfied with his experience as a revolutionist. In the following year he renewed the attempt, and, with a band of four hundred and eighty men, a second time landed in Cuba. They were, however, attacked, defeated, and captured by an overwhelming force of Spaniards. Lopez and the ringleaders were taken to Havana, tried, condemned, and executed.

It was conceded that the first annual message of President Fillmore was a document of unusual ability. Many important measures were discussed and laid before Congress for the consideration of that body. Among these were the following: A system of cheap and uniform postage; the establishment, in connection with the Department of the Interior, of a Bureau of Agriculture; liberal appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors; the building of a national asylum for disabled and destitute seamen; a permanent tariff, with specific duties on imports and discrimination in favor of American manufactures; the opening of communication between the Mississippi and the Pacific coast; a settlement of the land dif-

ficulties in California; an act for the retirement of supernumerary officers of the army and navy; and a board of commissioners to adjust the claims of private citizens against the Government of the United States. Only two of these recommendations—the asylum for sailors and the settlement of the land claims in California—were carried into effect. For the President's party were in a minority in Congress, and the majority refused or neglected to approve his measures.

At this epoch, still another and serious trouble arose between the United States and Great Britain. According to the existing treaties between the two countries the coast fisheries of Newfoundland belonged exclusively to England, but outside of a line drawn three miles from the shore the American fisherman had equal rights and privileges. In course of time a contention sprang up between the fishermen of the two nationalities as to the location of the line. Should the same be drawn from one headland to another, so as to give all the bays and inlets to Great Britain? or should it be made to conform to the irregularities of the coast? Under the latter construction, American fishing-vessels might sail into the bays and harbors, and there ply their trade. But this privilege was denied by Great Britain, and the quarrel arose to such a height that both nations sent men-of-war into the contested waters. The difficulty began in 1852, and extended over a period of two years. At length reason triumphed over passion, and the difficulty was happily settled by negotiation. The right to take fish in any of the bays of the British possessions outside of a marine league from the shore was conceded to American fishermen.

The summer of 1852 was noted for the visit of the Hungarian patriot, Louis Kossuth, to the United States. He made a tour of the country, and was everywhere received with enthusiastic admiration. It was at this time that Austria and Russia had united against Hungary, and had overthrown the liberties of that land. Kossuth came to America to plead the cause of his country and to conciliate public opinion in behalf of the cause which he represented. He also sought to obtain such aid as might be privately given to him by those favorable to Hungarian liberty. His

mission was highly successful, and although the long-established policy of the United States, not to have entanglements and alliances with foreign nations, forbade the Government to interfere in behalf of Hungary, yet the people in their private capacity gave to the cause of freedom in that land abundant contributions.

To this epoch in our history belong the first endeavors on the part of explorers to make known the regions about the North Pole. Systematic attempts were now made to enter

of Franklin, but returned without success. Henry Grinnell, a wealthy merchant of New York, fitted out several vessels at his own expense, put them under command of Lieutenant De Haven, and sent them to the North; but in vain. The Government came to Grinnell's aid. In 1853 an Arctic squadron was equipped and the command given to Dr. Elisha Kent Kane; but this expedition also, though rich in scientific results, returned without the discovery of Franklin.



KANE AND HIS COMPANIONS IN THE ARCTIC REGIONS.

and explore the Arctic Ocean. As early as 1845, Sir John Franklin, one of the bravest of English seamen, sailed on a voyage of discovery to the extreme North. Believing in the possibility of a passage through an open polar sea into the Pacific, he made his way to an unknown distance in that direction; but the extent of his success was never ascertained. Years went by, and no tidings came from the daring sailor. It was only known that he had passed the country of the Esquimaux. Other expeditions were at length sent out in search

The first half of the new decade was marked by the death of a number of distinguished men. On the 31st of March, 1850, Senator John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina, passed away. His death was much lamented, especially in his own State, to whose interests he had devoted the energies of his life. His earnestness and zeal and powers of debate placed him in the front rank of American orators. As a statesman, however, he was wedded to the destructive theory of State Rights; and the advocacy of this doctrine against the

supremacy of Congress and the nation has placed him on a lower level than that of his great contemporaries, Webster and Clay. At the age of sixty-eight he fell from his place, like a scarred oak of the forest, never to rise again. Then followed the death of the President, already mentioned. Then, on the 28th of June, 1852, Henry Clay, having fought his last battle, sank to rest. On the 24th of the following October the illustrious Daniel Webster died at his home at Marshfield, Massachusetts. The place of Secretary of State, made vacant by his death, was conferred on Edward Everett.

In Europe the news of Lopez's ridiculous



JOHN C. CALHOUN.

invasion of Cuba created great excitement. Notwithstanding the distinct disavowal of his proceedings by the Government of the United States, and the immediate dismissal of the officer at New Orleans who had allowed the expedition of Lopez to escape from that port, the Governments of Great Britain and France affected to believe that the covert aim and purpose of the United States was to acquire Cuba by conquest—that the American Government was really behind the absurd fiasco of Lopez.

Acting upon this theory the British and French ministers proposed to the American

Government to enter into a *Tripartite Treaty*, so-called, in which each of the contracting nations was to disclaim then and forever all intention of gaining possession of Cuba. To this proposal Mr. Everett replied in one of the ablest papers ever issued from the American Department of State. He informed Great Britain and France that the annexation of Cuba was foreign to the policy of his Government; that the project was regarded by the United States as a measure hazardous and impolitic; that entire good faith would be kept with Spain and with all nations, but that the Federal Government did not recognize in any

European power the right to meddle with affairs purely American, and that, in accordance with the doctrine set forth by President Monroe, any such interference would be regarded as an affront to the sovereignty of the United States. Such were the last matters of importance connected with the Administration of President Fillmore.

The time now drew on for another Presidential election, and the political parties marshaled their forces for the contest. Franklin Pierce, of New Hampshire, was put forward as the candidate of the Democratic party, and General Winfield Scott as the choice of the Whigs. The question at issue, so far as one could be formulated, was the Compromise Acts of 1850. But the parties, strangely enough, instead of being divided on that issue, were for once agreed as to the wisdom and justice of the measure. Both the Whig and Democratic platforms stoutly reaffirmed the principles of the Omnibus Bill, by which the discussions of the country had been quieted.

The philosophic eye may discover in this unanimity the exact conditions of the universal revolt against the principles so stoutly affirmed. Certain it is that when the two political parties in any modern nation agree to maintain a given theory and fact, that theory and fact are destined to speedy overthrow. The greater the unanimity the more certain the revolution. It was so in the present instance. Although the Whigs and Democrats agreed as to the righteousness of the Omnibus Bill, a third party arose whose members,

whether Whigs or Democrats, doubted and denied the wisdom of the Compromise of 1850, and declared that *all* the Territories of the United States ought to be free. John P. Hale, of New Hampshire, was put forward as the candidate of this Free-Soil party, and the largeness of his vote showed unmistakably the approach of the coming storm. Mr. Pierce, however, was elected by a handsome majority, and William R. King, of Alabama, was chosen Vice-President.

Franklin Pierce was a native of New Hampshire, a graduate of Bowdoin College, a lawyer by profession, a politician, a general in the Mexican War, a statesman of considerable ability. Mr. King, the Vice-President, had for a long time represented Alabama in the Senate of the United States. On account of failing health he was sojourning in the island of Cuba at the time of the inauguration, and there received the oath of office. Growing still more feeble, he returned to his own State, where he died on the 18th. of April, 1853. As Secretary of State under the new Administration, William L. Marcy, of New York, was chosen.

At the epoch of the accession of Pierce to the Presidency, the attention of the country began to be called again to the necessity of improved means of communication between the East and West. Railroads had now been extended across the older States of the Union and had at length reached the Mississippi River; but the vast territories lying west of the Father of Waters were still unexplored, except by the slow-going movements of primitive times. The question of a Pacific railroad was now agitated, and as early as the summer of 1853 a corps of engineers was sent out by the Government to explore a suitable route. At the first the enterprise was regarded by a majority of the people as visionary; but the intelligent minority discerned clearly enough the feasibility, and indeed the inevitable success, of the enterprise. In the same year of sending out the engineers the disputed boundary between New Mexico and the Mexican province of Chihuahua was satisfactorily settled. The maps on which the former treaties with Mexico had been based were found to be

erroneous. Santa Anna, who had again become President of the Mexican Republic, attempted to take advantage of the error, and sent an army to occupy the territory between the true and the false boundary. This action was resisted by the authorities of New Mexico and the United States, and at one time a second war with the Mexicans seemed probable. The difficulty was adjusted, however, by the purchase of the doubtful claim of New Mexico. This transaction, known as the Gadsden Purchase, led to the erection of the new Territory of Arizona.




FRANKLIN PIERCE

In 1853 formal intercourse was opened between the United States and the Empire of Japan. Hitherto, in accordance with Oriental policy, the Japanese ports had been closed against the vessels of Christian nations. In order to remove this foolish and injurious restriction, Commodore Perry, son of Oliver H. Perry, of the War of 1812, sailed with his squadron into the bay of Yedo. When warned to depart, he explained to the Japanese officers the sincere desire of the United States to enter into a commercial treaty with the Emperor. After much delay and hesitancy on the part of the Japanese Government, con-

sent was obtained, and an interview was held between that august personage and Commodore Perry. An audience was obtained on the 14th of July, and the American officer laid before the dusky monarch a letter from the President of the United States. The Government of Japan, however, was wary of accepting the proposition, and it was not until the spring of 1854 that a treaty was effected. The privileges of commerce were then conceded to American vessels, and two ports of entry were designated for their use.

While these events were happening in the far East the second World's Fair was opened, in the Crystal Palace, New York. It was the



SAN FRANCISCO, 1854.

beginning of the era of international exhibitions. The Palace, which had been erected at the American metropolis, was a marvel in architecture, being built exclusively of iron and glass. Thousands of specimens of the arts and manufactures of all civilized nations were put on exhibition within the spacious building. The enterprise and inventive genius of the whole nation were quickened into a new life by the display, and an impetus was given to this method of stimulating the industries and arts of the nation. The sequel has shown that these international exhibitions are among the happiest fruits of an enlightened age.

The lawless expedition of Lopez into Cuba

was soon followed by the still greater filibustering expeditions of General William Walker into Central America. This audacious and unscrupulous adventurer began his operations in 1853. He first gathered a band of followers in California, and escaping from the port of San Francisco, made a descent on La Paz, in Old California. In the following spring, he marched overland, with a hundred men, into the State of Sonora, and there set up the standard of revolt. His band, however, were soon scattered and himself made prisoner. In May of 1854 he was subjected to a trial by the authorities of San Francisco, but was acquitted. Not satisfied with his experiences, he a second time raised a band, numbering sixty-two, and with this handful proceeded to Central America. He was now joined by a regiment of insurgent natives, and with these he fought and gained a battle at Rivas, on the 29th of June, 1855. In the second conflict, at Virgin Bay, he was also successful. Desultory fighting continued until the following summer, when his influence had become so great that he was elected President of Nicaragua. Soon afterwards there was a change in

his fortunes. A great insurrection ensued against his authority, and the other Central American States, assisted by the Vanderbilt Steamship Company, whose rights he had violated, combined against him. He was overthrown, and on the 1st of May, 1857, was again made prisoner. In a short time, however, he was foot-loose, and, making his way to New Orleans, he succeeded in organizing a third company of adventurers—men who had everything to gain and nothing to lose. On the 25th of November he was successful in reaching Punta Arenas, Nicaragua, but within less than a month he was obliged to surrender to Commodore Paulding, of the United States Navy. He was taken as a captive to New

York, but, regaining his liberty, he continued his scheming, and in June of 1860 reached Central America for the third time. He now commanded a considerable force. With his army he made a descent on Truxillo, Honduras; but the President of that State, assisted by a British man-of-war, soon overpowered and captured nearly the whole band. On the 3d of September, Walker was brought to trial by a court-martial at Truxillo, was condemned and shot. The courage with which he met his fate has half redeemed his forfeited fame, and left after times in doubt whether he shall be called fanatic or hero.¹

To Pierce's Administration belongs the episode in American history known as the **MARTIN KOSZTA AFFAIR**. MARTIN KOSZTA had been a leader in the Hungarian revolt against Austria, in 1849. After the suppression of the rebellion he fled to Turkey, whence he was demanded by the Austrian Government as a refugee and traitor. The Turkish authorities, however, refused to give him up, but agreed that he should be sent into exile to some foreign land, never to return. Koszta thereupon chose the United States as his asy-

¹ The poet Joaquin Miller, claiming to have been a member of Walker's band in the first invasion of Central America, has affectionately embalmed the memory of his brave leader in a poem, *With Walker in Nicaragua*, which might well conciliate the good opinion of posterity.

lum, came hither, and took out his papers of intention, but not the papers of complete naturalization. In 1854 he returned to Turkey, contrary, as it was alleged, to his former promise. At the city of Smyrna he received a passport from the American Consul there, and went ashore. The Austrian Consul at



WALKER BEFORE HIS EXECUTION.

Smyrna, hearing of Koszta's arrival in the city, and having no power to arrest him on shore, induced some bandits to seize him and throw him into the water of the bay, where a boat, in waiting for that purpose, picked him up and put him on board an Austrian frigate.

The American officials immediately demanded Koszta's release; but this was refused.

Thereupon, Captain Duncan Ingraham, commander of the American sloop-of-war *St. Louis*, loaded his guns, pointed them at the Austrian vessel, and was about to make hot work, when it was agreed by all parties that Koszta should be put in charge of the French Government until his nationality should be authoritatively decided. In this condition of affairs the question was given over for discussion to Baron Hulseman—the Austrian minister at Washington—and William L. Marcy, the American Secretary of State. The correspondence on the subject was one of the ablest discussions on record, and extended, before its termination, to almost every question affecting naturalization and citizenship, and, indeed, to many other important topics of international law. Mr. Marcy was completely triumphant in his argument, and Koszta was remanded to the United States. Of so much importance is *the life of our man*, when it involves the great question of human rights.

The bad state of feelings cherished by Spain towards the United States after the invasion of Cuba by Lopez did not readily subside. In 1853-54 the peaceable relations of the two countries were again endangered on account of Cuban complications. President Pierce believed that, owing to the financial embarrassments of the Spanish Government, Cuba might now be purchased at a reasonable price and annexed to the United States. It can not be doubted that there had existed for some time, on the part of Democratic Administrations, a covert purpose to obtain possession of Cuba, and this again with respect to the institution of slavery. For a quarter of a century the South, embodying the slaveholding sentiment, had seen with alarm the overwhelming growth of the North and of the free institutions cherished by the Northern people. Against this, Southern statesmen had sought to oppose the machinery of the Government; and many were the devices adopted to prevent that natural course of affairs which portended the limitation of the slave-system. The desire to purchase Cuba was one of those devices by which it was hoped to keep up the equipoise of the South and of the system of slave-labor on the one side, as against the North and the system of free-labor on the other.

The duty of adjusting the delicate rela-

tions of the United States and Spain with respect to the island was intrusted at first to Mr. Soulé, the American Minister at Madrid; but afterwards James Buchanan and John Y. Mason were added to the Commission. A convention of the ambassadors of the various Governments concerned was held at Ostend, and an important instrument was there drawn up, chiefly by Mr. Buchanan, known as the OSTEND MANIFESTO. The document was chiefly devoted to an elaborate statement of the arguments in favor of the purchase and annexation of Cuba by the United States as a measure of sound wisdom to both the Spanish and American Governments; but nothing of practical importance resulted from the embassy or the manifesto. The logic of events was against the purchase, and the question at length lapsed.

The time had now come for the territorial organization of the great domains lying west of Minnesota, Iowa, and Missouri. Already into these vast regions the tides of immigration were pouring, and a government of some kind became a necessity of the situation. One must needs see, in the retrospect, the inevitable renewal under these conditions of the slavery question as the most important issue which was likely to affect the creation of new Territories and new States.

In January of 1854, Senator Stephen A. Douglas, of Illinois, brought before the Senate of the United States a proposition to organize the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska. In the bill reported for this purpose a clause was inserted providing that the people of the two Territories, in forming their Constitutions, *should decide for themselves* whether the new States should be free or slaveholding. This was a virtual repeal of the Missouri Compromise; for both of the new Territories lay north of the parallel of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes, above which line it had been provided in the Missouri compact that slavery, or involuntary servitude, should not exist.

What the ulterior motive of Senator Douglas was in thus opening anew a question which had been settled with so great difficulty thirty-three years before, can not well be ascertained. The friends of that statesman have claimed that his action in the premises was based upon

a theory that all the Territories of the Union should, as an abstract and general proposition, be left entirely free to decide their domestic institutions for themselves. The opponents of Douglas held that his object was in this covert manner to open the vast domain of Kansas and Nebraska to the institution of slavery, and that thereby he hoped to secure the everlasting gratitude of the South, to the support of which he looked in his aspirations for the Presidency. However this may be, the effect of his measure in the Senate was inevitable. At a single stroke the old settlement of the slavery question was undone. From January until May, Douglas's report, known as the KANSAS-NEBRASKA BILL, was debated in Congress. All the bitter sectional antagonisms of the past were aroused in full force. The bill was violently opposed by a majority of the representatives of the East and the North, but the minority from those sections, uniting with the Congressmen of the South, enabled Douglas to carry his measure through Congress, and in May of 1854 the bill was passed and received the sanction of the President.

No sooner had this act for the organization of the two Territories been passed than the battle which had been waged in Congress was transferred to Kansas. Whether the new State should admit slavery or exclude it, now depended upon the vote of the people. Free-State men and Slave-State men both made a rush for the Territory, in order to secure the majority; and both parties were backed by factions throughout the Union. As a result, Kansas was soon filled with an agitated mass of people, thousands of whom had been sent thither to vote. On the whole, the Free-State partisans gained the advantage on the score of immigration; for their resources were greater, and their zeal no less. But the pro-slavery party had a corresponding advantage in the proximity of the great slave State of Missouri. With only a modest river between her western borders and the prairies of Kansas, she might easily discharge into the Territory a large part of her floating population, to be remanded when the purpose for which it was sent across the boundary had been subserved.

At the Territorial election of November, 1854, a pro-slavery delegate was chosen to Congress, and in the general election of the

following year the same party was triumphant. The State Legislature, chosen at this time, assembled at the town of Leecompton, and organized a Government and framed a Constitution permitting slavery. The Free-Soil party, however, declared the general election invalid on account of fraudulent voting. A general convention of this party was held at Topeka, where a Constitution excluding slavery was adopted. A rival Government was organized, and civil war broke out between the two factions.

From the autumn of 1855 until the following summer the Territory was the scene of constant turmoil and violence. On the 3d of



STEPHEN A. DOUGLAS.

September the President appointed John W. Geary, of Pennsylvania, Military Governor of Kansas, with full powers to restore order and punish lawlessness. On his arrival warlike demonstrations ceased, and the hostile parties scattered to their homes. Meanwhile, however, the agitation having its center in the Territory had extended to all parts of the Union. The questions thus raised were those on which the people of the United States divided in the Presidential election of 1856.

There was now no lack of an issue. James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, was nominated as the Democratic candidate. By planting himself

on the platform and principles of his party, in which the doctrines of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill were distinctly reaffirmed, he was able to secure a heavy vote, both North and South; for many of the Northern Democrats, though opposed to slavery, held firmly to the opinion that the people of every Territory have the right to decide such questions for themselves. As the candidate of the Free-Soil, People's or Republican party, John C. Fremont, of California, was brought forward. The prime principle of this party was the total exclusion of slavery from the Territories of the



JAMES BUCHANAN

United States by Congressional enactment. In the meantime, still a fourth party had appeared. About the time when the Whig organization was dissolved, the foreign element in the United States, especially in some of the larger Eastern cities, had become so strong as to be a prevailing force in politics. This element was mostly dominated, moreover, by Catholicism, and many other foreign influences and practices had been imported along with the foreigners from the respective European countries. The presence of such a power in the country aroused first the distrust and then the antagonism of the natives, and an Ameri-

can, or Know-Nothing¹ party, so-called, rose up in opposition to foreign influence in the United States. At one time the movement became formidable, and several of the Northern States were carried at general elections by the Know-Nothings. The leaders of the party, however, were anxious to ignore the slavery issue and to confine the attention of their followers to the matter of foreign influence and the best means to counteract it. As the candidate of this party, Millard Fillmore, of New York, was nominated for the Presidency.

It was now seen, however, that the slavery question was uppermost in the minds of the American people. On that issue they had divided in earnest, and no party discipline could any longer force them from their position. In the Presidential election of 1856 a large majority decided in favor of Buchanan for the Presidency, while the choice for the Vice-presidency fell on John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky. Fremont, however, obtained a large vote in the Northern States, and but for the diversion made by the Know-Nothings his election had not been improbable.

James Buchanan was a native of Pennsylvania, born on the 13th of April, 1791. He was educated for the profession of law. In 1831 he was sent as minister to Russia, and was afterwards elected to the Senate of the United States. From that position he was called to the office of Secretary of State, under President Polk. In 1853 he was appointed minister to Great Britain, and resided at the Court of St. James until his nomination for the Presidency.

On his accession to that office he gave the position of Secretary of State to General Lewis Cass, of Michigan.

Scarcely had Buchanan been inaugurated as President before there was issued from the Supreme Court of the United States what is known in America as the DRED SCOTT DECISION. The opinion of the Court in the matter involved was so extraordinary, and the

¹The origin of this apparently absurd name is found in a part of the pledge which the members took on nomination. They promised to *know nothing* but the Union, and to *know nothing* but "America for Americans."

subject matter of the decision so important to the destinies of the country, that it engrossed for a considerable period the attention of the American people. Dred Scott was a Negro, and had been held as a slave by a certain Dr. Emerson, of Missouri, a surgeon in the United States army. In course of time Emerson removed to Rock Island, Illinois, and afterwards, in 1836, to Fort Snelling, Minnesota. In these removals, Scott was taken along as a slave. At the latter place he and a negro woman, who had been bought by the surgeon, were married. Two children were born of the marriage, and then the whole family were taken back to St. Louis and sold. Dred Scott thereupon brought suit for his freedom. The cause was tried successively in the Circuit and the Supreme Court of Missouri, and in May of 1854 was appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. There the matter lay for about three years. After the Democratic triumph in 1856, and the accession of Buchanan to the Presidency, the moment was deemed opportune for giving a quietus to the doctrines of the Free-Soil party, and the decision was at once issued. In March, 1857, Chief-Justice

Roger B. Taney, speaking for the Court, decided that negroes, whether free or slave, were not citizens of the United States, and that they could not become such by any process known to the Constitution; that under the laws of the United States a negro could neither sue nor be sued, and that therefore the Court had no jurisdiction of Dred Scott's cause; that the slave was to be regarded simply in the light of a personal chattel, and that he might be removed from place to place by his owner, as any other piece of property; that the Constitution gave to the slaveholder the right of removing to or through any State or Territory with his slaves, and of returning at his will with them to a State where slavery was recognized by law; and that, therefore, the Missouri Compromise of 1820, as well as the Compromise measures of

1850, was unconstitutional and void. In these opinions six associate Justices of the Supreme Bench—Wayne, Nelson, Grier, Daniel, Campbell, and Catron—concurred, while two associates—Judges McLean and Curtis—dissented. The decision of the majority, which was accepted as the decision of the Court, gave great satisfaction to the ultra-slaveholding sentiments of the South, and, indeed, chimed in agreeably with the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty which had been so zealously advocated by Senator Douglas and his followers. In the North, however, great excitement was produced, and thousands of indignant comments and much bitter opposition were provoked by the dictum of the Court.

It will be remembered that in one clause of the Compromise measures of 1850 provision



SALT LAKE CITY.

was made for the organization of Utah Territory. That remote region was occupied almost exclusively by the Mormons or Latter-Day Saints. They had escaped virtually from the jurisdiction of the United States, and had planted themselves in what they supposed to be an inaccessible country. At length, however, the attempt was made to extend the American judicial system over the Territory. Thus far Brigham Young, the Mormon Prophet and Governor, had, as the head of the theocracy, taken his own course in the administration of justice. The community of Mormons was organized on a plan very different from that existing in other Territories, and many usages, especially polygamy, had grown up in Utah which were deemed repugnant to the laws of the country.

That remote region was occupied almost exclusively by the Mormons or Latter-Day Saints. They had escaped virtually from the jurisdiction of the United States, and had planted themselves in what they supposed to be an inaccessible country. At length, however, the attempt was made to extend the American judicial system over the Territory. Thus far Brigham Young, the Mormon Prophet and Governor, had, as the head of the theocracy, taken his own course in the administration of justice. The community of Mormons was organized on a plan very different from that existing in other Territories, and many usages, especially polygamy, had grown up in Utah which were deemed repugnant to the laws of the country.

When the Federal Judge was sent out in 1857 to preside in the Territory, he was resisted, insulted, and driven violently from the seat of justice. The other officials of the Federal Government were in a like manner expelled, and the Territory became the scene of a reign of terror. The Mormons claimed in justification of their action that the officers who had been sent out to govern them were of so low a character as to command no respect. But the excuse was deemed insufficient, and Brigham Young was superseded in the Government by Alfred Cumming, Superintendent of Indian Affairs on the Upper Missouri. Judge Delana R. Eckels, of Indiana,


mand of Colonel Albert Sidney Johnston, were obliged to find quarters on Black's Fork, near Fort Bridges.

In the meantime, the President dispatched Thomas L. Kane, of Pennsylvania, with conciliatory letters to the Mormons. Going by way of California, he reached Utah in the spring of 1858, and in a short time succeeded in bringing about an understanding between Governor Cumming and the Mormons. In the latter part of May, Governor Powell, of Kentucky, and Major McCulloch, of Texas, arrived at the head-quarters of the army, bearing from the President a proclamation of pardon to all who would submit to the national authority.

The Mormons in general accepted the overture.

In the fall of this year the army marched to Salt Lake City, but was afterwards quartered at Camp Floyd, forty miles distant. At this place the Federal forces remained until order was restored, when, in May of 1860, they were withdrawn from Utah.

Meanwhile, in 1858, an American vessel, sailing innocently up the Paraguay River, on an exploring expedition, was fired on by a jealous garrison. Reparation



LANDING THE ATLANTIC CABLE.

was appointed Chief-Justice of the Territory, and an army of two thousand five hundred men was sent to Utah to put down lawlessness by force.

Brigham Young and the Mormon elders were not, however, disposed to yield without a struggle. The antagonism of the people of the Territory was excited to the highest degree. The American army was denounced as a horde of barbarians, and preparations were made for resistance. In September of 1857 the national forces entered the Territory, and on the 6th of October a company of Mormon rangers attacked and destroyed most of the supply trains of the army. Winter came on, and the Federal forces, under the com-

mand of Colonel Albert Sidney Johnston, demanded, but none was given, and the Government of the United States was obliged to send a fleet to South America to obtain satisfaction. A civil commissioner was sent with the squadron, who was empowered to offer liberal terms of settlement in respect to the injury. The authorities of Paraguay quailed before the approaching fleet, and suitable apologies were made for the wrong which had been committed.

The year 1858 was memorable in the history of the United States and of the whole world for the completion and laying of the first TELEGRAPHIC CABLE across the Atlantic Ocean. It was on the 5th of August in this year that the great enterprise was successfully

completed. The work was done in a large measure to the energy and genius of Cyrus W. Field, a wealthy merchant of New York City. The first cable was one thousand six hundred and forty miles in length, extending from Trinity Bay, Newfoundland, to Valentia Bay, Ireland. Telegraphic communication was thus established for a brief season between the Old World and the New, and the fraternal greetings of peaceful nations on the two sides of the Atlantic were for the first time transmitted through the depths of the sea. Unfortunately, however, the cable which, as at first employed, was ill adapted to its purpose. In a short period it was parted on a reef, and the enterprise was thought by the unhopeful to have ended in failure.

In 1858 the Territory of Minnesota was organized and admitted into the Union. The area of the new State was a little more than eighty-one thousand square miles, and its population at the date of admission about a hundred and fifty thousand. In the following year Oregon, the thirty-third State of the Union, was admitted, bringing a population of forty-eight thousand and an area of eighty

of Texas, had adieu to the Senate of the United States and retired to private life. His



WASHINGTON IRVING.

fame as a General in the War for Texan independence has already been mentioned. His career had been marked by the strangest vicissitudes. He was a Virginian by birth, but his youth had been hardened among the mountains of Tennessee. He gained a military fame in the Seminole War, and soon, by the force of his character, rose to political distinction. He was elected Governor of Tennessee, but while in the full tide of his ascendancy his life was suddenly overshadowed with a domestic calamity, the nature of which has never been fully ascertained. He suddenly resigned his office, left his home, and exiled himself among the Cherokee Indians, and was presently elected as one of their chiefs. Afterwards he went to Texas, joined the American party there, became its leader, and was chosen President of the State after the successful struggle for independence. He was next sent by the Legislature of Texas to represent the new Commonwealth in the Senate of the United States. He was a man of sterling integrity, strong



GENERAL SAM HOUSTON.

thousand square miles. It was on the 4th of March in this year that General Sam Houston,

will, and equally strong idiosyncrasies of character.

In the year 1859 died Washington Irving, who might at the time of his death be regarded as the prince of American literature. For fully fifty years the power of his genius had been unremittingly devoted to the great work of creating for his native land a literary rank among the nations of modern times. On both sides of the Atlantic his name had become familiar as a household word. He it was, first of all, who wrung from the reluctant and prescriptive reviews of England and Scotland

an acknowledgment of the power and originality of American genius. When Murray, the great bookseller of London, was obliged to pay for the manuscript of *Bracebridge Hall*, which he had not yet seen, the sum of a thousand guineas, it was no longer doubtful that an American literary genius had appeared, destined to universal recognition. Except Sir Walter Scott and Lord Byron, no other author of Irving's times had received so magnificent a reward for his labor.

CHAPTER CXXIV.—DISUNION AND CIVIL WAR.



AFTER the issuance of the Dred Scott Decision the excitement in the United States on the question of slavery became constantly greater and more heated.

It had been believed by the pro-slavery party and by the Democratic Administration that the decision in question would allay the troubled waters and produce a calm; but, on the contrary, it appeared rather to be a torch cast among combustibles. In some of the Free States the opposition rose higher and higher, and what were called PERSONAL LIBERTY BILLS were passed, the object of which was to defeat the execution of the Fugitive-Slave Law. In the fall of 1859 the excitement of the country was still further aroused by the mad scheme of John Brown of Osawatimie to raise a servile insurrection in the South. With a party of twenty-one men, daring as himself, he made a sudden descent on the United States arsenal at Harper's Ferry, captured the place, and held his ground for nearly two days. The militia of Virginia, and then the national troops, were called out, in order to suppress the revolt. Thirteen of Brown's men were killed, two made their escape, and the rest were captured. The leader and his six companions were given over to the authorities of Virginia, tried, condemned, and hanged. The event was one which to the present day excites the keenest interest and liveliest discussion. Nor may it be easily decided whether an adventurer, sup-

posing himself under the direction of the Higher Law, may in such a manner attack the abuses of a State.

Meanwhile, in Kansas the controversy, ever and anon, broke out with added heat. But the Free-Soil party gradually gained the upper hand, and it became evident that slavery would be interdicted in the Territory. But an issue had now been created between the North and the South. In the former the antislavery sentiment spread and became intense. It settled into a conviction which might not be eradicated. In the South, on the other hand, the conviction grew that it was the settled purpose of the Northern people, first to gain the ascendancy in the national Government, and then to attack them and their peculiar institutions. Such was the alarming condition of affairs when the time arrived for holding the nineteenth Presidential election.

The excitement, as usual, rose high. The Free-Soil party had now permanently taken the name of Republican. A great convention of delegates of that party was held in Chicago, and Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, was nominated for the Presidency. A platform of principles was adopted, in which opposition to the extension of slavery was the one vital issue. In the month of April the Democratic convention assembled at Charleston, South Carolina; but no sooner had the body convened than its utter distraction of counsels was apparent. The delegates were divided on the slavery question, and, after much debating and wrangling, the party was disrupted. The

delegates from the South, unable to obtain a distinct expression of their views in the platform of principles, and seeing that the Northern wing of the party was determined to nominate Senator Douglas—the great defender of popular sovereignty—withdrew from the convention. The remainder, embracing most of the delegates from the North, continued in session, balloted for a while for a candidate, and on the 3d of May adjourned to Baltimore.

In that city, on the 18th of June, the delegates of the Northern wing of the party reassembled and chose Douglas as their standard-bearer in the approaching canvass. The seceding delegates adjourned, first to Richmond and afterwards to Baltimore, where they met on the 28th of June, and nominated John C. Breckinridge, of Kentucky. The American, or Know-Nothing, party had by this time lost something of its distinctive features, and took the name of Constitutional Unionists. Representatives of this party met in convention, and chose John Bell, of Tennessee, as their candidate. Thus were four political standards raised in the field, and the excitement swirled through the country like a storm.

The Republicans now gained by their compactness and the distinctness of their utterances on the slavery question. Most of the old Abolitionists, though by far more radical than the Republicans, cast in their fortunes with the latter, and supported Lincoln. The result was the triumphant election of the Republican candidate, by the votes of nearly all the Northern States. The support of the Southern States was for the most part given to Breckinridge. The States of Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee cast their ballots, thirty-nine in number, for Bell. Douglas received a large popular, but small electoral, vote, his supporters being scattered through all the States, without the concentration necessary to carry any. Thus, after having controlled the destinies of the Republic for sixty years, with only temporary overthrows in 1840 and 1848, the Democratic party was broken into fragments and driven from the field.

The issue of the Presidential election had been clearly foreseen, and the results were anticipated, at least in the South. The Southern leaders had not hesitated to declare, during the campaign, that the choice of Lincoln

would be regarded as a just cause for a dissolution of the Union. Threats of secession had been heard on every hand; but in the North such expressions were regarded as mere political bravado, having little foundation in the actual purposes of the Southern people. At any rate, the Republicans of the populous North were not to be deterred from voting according to their political convictions. They crowded to the polls, and their favorite received a plurality of the electoral votes.

At this time the Government, so far as Congress and the Executive were concerned, was under the control of the Douglas Democracy. A majority of the members of the Cabinet, however, and a large number of Senators and Representatives belonged to the Breckinridge party, and had imbibed from a pro-slavery education all of the fire-eating propensities of the extreme South. Such members of Congress did not hesitate openly to advocate the principles of secession as a remedy for the election of Lincoln. In the interim between the fall of 1860 and the expiration of Mr. Buchanan's term of office, the animosity of the Southern leaders reached a climax. It was foreseen by them that with the ensuing spring all the departments of the Government would pass under Republican control. The times were full of passion, animosity, and rashness. It was seen that, for the present, disunion—the secession of the Southern States—was possible; but that if the matter should be postponed until the incoming Administration should be fully established, disunion would be impossible. The attitude of the President favored the measure. He was not himself, in principle or profession, a disunionist. On the contrary, he denied the right of a State to secede, but at the same time he declared himself not armed with the Constitutional power necessary to prevent secession by force. Such a theory of government was sufficient of itself to paralyze the remaining energies of the Executive—to make him helpless in the presence of the emergency. The interval, therefore, between the Presidential election in November of 1860 and the inauguration of Lincoln in the following spring, was seized by the leaders of the South as the opportune moment for dissolving the Union.

The event showed that the measure had

been carefully prepared. The actual work of secession was begun, as might have been anticipated, in South Carolina. The old disunion proclivities of that State had slumbered in the embers for thirty years, and were now ready to burst forth in flames. On the 17th of December, 1860, a convention, chosen by the people of South Carolina, assembled at Charleston, and, after three days of fiery discussion, passed a resolution that the Union, hitherto existing between South Carolina and the other States under the name of the United States of America, was dissolved. It was a step of fearful importance, portending war and uni-




ALEXANDER H. STEPHENS

versal discord. The action was contagious. The sentiment of disunion spread like an insanity among the Southern people. In a short time the cotton-growing States were almost unanimously in support of the measure. By the first of February, 1861, six other States—Mississippi, Florida, Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, and Texas—had passed ordinances of secession similar to that adopted by South Carolina, and had withdrawn from the Union. Nearly all the Senators and Representatives of those States, following the lead of their constituents, whom they themselves had instigated in their course, resigned their seats in Congress, returned to the South,

and gave themselves fully to the disunion cause.

In the secession conventions, but little opposition was manifested to the movement. As a matter of fact, those who were opposed to disunion did not appear in the conventions, and their voices were unheard. The hot-headed leaders in the secession enterprise rushed together, carrying with them the enthusiastic support of the planters and the young politicians of the Southern States, and by these the work was done. In some instances a considerable minority vote was cast against disunion. A few speakers boldly denounced the measure as disloyal, bad in principle, ruinous in results. The course of Alexander H. Stephens, afterwards Vice-President of the Confederate States, was peculiar. He appeared in the Georgia convention, among a people with whom his voice had hitherto been prevalent in all matters affecting their interests. He undertook on the floor of the convention to stem the tide and to prevent the secession of his State. He delivered a long and powerful speech, in which, unfortunately for his fame, he defended the theory of secession, advocated the doctrine of State sovereignty, declared his intention of abiding by the decision of the convention and his State, but at the same time spoke against secession on the ground that the measure *was impolitic, unwise, and likely to be disastrous in its results.* Not a few other prominent men in different parts of the South held the same view; but the opposite opinion prevailed, and secession was readily and enthusiastically accomplished.

The formation of a new Government followed fast on the heels of disunion. On the 4th of February, 1861, delegates from six of the seceded States assembled at Montgomery, Alabama, and proceeded to form a new Government, under the name of the CONFEDERATE STATES OF AMERICA. On the 8th of the month the organization was completed by the election of Jefferson Davis, of Mississippi, as provisional President, and Alexander H. Stephens as Vice-President. On the same day of the meeting of the Confederate Congress at Montgomery, a Peace Conference, so-called,



INAUGURATION OF JEFFERSON DAVIS AT MONTGOMERY.

assembled in Washington City. Delegates from twenty-one States were present, and the optimists who composed the body still dreamed of peace. They prepared certain amendments to the Constitution of the United States, and the same were laid before Congress, with the recommendation that they be adopted. That body, freshly gathered from the people, and inspired with rising antagonism to the action of the Southern leaders, gave little heed to the recommendations, and the Conference dispersed without practical results.

Buchanan was still President, and the Government was still under the direction of the Democratic party; but the country seemed on the verge of ruin. It appeared that the Ship of State was purposely steered directly for the rocks. In the Executive Department there was a complete paralysis. The army had been sent in detachments to remote frontiers. The fleet was scattered in distant seas. The financial credit had run down to the lowest ebb. The Government was unable to borrow funds for current emergencies at twelve per cent. The diverse counsels of his friends had distracted the President. He hesitated, and knew not which way to turn. With the exception of Fort Sumter and Moultrie, in Charleston harbor, Fort Pickens, near Pensacola, and Fortress Monroe, in the Chesapeake, all the important naval ports and posts in the seceded States had been seized by the Confederate authorities, even before the organization of their Government. Meanwhile, in far-off Kansas the local warfare continued to break out at fitful intervals; but the Free State party had at last gained a complete ascendancy, and the early admission of the new Commonwealth, with two additional Republican Senators, was a foregone conclusion.

With the beginning of the new year, the President roused himself for a moment, and made a feeble attempt to reinforce and provision the garrison of Fort Sumter. The steamer *Star of the West* was accordingly sent out with men and supplies; but the Confederates were informed of all that was done, and had no trouble in defeating the enterprise. As the steamer approached the harbor of Charleston she was fired on by a Confederate battery, planted for that purpose, and com-

pelled to return. Thus in gloom and grief and the upheavals of revolution, the Administration of James Buchanan drew to a close. Such was the dreadful condition of affairs that it was deemed prudent for the new President to approach the Capital without recognition. For the first time in the history of the nation, the Chief Magistrate of the Republic slipped into Washington City by night, as a means of personal safety.

The new Chief Magistrate was a man for the hour and for the epoch. He had been thrown to the front by those processes which, in the aggregate, look so much like Providence. Abraham Lincoln, the sixteenth President of the United States, was a Kentuckian by birth; born in the county La Rue, on the 12th of February, 1809. His ancestors had immigrated thither from Rockingham County, Virginia; both father and mother were Virginians by birth. At the time of the emigration, however, Kentucky was simply a territorial extension westward of the Old Dominion. The childhood of Lincoln was passed in utter obscurity. It appears that the family were poor to the last degree—mere backwoods people of the lowest order. In 1816 the father, Thomas Lincoln, removed to Spencer county, Indiana—just then admitted into the Union—and built a cabin in the woods near the present village of Gentryville. This place was the scene of Lincoln's boyhood—a constant struggle with poverty, hardship, and toil. At the age of sixteen we find him managing a ferry across the Ohio, opposite the mouth of Anderson Creek—a service for which he was paid six dollars a month. In his youth he received, in the aggregate, about one year's schooling, which was all he ever had in the way of formal education. In the year of his majority he removed with his father's family to the North Fork of the Sangamon River, ten miles west of Decatur, in Illinois. Here he and his father built another log house, and opened and fenced a farm. Here Abraham Lincoln, pushing forth from the ancestral cabin, began for himself the hard battle of life.

"The uncleared forest, the unbroken soil,
The iron bark that turns the lumberer's axe;
The rapid that overbars the boatman's toil,

The prairie, hiding the mazed wanderer's tracks,

"The ambushed Indian, and the prowling bear,—
Such were the needs that helped his youth to
train.

Rough culture; but such trees large-fruit may bear,
If but their stocks be of right girth and grain."

Lincoln served as a flatboatman on the Mississippi, and after a trip to New Orleans returned to New Salem, a town twenty miles from Springfield, and became a clerk in a country store. At the outbreak of the Black Hawk War he was elected captain of a company, and went on a campaign into Wisconsin. From 1833 to 1836 he tried business for himself, but a dissolute partner brought him to bankruptcy. He then began the study of law, for which he had always had a preference; soon gained the attention of his fellow-men, and rose to distinction. His peculiar power, manifested at all periods of his life, of seizing the most difficult thought, and presenting it in such homely phrase as to make the truth appreciable by all men, made him a natural leader of the people. In 1849 he served in Congress for one term, where he distinguished himself as a humorous speaker. As candidate for the office of United States Senator from Illinois in 1858, he first revealed to the nation, in his great debates with Senator Douglas, the full scope and originality of his genius. Two years afterwards he was nominated and elected to the Presidency. On his accession to office he was fifty-two years of age. He came to the Presidency under such a burden of care and responsibility as had not been borne by any ruler of modern times. On the occasion of his inauguration he delivered a carefully prepared address, declaring his fixed purpose to uphold the Constitution, enforce the laws, and preserve the integrity of the Union. From the first it was the policy of his Administration to ignore the action of the seceded States as a thing in itself null, void, and of no effect.

At the head of the new Cabinet was placed William H. Seward, of New York, as Secretary of State. Salmon P. Chase, of Ohio, was appointed Secretary of the Treasury, and Simon Cameron Secretary of War; but the latter, in the following January, was succeeded in office by Edwin M. Stanton. The Secretaryship of the Navy was conferred on Gideon Welles. In his inaugural address and first official papers the President outlined not only

his theoretical, but his practical policy. The latter was, in brief, to repossess the forts, arsenals, and public property which had been seized by the Confederates, and to reestablish the authority of the Federal Government in all parts. The first military preparations and movements were made with this end in view. Meanwhile, on the 12th of March, a body of commissioners from the seceded States sought to obtain from the National Government a recognition of their independence, but the negotiations were of course unsuccessful. Then followed a second attempt on the part of the Government to reinforce the garrison at Fort




ABRAHAM LINCOLN

Sumter; and with that came the beginning of actual hostilities.

The defenses in Charleston harbor were held by Major Robert Anderson. His whole force amounted to but seventy-nine men. Owing to the feebleness of his garrisons, he deemed it prudent to withdraw from Fort Moultrie and concentrate his whole force in Fort Sumter. By this time Confederate volunteers had flocked to the city, and powerful land-batteries were built around the harbor, bearing on Sumter.

When it was known that the Federal Government would reinforce the forts, the authorities of the Confederate States determined to anticipate the movement by compelling Anderson to surrender. On the 11th of April,



REMOVAL OF TROOPS FROM FORT MOULTRIE TO FORT SUMTER


General P. T. Beauregard, commandant of Charleston, sent a flag to Major Anderson, demanding an evacuation of the fort. The Major replied that he should hold the fort and defend his flag. On the following morning, April 12th, at half-past four o'clock, the first gun of the great War was discharged from a Confederate battery. A terrific bombardment, of thirty-four hours' duration, followed. The fort was reduced to ruins, set on fire, and obliged to capitulate. The honors of war were granted to Anderson and his men, who had made a brave and obstinate resistance. It appeared, however, in the sequel, that no lives were lost, either in the fort or on the shore. The Confederates in their initial movement were thus completely successful, and obtained control of the harbor of Charleston.

But the effect was against the aggressors. The news of the capture of Sumter spread through the country like a flame of fire. There had been on the part of the people a vague expectation of violence, but the actual shock came like a clap of thunder. The people of the towns poured into the streets, and the country folk flocked to the villages, to gather tidings and comment on the outbreak of the war. Gray-haired men talked gravely of the deed that was done, and prophesied its consequences. The general effect of the capture of Sumter was to consolidate opinion in both the North and the South. On either side the sentiments of the people were crystallized into a firmly set antagonism, which could only be broken by the shock of battle.

Three days after the fall of Sumter, President Lincoln issued a call for seventy-five thousand volunteers, to serve three months in the overthrow of the secession movement. Two days later, Virginia seceded from the Union. On the 6th of May, Arkansas followed the example, and then North Carolina on the 20th of the same month. In Tennessee, especially in East Tennessee, there was a powerful opposition to disunion, and it was not until the 8th of June that a secession ordinance could be forced upon the people. In Missouri the movement resulted immediately in civil war, while in Kentucky the authorities issued a proclamation of neutrality. The people of Maryland were divided into hostile

parties, the disunion sentiment being largely prevalent.

Meanwhile, the volunteers from the North began to make their way to Washington. On the 19th of April, when the first regiment of the Massachusetts volunteers was passing through Baltimore, they were fired upon by the citizens, and three men were killed. This was the first bloodshed of the war. On the day before this event a body of Confederate soldiers advanced against the armory of the United States at Harper's Ferry. The officer in command hastily destroyed a portion of the vast magazine gathered there, and then escaped into Pennsylvania. On the 20th of the month another company of Virginians assailed the great navy-yard at Norfolk. The officers commanding fired the buildings and



FLAG OF THE CONFEDERATE STATES.

ships, spiked the guns, and withdrew. Most of the cannons and many of the vessels were afterwards recovered by the Confederates and turned against the Government. Virginia was soon filled with volunteers from the South, and in a short time Washington City was in imminent danger of capture.

The first duty of the Government was to secure the Capital. This done, the President, on the 31 of May, issued another call for soldiers. The number of the new call was set at eighty-three thousand, and the term of service at three years or during the war. A fleet was equipped and sent out to blockade the Southern ports, and on every side were heard the notes of preparation. The spirit of the people had been thoroughly aroused, and a great war thundered in the horizon. Already the Southern Congress had adjourned from Montgomery,

to meet, the 20th of July, at Richmond, which was chosen as the capital of the Confederacy. To that place had already come Mr. Davis and the officers of his Cabinet, for the purpose of directing the affairs of the Government and army. So stood the antagonistic powers at the beginning of June, 1861. It was now evident to all men—slow indeed had they been to believe it—that one of the greatest conflicts of modern times was impending over the United States. Let us look briefly into the CAUSES which produced the Rebellion and led to the Civil War.

The first and most general of these causes was the *different construction put upon the National Constitution by the people of the North and the South.* A difference had always existed as to how the instrument was to be understood. The question at issue had respect to the relation between the States and the General Government. One party held that under the Constitution the Union of the States is indissoluble; that the sovereignty of the Nation is lodged in the central Government; that the States are subordinate; that the acts of Congress, until they are repealed or pronounced unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, are binding on the States; that the highest allegiance of the citizen is due to the General Government, not to his State; and that all attempts at nullification and disunion are in their nature disloyal and treasonable. The other party held that the National Constitution is a compact between sovereign States; that these States constitute a confederacy, or what the Germans would call a *Staatenbund*; that for certain reasons the Union may be dissolved by the States; that the sovereignty of the nation is lodged in the individual States, and not in the central Government; that Congress can exercise no other than delegated powers; that a State feeling aggrieved may annul an act of Congress; that the highest allegiance of the citizen is due to his own State, and afterwards to the General Government; and that acts of nullification and disunion are justifiable, revolutionary, and honorable. The theory was, in brief, that the Constitution itself provided that the States, under the Constitution, might abrogate the Constitution as it related to themselves, and thereby dissolve the Union.

Here was an issue in its consequences the

most fearful that ever disturbed a nation. It struck into the very vitals of the Government. It threatened, with each renewal of the agitation, to undo the whole civil structure of the United States. For a long time the parties who disputed about the meaning of the Constitution were scattered in various sections. In the earlier history of the country the doctrine of State sovereignty had, indeed, been most advocated in New England. With the rise of the tariff question the local position of the parties was reversed. Since the tariff—a Congressional measure—favored the Eastern States at the expense of the South, it came to pass, naturally, that the people of New England, and afterwards of the whole North, passed over to the advocacy of National sovereignty, while the people of the South became wedded to the doctrine of State rights. Thus as early as 1831 the right of a State to nullify an act of Congress was openly advocated in South Carolina, and by her greatest statesman in the Senate of the United States; and thus also it happened that the belief in State sovereignty became more and more prevalent in the South, less and less prevalent in the North. The general effect of this localization of the two theories was to engender sectional parties, and to bring them ultimately into conflict.

The second general cause of the Civil War was the *different systems of labor in the North and in the South.* In the former sections the laborers were freemen, citizens, voters; in the latter, bondmen, property, slaves. In the South the theory was that the capital of a country should own the labor; in the North, that both labor and capital are free. In the beginning all the colonies had been slaveholding. In the Eastern and Middle States the system of slave-labor had been gradually abolished, being unprofitable. In the five great States formed out of the Territory North-west of the River Ohio slavery was excluded by the original Jeffersonian compact, under which that territory was organized. Thus there came to be a line of division drawn through the Union east and west. It was evident, therefore, that whenever the question of slavery was agitated a sectional division would arise between the parties north and south of the dividing line, and that disunion and war would be threatened. But the danger arising from this source, and

indeed from the first general cause above mentioned, was increased, and the discord between the sections aggravated, by several subordinate causes.

One of these was, at the time considered, merely an incident of industrial progress, namely, the INVENTION OF THE COTTON-GIN. In 1793 Eli Whitney, a young collegian of Massachusetts, went to Georgia and resided with the family of Mrs. Greene, widow of General Greene, of the Revolution. While there he became much interested in the difficult process of picking cotton by hand; that is, separating the seed from the fiber. So slow was this process that the production of upland cotton was nearly profitless. The industry of the cotton-growing States, however well it promised in the mere production of the plant, was rendered of no effect by the tediousness of preparing the product for the market. Mr. Whitney, with the inventive curiosity and skill of his race, undertook to remove the difficulty, and succeeded in constructing a gin which astonished the beholder by the rapidity and excellence of its work. Cotton in the seed, submitted to the action of the machine, was separated to perfection and with great facility. From being profitless, cotton suddenly became the most profitable of all the staples of the South. The industry of the cotton-producing States was revolutionized. Whitney obtained patents on his invention; but the greed for obtaining and using his machine was so great that no courts could or would protect him in his rights. Before the Civil War it was estimated that the cotton-gin had added an aggregate of a thousand millions of dollars to the revenues of the Southern States. Just in proportion to the increased profitableness of cotton, slave-labor became important, slaves valuable, and the system of slavery a fixed and deep-rooted institution.

Slave ownership more than ever before was now imbedded in Southern society. The separation between the laboring and the non-laboring class was not only a separation of race but it was a separation of *condition*. The present generation of planters and slaveholders had inherited that condition. They had grown up in its presence, and had come to regard it as a rightful and necessary part of the best social organization in the world. Seeing them-

selves manifestly lifted above the *social* class, they came to look upon the system of free-labor and free-laborers in the North with contempt.

From this time forth there was constant danger that the slavery question would so embitter the politics and legislation of the country as to bring about disunion. The danger of such a result was, as we have already seen, fully manifested in the MISSOURI AGITATION of 1820-21. Threats of dissolving the Union were freely made both in the South and the North; in the South, because of the proposed rejection of Missouri as a slaveholding State; in the North, because of the proposed enlargement of the domain of slavery. When the Missouri Compromise was enacted it was the hope of Mr. Clay and his fellow-statesmen to save the Union by removing forever the slavery issue from the politics of the country; but their success was temporary, evanescent. It had remained for Mr. Lincoln himself, in the opening of his great debates with Senator Douglas, to announce to the nation the ultimate irreconcilability of the opposing elements in the American system. // He declared that a house divided against itself can not stand; that the institution of slavery, to carry out the analogy, must either become universal in the United States, or else, by limitation, be put in such a condition as to lead to its ultimate extinction.

Next among the subordinate causes of the Rebellion and the Civil War should be mentioned the NULLIFICATION ACTS OF SOUTH CAROLINA. These, too, turned upon the institution of slavery and the profitableness of cotton. The Southern States had become cotton-producing; the Eastern States had given themselves to manufacture. The tariff measures seemed to favor manufacturers at the expense of the producers of raw material. Mr. Calhoun and his friends proposed to remedy the evil complained of by annulling the laws of Congress, and thus forcing an abolition of the tariff. His measures failed; but another compromise was found necessary in order to allay the animosities which had been awakened.

NEXT came the ANNEXATION OF TEXAS, with the consequent enlargement of the domain of slavery and the reawakening of the agitation.

Those who opposed the Mexican War did so, not so much because of the injustice of the conflict as because of the fact that thereby the area of slavery would be vastly extended. Then, at the close of the War, came the enormous acquisition of territory in the Southwest. Whether the same should be made into free or slaveholding States, was the question next agitated. This controversy led to the passage of the Omnibus Bill, by which again, for a brief period, the excitement was allayed.

In 1854, as we have seen, the KANSAS-NEBRASKA BILL was passed. Thereby the Missouri Compromise was repealed, and the whole question opened anew. Meanwhile, the character and civilization of the Northern and Southern people had become quite different. In population and wealth the North had far outgrown the South. In the struggle for territorial domain, the North had gained the larger advantage. In 1860 the division of the Democratic party made certain the election of Lincoln, a professed Free-Soiler, by the votes of the Northern States. The people of the South were exasperated at the choice of a Chief Magistrate whom they regarded as indifferent to their welfare, or positively hostile to their interests.

Returning, then, from these subordinate to the more general causes of the Civil War, we note, in the next place, *the want of intercourse between the people of the North and the South.* Obeying those cosmic laws by which the population of the earth has always been distributed, the people of the States west of the Alleghenies had been carried to their destinations in channels flowing from the east to the west—never from the north to the south. The artificial contrivances had been arranged along the same lines. The great railroads and thoroughfares ran east and west. All migrations had been back and forth in the same course. Between the North and the South there had been only a modicum of travel and interchange of opinion. The people of the two sections had become much more unacquainted than they were in the times of the Revolution. From this want of intercourse and familiarity, the inhabitants of the two sections, without intending it, had become estranged, jealous, suspicious. They misrepresented each other's beliefs and purposes. They suspected each

other of dishonesty and ill-will. Before the outbreak of the war, the people of the North and the South had come to look upon each other almost in the light of different nationalities.

A fourth general cause was found in *the publication and influence of sectional books and writings.* During the twenty years preceding the war, many works were published, both in the North and the South, whose popularity depended wholly or in part on the animosity existing between the two sections. Such books were frequently filled with ridicule and falsehood. The manners and customs, the language and beliefs, of one section were held up to the contempt and scorn of the people of the other section. The minds of all classes, especially of the young, were thus prejudiced and poisoned. In the North the belief was fostered that the South was given up to inhumanity, ignorance, and barbarism; while in the South the opinion prevailed that the Northern people were a selfish race of men, mercenary, cold-blooded Yankees.

Again, *the evil influence of demagogues* may be cited as a fifth general cause of the war. It is a misfortune of republican governments that they many times fall under the leadership of bad men. In the United States the demagogue has enjoyed special opportunities for mischief, and the people have suffered in proportion. From 1850 to 1860 statesmanship and patriotism were at a low ebb. Ambitions and scheming men had come to the front, taken control of political parties, and proclaimed themselves the leaders of public opinion. Their purposes were wholly selfish. The welfare and peace of the country were put aside as of little value. In order to gain power and keep it, many unprincipled men in the South were anxious to destroy the Union, while the demagogues of the North were willing to *abuse* the Union in order to accomplish their purposes.


Added to all these causes was *a growing public opinion in the North against the institution of slavery itself*, a hostility inborn and inbred against human chattelhood as a fact. The conscience of the Nation was roused, and the belief began to prevail that slavery was wrong *per se*, and ought to be destroyed. This opinion, comparatively feeble at the beginning

of the war, was rapidly developed, and had much to do in determining the direction and final issue of the conflict. Such, in brief, were the principal causes which led to the Civil War in the United States—one of the most terrible and bloody stripes of modern times.

We shall now enter upon a brief summary of the principal events of the struggle between the North and South, between the Union under the Constitution, backed by the machinery of the Government at Washington

detachment of Confederates, under the command of General Magruder. On the 10th of June a body of Union troops was sent to dislodge them, but was repulsed with considerable loss. Such was the opening scene of 1861 Virginia.

West of the mountains the conquest of the State had been undertaken by General George B. McClellan, destined to be a conspicuous figure of his epoch. In the latter part of May, General Thomas A. Morris, commanding a force of Ohio and Indiana troops, advanced



FORTRESS MONROE.

and the populous Northern States on the one side, and the machinery of the new Confederacy established at Richmond, backed by the forces of the South and the whole power of the ancient slaveholding system on the other. The war proper may be said to have opened on the 24th of May, 1861. On that day the Union army crossed the Potomac from Washington City to Alexandria. At this time Fortress Monroe, at the mouth of James River, was held by General B. F. Butler, with twelve thousand men. In the immediate vicinity, at a place called Bethel Church, was stationed a

from Parkersburg to Grafton, and on the 3d of June came upon the Confederates at Philippi. After a brief engagement the Federals were successful, and the Confederates retreated toward the mountains. It was at this juncture that General McClellan arrived in person, and on the 11th of July gained a victory of some importance at Rich Mountain. General Garnett, the defeated Confederate commander, fell back with his forces to Cheat River, where he made a stand, but was a second time defeated and himself killed in battle.

On the 19th of August, General Floyd.

commanding a detachment of Confederates of General Ewell, on July 1, 1862, by General McDowell, and on July 2, 1862, by General Patterson, and on July 3, 1862, by General Johnston. General Patterson was defeated at Cheat Mountain, an action which recognized the Federal authority throughout West Virginia. Meanwhile, in the beginning of June, General Robert Patterson marched from Chambersburg to retake Harper's Ferry. On the 11th of the month a division of the army, under command of Colonel Lewis Wallace, made a sudden and successful onset upon a detachment of Confederates stationed at Romney. Patterson then crossed



JEFFERSON DAVIS

the Potomac with the main body, entered the Shenandoah Valley, and pressed back the Confederates to Winchester. Thus far there had been only petty engagements, the preliminary onsets and skirmishes of the conflict; but the time had now come for the first great battle of the war.

After the retirement of the main body of Confederates from West Virginia, the forces of the State were commanded by General Beauregard, who concentrated at Manassas Junction, on the Orange and Potomac, twenty-seven miles from Alexandria. A strong force, led by General Joseph E. Johnston, lay in the Shenandoah Valley, and in supporting distance

of Beauregard. The Union army at Alexandria was commanded by General John McDowell, and General Patterson was stationed in front of Washington to watch Johnston's movements, in order that the latter might not form a junction with Beauregard.

On the 18th of July the Federal army moved forward. Two days afterwards an unimportant engagement took place between Centerville and Bull Run. The Unionists then pressed on, and on the morning of the 21st of July came upon the Confederate army, strongly posted between Bull Run and Manassas Junction. Here a general battle ensued, continuing with great severity until noonday. Up to that time the advantage had been with McDowell, and it seemed not unlikely that the Confederates would suffer a complete defeat; but in the crisis of the battle General Johnston arrived with nearly six thousand fresh troops from the Shenandoah Valley. The tide of victory turned immediately, and in a short time McDowell's whole army was thrown back in rout and confusion. A panic spread through the Union forces. The army had been followed out from Washington by a throng of non-combatants. Soldiers and citizens became mixed together, and the whole mass rolled back in disorganization into the defenses of Washington. The losses were nearly equal, being on the Union side 2,951, and on the Confederate side 2,050.

The chagrin and humiliation of the North were extreme, and the South was equally elated on account of the Confederate victory. For a while the Federal Government was more alarmed about the safety of Washington City than it was concerned about the capture of Richmond. In the latter city, on the day before the battle, the new Confederate Government had been formally organized. In the Southern Congress, there assembled, were many men of distinguished abilities. Jefferson Davis, the President, was a far-sighted and talented man. His experience was wide and thorough in the affairs of State, and his reputation as a soldier, earned in the Mexican War, was fairly good. He had served in both Houses of the National Congress, and as a member of President Pierce's Cabinet. His talents, decision of character, and ardent advocacy of State Rights had made him the

natural, if not the inevitable, leader of the South in the impending conflict.

After the battle of Bull Run, there was a lull in the military operations of the East. In Missouri, however, hostilities broke out, and were attended with important consequences. That Commonwealth, though a slaveholding State, had retained its place in the Union. A convention had been called by Governor Jackson, in accordance with an act of the Legislature, but had refused to pass an ordinance of secession. But the Missouri disunionists were numerous and powerful. The Governor favored their cause, and they were little disposed to give up the State without a struggle.

Missouri became a battle field for the contending parties. Federal and Confederate camps were organized in many parts of the State, and hostilities broke out in several places. The Confederates, by capturing the United States arsenal at Liberty, in Clay County, obtained considerable supplies, arms, and ammunition. They thereupon formed Camp Jackson, near St. Louis, and the arsenal in that city was endangered by the activity of their proceedings. At this stage of the game, however, Captain Nathaniel Lyon appeared on the scene, and sent the arms and stores in St. Louis up the river to Alton, and thence to Springfield, Illinois. Camp Jackson itself was soon afterwards attacked and broken up by the same vigilant officer.


Meanwhile, the lead-mines in the southwestern part of the State became an object of great importance to the Confederates. In order to secure possession of the same, they hurried up large bodies of troops from Arkansas and Texas. On the 17th of June, General Lyon encountered Governor Jackson at the head of a Confederate force, at Booneville, and gained a decided advantage. On the 5th of July the Unionists, under command of Colonel Franz Sigel, were again successful in a severe engagement with the Governor at Carthage. On the 10th of August the hardest battle fought thus far in the West occurred at Wilson's Creek, a short distance south of Springfield, Missouri. General Lyon made a daring but rash attack on a much superior force of Confederates, under command of Generals McCullough and Price. The Federalist first gained the field against heavy odds, but Gen-

eral Lyon was killed, and his men *disorganized*, his command falling to Sigel.

After his victory, Price pressed northward across the State to Lexington, on the Missouri River. This place was held by two thousand six hundred Federals, under command of Colonel Mulligan. A stubborn defense was made by the garrison, but Mulligan was obliged to capitulate. Price then turned to the south. The Federals rallied, and, on the 16th of October, Lexington was retaken. General John C. Fremont, who had now been appointed to the command of all the Union forces in Missouri, followed the Confederates as far as Springfield, and was on the eve of making an attack when he was superseded by General Hunter.¹ The latter retreated to St. Louis, and was in turn superseded by General Henry W. Halleck, on the 18th of November. It was now Price's turn to fall back towards Arkansas. The only remaining movement of importance was at Belmont, on the Mississippi.

After the declaration of neutrality by the State of Kentucky, the Confederate General Leonidas Polk, acting under orders of his Government, had led an army into the State and captured the town of Columbus. The object of the movement was to give support and countenance to the Confederate cause in Kentucky; for the Southern sympathizers in that Commonwealth were numerous and active. Polk planted batteries at Columbus, so as to command the Mississippi, and the Missouri Confederates gathered in force at Belmont, on the opposite bank of the river. In order to dislodge them, Colonel Ulysses S. Grant, with a brigade of three thousand Illinois troops, was sent, by way of Cairo, into Missouri. On the 7th of November he made a vigorous and successful attack on the Confederate camp

¹The command was taken from Fremont on account of his attitude towards the slaves. Thus far the Government had professed that slavery should not be interfered with, even in the States held by military occupation. General Fremont held the opposite view, and marched upon the Confederates not only as a military commander, but as an emancipator. He issued a proclamation in accordance with the facts, but the pro-slavery sentiment, even in the North, was as yet too strong to tolerate such radical proceedings, and Fremont was accordingly relieved of his command. A reason which at a later period of the war would have been no reason at all.



CARRYING A BRIDGE OVER THE POTOMAC.

at Belmont, but General Polk threw reinforcements across the river. The guns of the batteries on the Kentucky side were brought to bear on the Union position, and Grant, after his success, was obliged to fall back. Such, in general, were the military operations in the West during the summer and fall of 1861.

For a while after the battle of Bull Run the Government at Washington was almost paralyzed. It was put on the defensive. The bridges over the Potomac had to be vigilantly guarded lest, by a dash of cavalry, the Capital might fall into the hands of the Confederates. A brief season of great depression ensued; but the reaction was correspondingly vigorous and salutary. As soon as the panic had subsided the Administration redoubled its energies, and troops from the Northern States were rapidly hurried to Washington. The aged General Scott, still retaining his place as Commander-in-chief of the armies of the United States, unable to bear longer the burden resting upon him, now retired from active duty, and General George B. McClellan was called over from West Virginia to take command of the Army of the Potomac.

It was soon evident that as an organizer and disciplinarian the young commander had no superior. By the middle of October the forces under his command had increased to a hundred and fifty thousand men. Nor was it any longer the mere rout of volunteers which had rushed forward to meet defeat at Bull Run, but a compact, well-disciplined, and powerful army. On the 21st of October a brigade, numbering nearly two thousand men, was thrown across the Potomac at Ball's Bluff. The movement, however, was not well supported. Nor had adequate means of retreat been prepared. The Federals were attacked on their advance by a strong force of Confederates under General Evans, were driven to the river, their leader, Colonel Baker, killed, and the whole force routed with terrible loss. Fully eight hundred of Baker's men were killed, wounded, or taken.

From the first it was seen by the Federal Government that the command of the sea-coast was an essential of success. Accordingly, in the summer of 1861, several important naval expeditions were sent out to maintain the interests of the United States. One of these,

under command of Commodore Stringham and General Butler, proceeded to the North Carolina coast, and, on the 29th of August, captured the forts at Hatteras Inlet. On the 7th of November a second armament, commanded by Commodore Dupont and General Thomas W. Sherman, entered the harbor of Port Royal, and took Forts Walker and Beauregard. Hilton Head, a point most advantageous in operations against Charleston and Savannah, thus fell into the power of the Government. Around the whole coast a blockade was established, which soon became so rigorous as to cut off all commerce and communication between the Confederate States and foreign nations. It was in this juncture of affairs that a difficulty arose which brought the United States and Great Britain to the very verge of war.

Ever since the expansion of the cotton-producing interest in the Southern States the factories of England had been in a measure dependent upon the American cotton-fields for the raw material which they employed. Around this fact many other industrial interests of Great Britain clustered. It was, therefore, a serious calamity to the English factories, and to English industrial welfare in general, when the Southern ports were closed by the Federal blockade. A state of public feeling supervened in Great Britain very unfavorable to the United States, and strongly sympathetic with the Confederacy. In the meantime the Confederate Government had appointed James M. Mason and John Slidell, formerly Senators of the United States, to go abroad as ambassadors from the Confederate States to France and England. Before the ambassadors left America, the blockading squadron had closed around the Southern ports, and the envoys were obliged to make their escape from Charleston harbor on board a blockade runner. Having made their way from that port, they reached Havana in safety and were taken on board the British mail steamer *Trent*, for Europe.

On the 8th of November the vessel was overhauled by the United States frigate *San Jacinto*, commanded by Captain Wilkes. The *Trent* was hailed and boarded. The two ambassadors and their secretaries were seized, transferred to the *San Jacinto*, carried to Bos-

ton, and imprisoned. The *Trent* proceeded on her way to England. The story of the insult to the British flag was told, and the whole kingdom burst out in a blaze of wrath.

The sequel soon showed how little disposed even the most civilized nations are to regard consistency and right when their prejudices are involved in the question. For nearly a half-century the Republic of the United States had stoutly contended for the exemption from insult of neutral flags on the high sea, and the American theory had always been that the free flag makes free goods, contraband of war only being excepted. On the other hand, Great Britain had immemorially been the most arrogant of all the civilized States in the matter of search and seizure. She had, in the course of her history, insulted almost every flag that had been seen on the ocean. Yet, in this particular instance, the position of the parties to the *Trent* affair was suddenly reversed, under the influence of passion and prejudice. At the first, the people of the United States loudly applauded Captain Wilkes. The House of Representatives passed a vote of thanks to him, with the presentation of a sword; and even the Administration was disposed to defend his action. Had such a course been taken, war would have been inevitable; for Great Britain, with equal inconsistency, had flung herself into a passion for the alleged insult to her flag and sovereignty.

The country was saved from the peril, however, by the adroit and far-reaching diplomacy of William H. Seward, the Secretary of State. When Great Britain demanded reparation for the insult and immediate liberation of the prisoners, he replied in a mild, cautious, and very able paper. It was conceded that the seizure of Mason and Slidell was not justifiable according to the law of nations, and a suitable apology was accordingly made for the wrong done. The Confederate ambassadors were liberated, put on board a vessel, and sent to their destination. The action of the Secretary was both just and politic. The peril of the war went by, and Great Britain, without intending it, was committed to a policy in regard to the rights of neutral flags, which she had hitherto denied, and which the United States had always contended for. So ended the first year of the Civil War.

At the beginning of 1862 the Federal forces numbered about four hundred and fifty thousand men. Of these, nearly two hundred thousand, under command of General McClellan, were encamped in the vicinity of Washington. Another army, commanded by General Buell, was stationed at Louisville, Kentucky, and it was in this department that the first military movements of the year were made. Early in January, Colonel Humphrey Marshall, commanding a force of Confederates on Big Sandy River, in Eastern Kentucky, was attacked and defeated by a detachment of Unionists led by Colonel James




WILLIAM H. SEWARD.

A. Garfield. Ten days later, another and more important battle was fought at Mill Spring, in the same section of the State. The Confederates were commanded by Generals Crittenden and Zollicoffer, and the Federals by General George H. Thomas. The battle was hard fought. Both sides lost heavily, and the Confederates suffered defeat, which was rendered doubly severe by the death of Zollicoffer.

These operations were followed first by still more vital movements on the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers. The former stream was commanded at the southern border of Kentucky by Fort Henry, and the latter by the more important Fort Donelson, ten miles

south of the Tennessee line. At the beginning of the year a plan was formed by the Federal officers for the capture of both these places. Early in February, Commodore Foote was sent up the Tennessee, with a flotilla of gun-boats, and at the same time General Grant moved forward to cooperate in an attack on Fort Henry. Before the land forces were well in position, however, the flotilla, unassisted, compelled the evacuation of the fort, the Confederates escaping to Donelson. Eighty-three prisoners and a large amount of stores were the trophies of the victory.

After their success, the gun-boats dropped down the Tennessee, took on stores at Cairo, and then began the ascent of the Cumberland.



BATTLE OF FORT DONELSON.

Grant pressed on from Fort Henry, and as soon as the flotilla arrived began a siege of Fort Donelson. The defenses were strong and well manned by more than ten thousand Confederates, under General Simon B. Buckner. Grant's forces numbered nearly thirty thousand; but the weather was extremely bad, the winter not yet broken, and the assaults on the fortifications perilous in the extreme. On the 14th of February the gun-boats were repulsed with considerable loss, Commodore Foote being among the wounded. On the next day the garrison attempted to break through Grant's lines, but were driven back with slaughter. On the 16th Buckner was obliged to capitulate. His army, numbering fully ten thousand men, became prisoners of

war, and all the magazines, stores, and guns of the fort fell into the hands of the Federals. It was the first decided Union victory of the war. The immediate result of the capture was the evacuation of Kentucky and the capital of Tennessee by the Confederates. Nor did they ever afterwards recover the ground thus lost.

Following up his success at Fort Donelson, General Grant now ascended the Tennessee River as far as Pittsburg Landing. In the beginning of April a camp was formed on the left bank of that stream, at a place called Shiloh Church. Here, on the morning of the 6th of the month, the Union army was suddenly attacked by the Confederates, led by

Generals Albert S. Johnston and Beauregard. The shock of the onset was at first irresistible. All day long the battle raged with tremendous slaughter on both sides. The Federals were gradually forced back nearer and nearer to the Tennessee, until they were saved by the gun-boats in the river. Night fell on the scene with the conflict still undecided, but in the desperate crisis General Buell arrived

from Nashville with strong reinforcements. Grant, however, by no means despaired of gaining the victory, even unaided by the fresh arrivals. During the night he, with General William T. Sherman, made arrangements to assume the offensive. General Johnston had been killed in the battle of the previous day. Beauregard, on whom the command was now devolved, was unable to gain any further successes. On the contrary, as the battle was renewed on the morning of the 7th, everything went against the Confederates, and they were obliged to fall back in full retreat to Corinth. The losses in killed, wounded, and missing in this dreadful conflict were more than ten thousand on each side. There had never before been such a harvest

of death in the countries this side of the Atlantic.

On the Mississippi also the Unionists were gaining steadily. After the evacuation of Columbus, Kentucky, the Confederates proceeded to Island Number Ten, a few miles below, and built thereon strong fortifications commanding the river. On the western shore was the town of New Madrid, held by a Confederate force

from Missouri. Against this place an expedition was made by General John Pope, with a body of Western troops, while at the same time Commodore Foote descended the Mississippi with his flotilla, to attack the forts of the island. Pope was entirely successful in his movement, and gained possession of New Madrid. The land forces then cooperated with the gun-boats, and for twenty-three days Island Number Ten was vigorously bombarded.


On the 7th of April, while the Union army at Shiloh were rallying from the disasters of the preceding day, and were pursuing the Confederates beyond the Tennessee, the garrison of Island Number Ten, numbering about five thousand, were made prisoners of war. By this striking success the Mississippi was opened from above as far south as Memphis, and on the 6th of the following June that city was taken by the fleet of Commodore Davis.

Early in the year General Curtis had

pushed forward through Missouri, entered Arkansas, and taken a position at Pea Ridge, among the mountains in the north-west angle of the State. Here, on the 6th of March, he was attacked by the Confederates and Indians, twenty thousand strong, under command of McCullough, McIntosh, and Pike. The conflict lasted for two days, at the end of which time the battle was decided in favor of

the Federals. McCullough and McIntosh were both killed, and their broken forces fell back towards Texas. The Union losses were also severe, and the battle was comparatively barren of results.

On the day following the conflict at Pea Ridge, an event occurred at Fortress Monroe which came near changing the character



SURRENDER OF FORT DONELSON.

of naval warfare. After the destruction of the Norfolk navy-yard, the Confederates had raised the United States frigate *Merimac*, one of the sunken ships, and had plated her sides with an impenetrable armor of iron. At this time the Union fleet was lying at Fortress Monroe. When the equipment of the *Merimac* was complete, she was sent down to attack and destroy the squadron. Reaching that place on the 8th of March, the *Merimac*, called by the Confederates the *Virginia*, began the work of destruction, and two powerful

ships, the *Cochetopod* and the *Congo*, were sent to the bottom. Some time before this, Captain John Ericsson, the great inventor of New York, had invented and built a peculiar war vessel, with a single round tower of iron exposed above the water-line. The tower was made to revolve so as to bring its single heavy gun to bear on the enemy in any direction. Except when the port-hole was thus momentarily exposed to an enemy's shot, the strange craft appeared invulnerable to any missile which the skill of man and the force of explosives had ever hurled. This vessel, called the *Monitor*, was offered in the service of the Government, and at length steamed out from New York for Fortress Monroe. It happened,



BATTLE OF MONITOR AND MERRIMAC.

rather than was intended, that Ericsson's ship arrived in Hampton Roads at the very time when the *Virginia* was making havoc in the Union fleet. On the morning of the 9th the two iron-clad monsters came face to face, and turned their terrible engines upon each other. After fighting for five hours, the *Virginia* was obliged to give up the contest, and return badly damaged to Norfolk. Such was the excitement produced by this novel sea-fight that for a while the whole energies of the Navy Department were devoted to building monitors.

Other events at sea were equally important. Early in February, 1862, a strong land and naval force, under command of General Ambrose E. Burnside and Commodore Goldsborough, was sent against the Confederate garrison at

Roanoke Island. On the 8th of the month the squadron reached its destination. The fortifications on the island were attacked and carried, and the garrisons, nearly three thousand strong, were taken prisoners. Burnside next proceeded against New Bern, North Carolina, and on the 14th of March captured the city, after four hours of severe fighting. Proceeding southward he reached the harbor of Beaufort, carried Fort Macon, at the entrance, and on the 25th of April took possession of the town. On the 11th of the same month Fort Pulaski, commanding the mouth of the Savannah River, had surrendered to General Gilmore. This important capture resulted in the effectual blockade of the emporium of Georgia.

A still greater reverse now awaited the Confederates, at New Orleans. Early in April a powerful squadron, commanded by General Butler and Admiral Farragut, entered the Mississippi, and proceeded up the river as far as Forts Jackson and St. Philip, thirty miles from the Gulf. The guns of these forts, planted on opposite shores of the Mississippi, completely commanded the river, and obstructions and torpedoes had been planted in the channel.

On the 18th of April the Federal fleet, comprising forty-five vessels, was brought into position, and a furious bombardment of the forts was begun. An incessant shower of missiles was for six days rained on the fortifications. Still the forts were but little injured, and Farragut undertook the hazardous enterprise of running past the batteries. In this he succeeded. The chain which the Confederates had stretched across the river was broken, and their fleet above was overpowered. On the next day the Federal squadron reached New Orleans, and the city yielded. General Butler became commandant, and the fortifications were manned with fifteen thousand Federal soldiers. Three days afterwards, Forts

Jackson and St. Philip surrendered to Admiral Porter, who had remained below and prosecuted the siege. The control of the Lower Mississippi, with the metropolis of the South, was thus recovered by the Federal Government.

After Donelson and Shiloh, the Confederates in Kentucky and Tennessee were much disheartened; but they soon rallied from their discouragement, and renewed the struggle. An invasion of Kentucky was planned, and two strong divisions—one led by General Kirby Smith, and the other by General Braxton Bragg—entered the State from East Tennessee. Smith's army pressed forward as far as Richmond, Kentucky, and there, on the 30th of August, attacked the Federals, routing them with heavy losses. Lexington was taken, and then Frankfort; and Cincinnati was saved from capture only by the extraordinary exertions of General Lewis Wallace. The army of General Bragg advanced from Chattanooga to Munfordsville, where, on the 17th of September, he captured a Federal division of four thousand five hundred men.

From this point Bragg pressed on toward Louisville; but General Buell made a forced march from Tennessee, and arrived in that city only one day ahead of Bragg. That one day turned the scale. The Unionists henceforth had the advantage, and the Confederates were turned back. Buell's army was swelled to a hundred thousand men by reinforcements pouring in from the North. The General took the field in the beginning of October, the Confederates retiring before him to Perryville. At this place, on the 8th of the month, Bragg was overtaken, and a severe but indecisive battle was fought. The retreat and pursuit then continued to East Tennessee, the Confederates sweeping out of Kentucky a train of four thousand wagons laden with the spoils of the campaign.

Meanwhile, in September stirring events had occurred in Mississippi. On the 19th of that month a hard battle was fought at Iuka between the Federal Army, under Generals Rosecrans and Grant, and the Confederate force, under General Price. The latter suffered a defeat, losing in addition to his killed and wounded, nearly a thousand prisoners. General Rosecrans now took post at Corinth

with twenty thousand men, while General Grant, with the remainder of the Federal forces, proceeded to Jackson, Tennessee. Perceiving this division of the army, the Confederate Generals, Van Dorn and Price, turned about to recapture Corinth. Advancing for that purpose, they came upon the Federal defenses on the 3d of October. Another hotly contested battle ensued, which ended, after two days of heavy fighting and heavy losses on both sides, in the repulse of the Confederates.

The Mississippi River was now open to the Federals above and below; but in the middle, namely, in the latitude of Tennessee, it was still held with a firm grip by the Confederacy. To relieve this stricture now became the principal end of the Federal endeavors. General Grant removed his head-quarters from Jackson to La Grange. General Sherman was now at Memphis, and it was the purpose of the two Union commanders to cooperate in an effort against Vicksburg. The movement promised to be successful, but, on the 20th of December, General Van Dorn succeeded in cutting Grant's line of supplies at Holly Springs, and obliged him to fall back. General Sherman dropped down the river from Memphis as far as Yazoo, where he effected a landing, and on the 29th of December made an unsuccessful attack on the forts at Chickasaw Bayou. The result was exceedingly disastrous to the Federals, who lost in killed, wounded, and prisoners, more than three thousand men. The enterprise was abandoned, and the defeated army returned to the fleet of gun-boats in the Mississippi.

The military operations of the year in the West were destined to end with the great battle of Murfreesborough. After his successful defense of Corinth, General Rosecrans had been transferred to the command of the Army of the Cumberland. Late in the fall he established his head-quarters at Nashville, and there collected a powerful army. General Bragg, on his retreat from Kentucky, as above narrated, threw his force into Murfreesborough. Thus the two Generals found themselves face to face and only thirty miles apart.

Late in December, Rosecrans moved against his antagonist, and on the evening of the 30th came upon the Confederates strongly posted on

Stone River, a short distance north-west of Murfreesborough. During the night preparations were made on both sides for the impending battle. The plan of attack adopted by Rosecrans contemplated the massing of his forces on the left in such numbers as to crush the Confederate right wing, under Breckinridge, before assistance could be brought from the west side of the river. Bragg's plan of battle was the exact counterpart of that adopted by Rosecrans. Before daylight the Confederates were heavily massed, under Hardee, on the left, and in the early morning the battle began with a furious charge on the



STONEWALL JACKSON.

division of McCook, on the Union right. McCook's appeal for help was at first unheeded by Rosecrans, who did not perceive the real nature of the Confederate onset. After a terrible struggle, which lasted until noonday, the Union right was shattered to fragments and driven from the field. The brunt of the battle next fell on General Thomas, who commanded the Federal right center, and he, too, after desperate fighting, was obliged to fall back to a new position. Here, however, he rallied his forces, and held his ground until General Rosecrans readjusted his line of battle. While this work was going on, the Confederates were barely prevented

from an overwhelming victory by the heroism of the division of General William B. Hazen. With only thirteen hundred men, he stayed the onset until the Federal lines were restored. At nightfall more than seven thousand Union soldiers were missing from the ranks.

General Rosecrans, however, was by no means disposed to yield the victory. During the night preparations were made to renew the battle on the morrow. On New-Year's morning General Bragg found his antagonist firmly posted, with shortened lines and every disposition for fight. The day was spent in indecisive skirmishing and artillery firing at long range. Early on the morning of the 2d the conflict broke out anew on the east side of Stone River, and for some hours there was terrific cannonading in that quarter. At three o'clock in the afternoon the Confederates were massed against the Union left, and the Nationals were driven across the river by the shock. At this juncture, however, the Federal artillery posted on the hills west of the stream opened a destructive fire on the assailing columns. At the same time the Federals rallied to the charge, turned upon their pursuers, and in one tremendous onset drove them from the field, with a loss of thousands. General Bragg had lost the prize. During the night he withdrew his broken columns through Murfreesborough, and retreated in the direction of Tullahoma. The Union loss in the two battles was two thousand five hundred and thirty-three killed, seven thousand two hundred and forty-five wounded, and nearly three thousand prisoners. That of the Confederates amounted in killed, wounded, and prisoners to between ten and eleven thousand men. 3/2 1/2 1/2

In the meantime, a great campaign had been in progress in the East, in its preparations more extensive and in its results more destructive than anything which had been witnessed west of the Alleghenies. The Army of the Potomac had not been idle, and other divisions of the Union and Confederate forces had converted Virginia into a battle-field. The first stirring movements of the year were in the valley of the Shenandoah. Desiring to occupy this important district, the Federal

Government sent forward a strong division under General N. P. Banks, who pressed his way southward, and in the last days of March occupied the town of Harrisonburg. On the other side, General Stonewall Jackson was sent with a force of twenty thousand men to cross the Blue Ridge and cut off Banks's retreat. At Front Royal, on the Shenandoah, just before the gap in the mountains, the Confederates came upon a body of Federals, routed them, and captured their guns, and all the military stores in the town.

Banks had succeeded in passing with his main division to Strasburg, where he learned of the disaster at Front Royal, and immediately turned on his retreat down the valley. Jackson pursued him hotly, and it was only by the utmost exertions that the Federals gained the northern bank of the Potomac.

It was now the turn of the Confederate leader to find himself in peril. General Fremont, at the head of a strong force of fresh troops, had been sent into the valley to intercept the retreat of the Confederates. Jackson was now obliged to save himself and his army. With the utmost celerity he receded up the valley and reached Cross Keys before Fremont could attack him. Even then the battle was so little decisive that Jackson pressed on to Port Republic, where he fell upon the division of General Shields, defeated it, and retired from his brilliant campaign to join in the defense of Richmond. It was the first of those rapid and successful movements which revealed the military genius and daring of Stonewall Jackson. Meanwhile, on the 10th of March, the Grand Army of the Potomac, numbering nearly two hundred thousand men, thoroughly disciplined and equipped, and commanded by General McClellan, set out from the camps about Washington on a campaign against the Confederate Capital. It had all

the time been the theory of the National Government that the capture of Richmond was the principal object to be attained in the war. It was only after many and severe reverses, after the rise of a new group of commanders, and a better apprehension of the nature of the conflict, that the theory was changed, and the Confederate armies, rather than the seat of their Government, became the objective in the plans of the Union Generals.

McClellan's advance proceeded to Manassas



GEORGE B. MCCLELLAN

Junction, the Confederates falling back and forming new lines of defenses on the Rappahannock. At this stage of the campaign, however, McClellan changed his plan, and embarked a hundred and twenty thousand of his men for Fortress Monroe, with a view to proceeding from that point up the peninsula between the James and York Rivers. The transfer of the troops occupied the time to the 4th of April, when the Union Army left Fortress Monroe for Yorktown. The latter place was held by a garrison of ten thousand

Confederates, under General Magruder, and yet with so small a force McClellan's advance was delayed for a whole month. It was one of the military peculiarities of the Union General to overestimate the forces of his enemy, and to display undue caution in his presence. At last, on the 4th of May, Yorktown was taken by siege, and the Federal Army moved forward to Williamsburg, where the Confederates made a second stand, but were defeated with severe losses. Four days afterwards a third engagement occurred at West Point, at the confluence of the Mattaponi and the Pamunkey. Here the Confederates were again overwhelmed and driven

ports, laden with supplies for the Army of the Potomac.

McClellan now advanced on Richmond, and when but seven miles from the city was attacked, on the 31st of May, by the Confederates in full force, at a place called Fair Oaks, or Seven Pines. Here for two days the battle raged, till, at last, the Confederates were driven back. The Union victory, however, was by no means decisive. The Confederate loss was greatest, amounting to nearly eight thousand in killed and wounded, while that of the Federals was in excess of five thousand. General Joseph E. Johnston, Commander-in-Chief of the Confederates, was severely wounded, and his place at the head of the army was filled by the appointment of General Robert E. Lee, a man whose military genius from this time to the close of the war was ever conspicuous. He became the chief stay of the Confederacy until the day of its final collapse at Appomattox.

After the battle of Fair Oaks there was a lull in the fighting for a short time, and McClellan determined to change his base of supplies from the White House, so-called, on the Pamunkey River, to some suitable point on the James. The movement was hazardous in the last degree. Nor was it fairly begun until General Lee, discovering the purpose of his antagonist, swooped down on the right wing of the Union army at Oak Grove, and another hard-fought battle ensued, without decisive results. On the following day a third dreadful engagement occurred at Mechanicsville, and this time the Federals won the field. But on the following morning Lee renewed the struggle at a place called Gaines's Mill, and came out victorious. On the 28th, there was but little fighting. On the 29th, McClellan's army, still in motion for the change of base, was twice attacked—in the forenoon at Savage's Station, and in the afternoon in the White Oak Swamp—but the divisions defending the rear-guard of the army were able to keep the Confederates at bay.


On the 30th of the month was fought the desperate but indecisive battle of Glendale, or Frazier's Farm. On that night the Federal army reached Malvern Hill, on the north bank of the James, twelve miles below Richmond. McClellan had thus receded about five miles



ROBERT EDWARD LEE

back. The way now lay open to Richmond as far as the Chickahominy, ten miles north of the city. The Union Army reached that stream without further resistance, and crossed at a place called Bottoms Bridge.

While this movement was in progress, General Wood, commandant of Fortress Monroe, had, on the 10th of May, led an expedition against Norfolk and recaptured that town from the Confederates. The garrison withdrew on the Union General's approach, and marched off to join in the defense of Richmond. On the following day the iron-clad *Virginia* was blown up, to save her from capture by the Federals. The James River was thus opened for the ingress of the National trans-



BATTLE OF MALVERN HILL.

COPYRIGHT 1867, BY H. H. FURNISH.

in a circuitous direction from the Confederate Capital. His position at Malvern Hill was strong, being under the protection of the Federal gun-boats in the river. General Lee, however, determined, if possible, to carry the place by storm. On the morning of the 1st of July the whole Confederate army was pushed forward to the assault. Throughout the day the struggle for the possession of the high grounds was furious in the last degree. Not until nine o'clock at night did Lee's shattered columns fall back exhausted. For seven days the roar of battle had been heard almost without cessation. No such dreadful scenes had ever before been enacted on the American Continent.

McClellan was clearly victorious at Malvern Hill, and in the judgment of after-times might have at once made a successful advance on Richmond. Lee's army was shattered, and McClellan was still superior in numbers. Nor could it be doubted that the Union army, now inured to fighting, was ready and able to continue the struggle. Its commander, however, chose, as usual, the less hazardous course. On the 2d of July he retired with his army to Harrison's Landing, a few miles down the river. The great campaign was really at an end. The Federal army had lost on the advance from Yorktown to this point, in its progress, fully fifteen thousand men, and the capture of Richmond, the great object for which the expedition had been undertaken, seemed further off than ever. The losses of the Confederates had been heavier than those of the Union army, but all the moral effect of a great victory remained with the exultant South.

General Lee, perceiving that Richmond was not likely to be further molested, immediately formed the design of invading Maryland, and capturing the Federal Capital. The Union troops between Richmond and Washington, numbering about fifty thousand men, were under command of General John Pope. They were in scattered detachments at various points from Fredericksburg to Winchester and Harper's Ferry. Lee moved forward about the middle of August, and Pope began at once to concentrate his forces as rapidly as possible. On the 20th of the month he put the Rappahannock between his army and the advancing

Confederates. Meanwhile, General Banks, while attempting to form a junction with Pope, was attacked by Stonewall Jackson, at Cedar Mountain, where nothing but desperate fighting saved the Federals from a complete rout.

While Pope was still engaged in gathering his army into one place, Jackson passed him with his division, on a flank movement, reached Manassas Junction, and captured the men and stores at that place. Pope, with great audacity, now threw his army between the two divisions of the Confederates, hoping to crush Jackson before Lee could come to the rescue. On August the 28th and 29th, there was terrible but indecisive fighting at Manassas Junction, on the old Bull Run battle-ground, and at Centerville. At one time it appeared that Lee's army would be completely defeated, but the reinforcements which Pope expected, a strong division under General Fitz John Porter, did not reach the field in time, and Pope was defeated. On the 31st of the month, the Confederates bore down on the Union army at Chantilly, fought all day, and won a victory. Generals Stevens and Kearney were among the thousands of brave men who fell from the Union ranks in this battle. On that night Pope withdrew his shattered columns as rapidly as possible, and took refuge within the defenses of Washington. He immediately resigned his command, and his forces, known as the Army of Virginia, were consolidated with the Army of the Potomac, which had now been recalled from the peninsula below Richmond, and General McClellan was placed in supreme command of all the divisions about Washington. Thus ended in dire disaster what is known as the Peninsular Campaign.

After his successes, both defensive and offensive, General Lee pressed on to the Potomac, crossed that river at the Point of Rocks, and on the 6th of September captured Frederick. On the 10th, Hagerstown was taken; and on the 15th, Stonewall Jackson came upon Harper's Ferry, and frightened the commandant, Colonel Miles, into a surrender, by which the garrison, nearly twelve thousand strong, became prisoners of war. On the previous day there was a hard-fought engagement at South Mountain, in which the Federals, commanded by Generals Hatch and Doubleday, were victorious. McClellan's whole army was

now in the immediate rear of Lee, who, on the night of the 14th, fell back to Antietam Creek, and took a strong position in the vicinity of Sharpsburg.

On the following morning there was sharp but desultory fighting between the Union and Confederate cavalry. In the afternoon the Federal advance, coming in on the Sharpsburg road from Keedysville, received the opening volleys from the Confederate guns along the Antietam; but night came on, and the conflict was postponed. With the morning there was great activity of preparation in both armies. Later in the day the corps of General Hooker, who commanded on the Federal right, was

thrown across the stream which separated the combatants, and brought into a favorable position for action. In this quarter of the field, the Confederate left, under command of General Hood, was assailed and driven back a few miles in the direction of Sharpsburg. The rest of the day was spent in an irregular cannonade. During the night, General Mansfield's corps crossed the Antietam, and joined Hooker.

On the morning of the 17th both armies were well in position, the Federals being strongest in number, and the Confederates having the advantage of an unfordable stream in their front. It was of the first importance that General McClellan should gain and hold the four stone bridges by which only his forces could be thrown to the other side. General Burnside, who was ordered to take the lower bridge, cross over and attack the division of A. P. Hill, encountered unexpected delays, and was retarded in his movements. On the right, Hooker renewed the battle at sunrise, and until late in the afternoon the conflict raged with almost unabated fury. Here fell the valiant General Mansfield and thousands of his comrades. At last Burnside forced the lower

crossing, and carried the battle far up in the direction of Sharpsburg; but the Confederates, being reinforced from other parts of the field, made a rally, and the Federals were driven back nearly to the Antietam. It was only by terrible fighting that Burnside succeeded in holding his position on the west bank of the stream; but on the approach of darkness the greater part of the Union Army had gained a safe lodgment between the river and Sharpsburg. The Confederate forces still held nearly the same ground as in the morning, and it seemed that the final struggle was reserved for the morrow.

On that day, however, General McClellan



STONEWALL JACKSON IN BATTLE.

acted on the defensive. It was another of those fatal delays for which the military career of that General was unfortunately noted. During the 18th two strong divisions of reinforcements, under Generals Humphreys and Couch, arrived, and it was resolved to renew the attack on the following morning. But in the meantime General Lee, wiser than his antagonist, had availed himself of the delay, withdrawn his shattered legions from their position, and recrossed the Potomac into Virginia. The great conflict, which had cost the Union Army an aggregate of ten thousand men, had ended in a drawn battle, in which there was little to be praised except the heroism of the soldiery. To the Confederates,

however, the result was equivalent to defeat. The promised uprising of the people of Maryland in behalf of the Confederate cause did not occur, and General Lee was obliged to give up a fruitless and hopeless invasion, which, in the short space of a month, had cost him about twenty-five thousand men. On the other side, the expectations which had been inspired by the movements and despatches of the Union commander previous to the battle had been sorely disappointed.


It was late in October before General McClellan, following the retreating Confederates,

to the protest of the President and the Cabinet, altered his plans, and chose Alexandria as his base of operations. From this point it was proposed to go forward by way of the Orange Railroad through Culpepper to Gordonsville, and thence by the Virginia Central to its junction with the line reaching from Fredericksburg to Richmond.

The whole month of October, however, was wasted with delay, and November was well begun before the Federal General, with his army of a hundred and twenty thousand men, announced himself ready for the forward movement. On the 7th of the month, just as the Union commander, according to his despatches, was about to begin the campaign, he was superseded and his command transferred to General Burnside. Right or wrong, the President at last reached the decision that General McClellan was a man overcautious and slow, too prudent and too much absorbed in preliminaries, to lead the armies of the Republic to victory.

The plan of the campaign was now immediately changed. Burnside decided to form a new base of supplies at the mouth of Aquia Creek, fifty-five miles below Washington, and from that point to force his way, by battle, southward through Fredericksburg; but again the movements were much delayed, and that, too, when everything depended on celerity. A fortnight was lost in preparations for crossing the Rappahannock. General Lee thus found abundant time to discover the plan of his antagonist, and to gather his army on the heights in the vicinity of Fredericksburg. He chose not seriously to dispute the passage of the Union army across the river; but rather allowed the Federals, with little molestation, to take their place on the right bank of the Rappahannock.

On the 11th of December, the Union army



STRUGGLE AT THE BRIDGE OF ANTIETAM

again entered Virginia and reached Rectortown. The temper of the National Government was still aggressive, and it was hoped that before the coming of winter the army might again be thrown forward against Richmond. The Union commander still preferred to advance by the route which he had taken the previous spring, making his base of supplies at West Point, on the Pamunkey. But this plan was objected to by the Administration, on the ground that Washington City would thus be again uncovered and exposed to a counter invasion on the part of the Confederates. McClellan yielded

was brought into position, with its several divisions stretching from the village of Falmouth to a point opposite the mouth of the Massaponax, about three miles below. The pontoons were laid in front of the corps of General Franklin, who held the Federal left, and by this means the army was transferred, without serious opposition. In other parts, the Confederate sharpshooters disputed the laying of pontoon bridges, and the crossing of the Federal was considerably delayed. But by the nightfall of the 12th the army had been safely transferred to the other side of the river.

On the morning of the 13th of December a general battle began on the left, where Franklin's division was met by that of Stonewall Jackson. At the first, a charge made by General Meade was successful, and a gap was opened in the Confederate lines, but the movement was not sustained. The Confederates rallied, and the Federals were driven back with a loss of more than three thousand men. Jackson's loss was almost as great, and in this part of the field the result was indecisive. But not so in the center and on the right. Here a portion of General Sumner's men were ordered forward against the Confederates, impregnable posted on a height called Marye's Hill. They were mowed down by thousands and hurled back in confusion, while the defenders of the heights hardly lost a man. Time and again the assault was recklessly renewed. A part of Hooker's corps, led by General Humphreys, came forward, charged with unloaded guns, and in fifteen minutes one-half of the four thousand brave fellows went down. Nor was the useless carnage ended until night came and closed the conflict.

General Burnside, rashly patriotic and almost out of his wits, would have renewed the battle, but his division commanders finally dissuaded him, and on the night of the 15th the Federal army was silently withdrawn across the Rappahannock. The Union losses in this terrible conflict amounted to a thousand five hundred killed, nine thousand one hundred wounded, and sixteen hundred and fifty prisoners and missing. The Confederates lost in killed five hundred and ninety-five, four thousand and sixty-one wounded, and six hundred and fifty-three missing and prisoners. Of all the important movements of the war, only that

of Fredericksburg was undertaken with the probability of success. Under the plan of battle, if plan it might be called, nothing could be reasonably expected but repulse, rout, and ruin. Thus, in gloom, disaster, and humiliation, ended the great Virginia campaigns of 1862.

It is now clear, in the light of the retrospect, that had the war continued for another year with the same general results and tendencies, the Confederacy must have succeeded. The revolution which had been attempted would have been accomplished and the American Union dissolved. It was now the aim and determination of the Confederate Government and of the military leaders to hold out, if possible, against the superior resources of



the North until they should compel the National Government to yield the contest. The war itself had now grown to unheard-of proportions. The Southern States were draining every source of men and means in order to support their armies. The superior energies of the North, though by no means so nearly exhausted, were greatly taxed. In the previous year, on the day after the battle of Malvern Hill, President Lincoln had issued a call for three hundred thousand additional troops. During the exciting days of Pope's retreat from the Rappahannock, he sent forth another call for three hundred thousand, and to this was soon added a requisition for a draft of three hundred thousand more. Most of these enormous demands were promptly met, and it became evident, in the spring of 1863, that

in respect to resources the Federal Government was vastly superior to the Confederacy, and to this element of strength and encouragement was added the recollection of the great Union success which had attended the National armies in the campaigns of the West.

It was on the first day of January, 1863, that President Lincoln issued one of the most important documents of modern times—the EMANCIPATION PROCLAMATION. The war had been begun and waged thus far with no well-defined intention on the part of the Government to free the slaves of the South. President Lincoln himself had said in his public papers that he would save the Union *with* slavery if he could, but *without* it if he must. Meanwhile, however, both the Administration and the Republican party throughout the country had come to look with greater and still greater disfavor on the institution of slavery. During the progress of the war, the sentiment of abolition had grown with great rapidity in the North, and among the soldiers in the field. When at last it became a military necessity to strike a blow at the labor-system of the Southern States, the step was taken with but little hesitancy or opposition. The preliminary proclamation of freedom to the slaves had been issued by the President in September of the previous year. In the paper which he sent forth on that occasion, he warned the people of the Southern States, that unless they laid down their arms and returned to their allegiance to the National Government, he would, at the expiration of ninety days, issue a proclamation of freedom to the bondmen. His warning was of course met with disdain on the part of the South, and the Emancipation Proclamation was accordingly issued. Thus, after an existence of two hundred and forty-four years, the institution of African slavery in the United States was swept away.


The military movements of the new year began on the Mississippi. General Sherman, though defeated at Chickasaw Bayou, was by no means idle. After that event he formed a plan for the capture of Arkansas Post, on the Arkansas River. At the very beginning of the year an expedition was sent out for that purpose, the land forces being under command of General John A. McClernand, and a flotilla under Admiral David Porter. The Union

forces entered Arkansas, and reached their destination on the 10th of the month. After a hard-fought battle with the Confederates, a Union victory was gained, and on the next day Arkansas Post surrendered, with nearly five thousand prisoners. As soon as the work was accomplished, the expedition was headed for Vicksburg, in order to cooperate with General Grant in a second effort to capture that stronghold of the Confederacy.

A second time the Union army was collected at Memphis, and embarked on the Mississippi. A landing was effected at Yazoo, but the capture of the city from that direction was found to be impracticable. The first three months of the year were spent by General Grant beating about the half-frozen bayous, swamps, and hills around Vicksburg, in the hope of gaining a position in the rear of the town. A canal was cut across a bend in the river, with a view to turning the channel of the Mississippi and opening a passage for the gun-boats, but a flood in the river washed out the works, and the enterprise ended in failure. Then another canal was begun, but was presently abandoned. Finally, in the beginning of April, it was determined at all hazards to run the fleet past the Vicksburg batteries. On the night of the 16th the boats were made ready, and silently dropped down the river. It had been hoped that in the darkness they might pass unobserved; but all of a sudden the guns burst forth with terrible discharges of shot and shell, pelting the passing steamers; but they went by with comparatively little damage, and found a safe position below the city.

Gratified with his success, Grant now marched his land forces down the right bank of the Mississippi, and formed a junction with the squadron. On the 30th of April he crossed the river at Bruinsburg, and on the following day fought and defeated the Confederates at Fort Gibson. The evacuation of Grand Gulf at the mouth of Big Black River followed immediately afterwards, and the Union army swept freely around to the rear of Vicksburg.

On the 12th of May a strong Confederate division was encountered at Raymond, and after a severe engagement, was repulsed. At this time General Johnston was on the march from Jackson to reinforce the garrison at



FEDERAL GUNBOATS PASSING VICKSBURG.

Vicksburg. Grant's right wing, under Sherman and McPherson, encountered Johnston's advance on the 14th of the month, and a severe battle was fought. The Confederates were defeated, and the city of Jackson was captured by the Unionists. By these successes General Grant obtained possession of the communications between Vicksburg and the interior, and General Pemberton, who commanded the Confederate army in the city, was cut off. He must now either repel the Federal army or be cooped up in Vicksburg. He accordingly sallied out with the greater part of his forces, and on the 16th met the Union army at Champion Hills, on Baker's Creek. Here another battle was fought, and still another at Black River. In both of these the Federals were decisively victorious. It only remained for Pemberton to fall back with his disheartened forces within the fortifications of Vicksburg. The city was immediately invested.

On the 19th of May General Grant attempted to storm the Confederate works, but the attack which he made on that day was repulsed with great losses. Three days afterwards the attempt was renewed, but the assailants were again hurled back, with still greater destruction of life. In these two unsuccessful assaults the Union losses amounted to nearly three thousand men. Grant perceived that Vicksburg could not be taken by storm, and began a regular siege, which was pressed with ever increasing rigor. It was not long until the garrison was placed on short rations, and then a condition of starvation ensued. Still, Pemberton held out for more than a month, and it was not until the 4th of July that he was driven to surrender. By the act of capitulation, the defenders of Vicksburg, nearly thirty thousand strong, became prisoners of war. Thousands of small arms, hundreds of cannon, and vast quantities of ammunition and warlike stores were the other fruits of this great Union victory, by which the National Government gained more and the Confederacy lost more than in any other previous struggle of the war. It was a blow from which the South never recovered.

The command of the Department of the Gulf had now been transferred from General Butler to General Banks, and the latter was conducting a vigorous campaign on the Lower

Mississippi. Early in January he set out from his headquarters at Baton Rouge, advanced into Louisiana, reached Brashear City, and gained a decisive victory over the Confederate force at a place called Bayou Teche. He then returned to the Mississippi, moved northward to Port Hudson, invested the place, and began a siege. The beleaguered garrison, under General Gardner, made a stout defense, and it was not until the 8th of July, when the news of the fall of Vicksburg was brought to Port Hudson, that the commandant, with his force of more than six thousand men, was obliged to capitulate. It was the last of those successful movements by which the Mississippi was freed from Confederate control, and opened throughout its whole length to the operations of the Union Army. The strategy and battles by which the great river had been recovered reflected the highest honor upon the military genius of General Grant. From this time forth the attention and confidence of the people of the North were turned to him as the military leader whose sword was destined to point the way to the final triumph of the National cause.

It was at this epoch of the war that the feature of cavalry raids became, on both sides, an important element of military operations. Perhaps the initiation of such movements may be referred to Stonewall Jackson's campaign down the Shenandoah Valley, in the summer of 1862. Later in the same year, after the battle of Antietam, the Confederate General, J. E. B. Stuart, commanding the cavalry wing of the Army of Northern Virginia, made a dash with a troop of eighteen hundred cavalymen into Pennsylvania, reached Chambersburg, captured the town, made a complete circuit of the Army of the Potomac, and returned in safety to Virginia. Just before the investment of Vicksburg, Colonel Benjamin Grierson, of the Sixth Illinois Cavalry, struck out with his command from LaGrange, Tennessee, entered Mississippi, traversed the State to the east of Jackson, cut the railroads, destroyed much property, and after a rapid course of more than eight hundred miles, gained the river at Baton Rouge. By these raids the border country of both sections was kept in perpetual agitation and alarm. With the progress of the war, such movements be-

came more and more injurious. The commanders and soldiers in the same learned to perfection the art of destroying the resources of the enemy. Their destructive skill was directed chiefly to the annihilation of railroads. This work became a new military art,

division of the Confederate General Forrest, was surrounded, captured, and sent to Libby prison. In the latter part of June, Rosecrans resumed activities, and by a series of flank movements succeeded in crowding General Bragg out of Tennessee into Georgia. The



GRANT AND PEMBERTON.—CAPITULATION OF VICKSBURG.

Copyright, 1867, O. M. Dunham.

and so skillful) were the raiders that miles on miles of track and road-bed were destroyed in a single day.

After the battle of Murfreesborough, General Rosecrans remained for a season inactive. Late in the spring the command of Colonel Streight made a raid into Georgia, met the

Union General pressed after, and took post at Chattanooga, on the left bank of the Tennessee.

During the summer months Bragg was heavily reinforced by Johnston, from Mississippi, and Longstreet, from Virginia. On the 19th of September he turned upon the Federal



TEARING UP A RAILWAY

army at Chickamauga Creek, in the north-west angle of Georgia. During the first day a hard battle was fought, but night fell on the scene with the victory undecided. Under cover of darkness the Confederates were strongly reinforced by the arrival of General Longstreet, who was stationed with his army on the left wing of Bragg. The Confederate right was commanded by General Polk, while the center was held by Ewell and Johnston. The Federal left was commanded by General Thomas, the center by Crittenden, and the right by McCook. The plan of the Confederate commander was to crush the Union line, force his way through the gap in Missionary Ridge, capture Rossville and Chattanooga, and annihilate Rosecrans's army.

The battle was renewed at half-past eight o'clock on the morning of the 20th, the Confederates coming on in powerful masses, and the Federals holding their ground with unflinching courage. After the conflict had continued for some hours, with varying successes, the National battle-line was opened by General Wood, acting on mistaken orders. Longstreet, who was over against this part of the line, seeing his advantage, thrust forward a heavy column into the gap, cut the Union army in two, and drove the shattered right wing in utter rout from the field. The brunt of the battle now fell on General Thomas, who, with a desperate firmness hardly equaled in the annals of war, held the left until nightfall, and then, under cover of darkness, withdrew into Chattanooga, where the defeated army of Rosecrans found shelter. The Union losses in this dreadful battle amounted, in killed, wounded, and missing, to nearly nineteen thousand, and the Confederate loss was equally appalling.

The victorious Bragg now pressed forward to the siege of Chattanooga. The Federal lines of communication were cut off, and for a while the army of Rosecrans was in danger of total destruction. But General Hooker arrived with two army corps from the Army of the Potomac, opened the Tennessee River, and brought relief to the besieged. It was at this juncture that General Grant was promoted to the chief command of the Western armies, and assumed the direction of affairs at Chattanooga. Nor was there ever a time in the

course of the war when the change of commanders was immediately felt in so salutary a measure. General Sherman arrived at Chattanooga with his division, and the Army of the Cumberland was so strengthened that offensive operations were immediately renewed.

The left wing of the Confederate Army now rested on Lookout Mountain, and the right on Missionary Ridge. The position was seemingly impregnable, and it required a courage almost equal to hardihood on the part of the Union commander to attack his antagonist. General Bragg was not only confident of his ability to hold his lines against any advance



GEORGE H. THOMAS.


that might be made, but even contemplated the storming of Chattanooga. But the position of the parties, their attitude towards each other, was destined to be suddenly reversed.

On the 20th of November, Bragg gave notice to General Grant to remove all non-combatants from Chattanooga, as the town was about to be bombarded; but to this the Union General paid no attention. On the contrary, General Hooker, on the 23d of the month, was thrown with his corps across the river below Chattanooga, where he gained a footing at the mouth of Lookout Creek, facing the mountain. From this position he was

ordered to hold himself in readiness to make an assault on the following morning. Hooker was supported by Generals Geary and Osterhaus, and the remainder of the Union army was kept in a state of activity, in order to prevent the Confederates from sending reinforcements to Lookout Mountain.

At the beginning of the engagement a dense fog hung like a hood over the heights, effectually concealing the movements of the Federals. The charge began between eight

of the mountain the troops sprang forward with irresistible energy. It was such a scene of dauntless heroism as has rarely been portrayed in the records of battle. The charging columns, struggling against the obstacles of nature, facing the murderous fire of the Confederate guns, could not be checked. The Union flag was carried to the top, and before two o'clock in the afternoon Lookout Mountain, with its cloud-capped summit overlooking the town and river, was swarming with



BATTLE OF LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN.

and nine o'clock, and in the space of two hours the ranges of the Confederate rifle-pits along the foot-hills were successfully carried. It had been General Hooker's purpose to pause when this should be accomplished, but the enthusiasm of his army rose to such a pitch as to suggest the still greater achievement of carrying the whole Confederate position. Taking advantage of the fog and the spirit of his soldiers, Hooker again gave the command to charge, and up the almost inaccessible slopes

Federal soldiers. The routed Confederates retreated down the eastern slope, and across the intervening hills and valleys in the direction of Missionary Ridge. Such was the event of the 24th of November.

General Grant had reserved the main battle for the morrow. During the night of the 24th, General Bragg concentrated his forces, and prepared to defend his position to the last. He now perceived that instead of being the attacking party he was himself to be assailed

with the whole resources of the Federals. On the morning of the 25th, Hooker's victorious troops were ordered to proceed down the slopes of Lookout, cross the Chattanooga, and renew the battle at the south-western terminus of Missionary Ridge. General Sherman had, in the meantime, built pontoon bridges over the Tennessee and the Chickamauga, thrown his corps across those streams, and gained a lodgment on the north-eastern declivity of the Ridge. General Thomas, commanding the Union center, lay with his impatient soldiers on the southern and eastern slopes of Orchard Knob, awaiting the result of Sherman's and Hooker's onsets.

The latter General was slow in striking the Confederates; but at two o'clock in the afternoon the signal of an artillery discharge from Orchard Knob announced the beginning of the assault along the whole line.¹ The command was instantly obeyed. The thrilling scenes of Lookout Mountain were again enacted on a more magnificent scale. The Federal soldiers were ordered by Grant to take the rifle-pits at the foot of Missionary Ridge, and then to pause and re-form for the principal assault; but such was the *elan* of the army, such the impetuosity of its impact, that, after carrying the rifle-pits, the column, of its own motion, pressed forward at full speed, clambering up the slopes and driving the Confederates in a disastrous rout from the summit of the Ridge. No more brilliant operation was witnessed during the whole war. Nor was there any battle of which the results were, on the whole, more decisive. During the night General Bragg withdrew his shattered columns, and fell back in the direction of Ringgold, Georgia. The Federal losses in the two great battles amounted to seven hundred and fifty-seven killed, four thousand five hundred and twenty-nine wounded, and three hundred and thirty missing. The loss of the Confederates in killed, wounded and prisoners reached considerably beyond ten thousand. The conflict was so decisive as to put an end to the war in Tennessee, until it was renewed by General Hood, at Franklin and Nashville, in the winter of 1864.

While these important movements were taking place at Chattanooga, General Burnside was making a strenuous effort to hold East Tennessee. On the 1st of September he had arrived with his command at Knoxville, where he was received by the people with lively satisfaction. East Tennessee had from the first been largely pervaded with Union sentiments. The Federal army had been much recruited by the mountaineers of this region, and the people in general looked forward to the overthrow of the Confederacy as the recovery of their liberties and fortunes. After Chickamauga, General Longstreet was detached from the Confederate army and sent into East Tennessee, to counteract the movements of the Unionists. On his march to Knoxville he overtook and captured several small detachments of Federal troops, then invested the town and began a siege. On the 29th of November, the Confederates made an attempt to carry Knoxville by storm, but were repulsed with heavy losses.

All this time General Grant had looked with the utmost solicitude to the progress of events in East Tennessee, and the Administration had been equally anxious lest the veteran Longstreet should achieve some great success by his campaign. As soon as Bragg fell back from Chattanooga, General Sherman marched to the relief of Burnside; but before he could reach Knoxville, Longstreet prudently raised the siege and retreated into Virginia.

In the meantime, the Confederates had resumed activities in Arkansas and Southern Missouri. In the early part of 1863, strong bodies commanded by Generals Marmaduke and Price, entered this country, and on the 8th of January reached and attacked the city of Springfield. They were, however, repulsed with considerable losses. On the 11th of the month a second battle was fought at the town of Hartsville, with the same results. On the 26th of April, General Marmaduke assaulted the post at Cape Girardeau, on the Mississippi, but the garrison succeeded in driving the Confederates away. On the day of the surrender of Vicksburg, General Holmes, with a force of nearly eight thousand men, made an attack on Helena, Arkansas, but was defeated with the loss of one-fifth of his men. On the 13th of August, in this summer, the town of Law-


¹The reverberations of Grant's six shotted guns from Orchard Knob were the signal of the beginning of the end of the Confederacy.

renez, Kansas, was sacked and burned, and a hundred and forty persons killed by a band of desperate fellows, led by a chieftain called Quantrell. On the 10th of September, the Federal General Steele reached Little Rock, the capital of Arkansas, captured the city, and restored the National authority in the State.

But the greatest raid of the year was reserved for the Confederate General Morgan. He organized a cavalry army, numbering three thousand, at the town of Sparta, Tennessee, and at the head of his column struck out for

in his rear a large force, under General Hobson, pressed hard after.

Morgan now made a circuit through south-eastern Indiana, crossed into Ohio at Harrison, passed to the north of Cincinnati, and then, becoming alarmed, attempted to regain and recross the Ohio. But the river was guarded by gun-boats, and the raiders were driven back. Morgan's forces began to melt away; but he pressed on resolutely, fighting and flying, until he came near the town of New Lisbon, where he was surrounded and captured



ATTACK ON FORT SUMTER

the invasion of Kentucky, Indiana, and Ohio. As he passed through Kentucky he gathered strength. The large Confederate element in that State contributed to his resources in men and means. Morgan reached the Ohio River at Brandenburg, crossed into Indiana, and began his march to the north and east. The Home Guards of the State turned out, but the movement of the Confederate force was so convenient and rapid that it was difficult to check Morgan's progress. He was resisted seriously at Clay City and at other points, and

by the brigade of General Shackelford. For nearly four months Morgan was imprisoned in the Ohio penitentiary. Making his escape from this place, he fled to Kentucky, and finally succeeded in reaching Richmond.

We may now pause to glance at some important movements on the sea-coast. On the 1st of January, General Marmaduke, by a brilliant exploit, captured Galveston, Texas. By this means the Confederates secured a much needed port of entry in the South-west. On the 7th of April, Admiral Dupont, with a

powerful fleet of iron-clads, made an attempt to capture Charleston, but the squadron was driven back much damaged. In the latter part of June the siege of the city was begun anew by a strong land force, under command of General Q. A. Gilmore, assisted by a fleet under Admiral Dahlgren. The Federal army first effected a lodgment on Folly Island, and then on Morris Island, where batteries were planted bearing upon Fort Sumter, Fort Wagner, and Battery Gregg—the latter at the northern extremity of the island.

After the bombardment had continued for some time, General Gilmore, on the 18th of July, made an attempt to carry Fort Wagner by assault, but was repulsed with the loss of more than fifteen hundred men. The siege was resumed and pressed until the 6th of September, when the Confederates evacuated Fort Wagner and Battery Gregg, and retired to Charleston. Gilmore thus obtained a position within four miles of the city, from which he could bombard the wharves and buildings in the lower part of the town. Meanwhile, the walls of Fort Sumter on the side next to Morris Island had been pounded into powder by the land batteries and the guns of the monitors. The harbor and city, however, still remained under the control of the Confederates, the only gain of the Federals being the establishment of a blockade so complete as to seal up the port of Charleston.

We may now turn to the consideration of affairs of the Army of the Potomac. In the spring and summer of 1863 that army, so unfortunate thus far in its career, had been engaged in several desperate conflicts. After his fatal repulse at Fredericksburg, General Burnside was superseded by General Joseph Hooker, who, in the latter part of April, moved forward with his army in full force, crossed the Rappahannock and the Rapidan, and reached Chancellorsville. Here, on the evening of the 2d of May, he was attacked by the veteran army of Northern Virginia, led by Lee and Jackson. The latter General, with extraordinary daring, put himself at the head of a division of twenty-five thousand men, filed off from the battle-field, outflanked the Union army, burst like a thunder-cloud upon the right wing, and swept everything to destruction. But it was the last of Stonewall's

battles. As night came on, with ruin impending over the Federal army, the great Confederate leader, riding through the gathering darkness, received a volley from his own lines, and fell mortally wounded. He lingered a week, and died at Guinea Station, leaving a gap in the Confederate ranks which no other man could fill.

On the morning of the 3d the battle was renewed with great fury. The Union right wing was restored, and the Confederates were checked in their career of victory. General Sedgwick, however, attempting to reinforce Hooker from Fredericksburg, was defeated and driven across the Rappahannock. The Union Army was crowded between Chancel-




JOSEPH HOOKER

lorsville and the river, where it remained in the utmost peril until the evening of the 5th, when General Hooker succeeded in withdrawing his forces to the northern bank. The Union losses in these terrible battles amounted, in killed, wounded, and prisoners, to about seventeen thousand, while that of the Confederates was less than five thousand. So far as the eastern field of action was concerned, there was never a time when the Union cause appeared to greater disadvantage, or the Confederate cause more likely to succeed. The campaign, taken as a whole, had been the most disastrous of any in which the Federal Army had as yet been engaged.

The defeat of Hooker, however, was to

some extent mitigated by the successful ten thousand men, tearing up the Virginia Central Railway, and dashing on to the Chickahominy. He succeeded in cutting General Lee's communications, swept around



BATTLE OF CHANCELLORSVILLE—JACKSON'S CHARGE.

Copyright 1897 O. M. Dunham.

within a few miles of Richmond, and on the 8th of May recrossed the Rappahannock in safety. To this time also belongs the successful defense of Suffolk, on the Nansemond River, by General Peck, against a siege conducted by General Longstreet. The Confederates retreated from the scene of action on the very day of the Union disaster at Chancellorsville.

Great was the elation of the Confederates on account of their successes on the Rappahannock. General Lee now determined to carry the war into Maryland and Pennsylvania. In the first week of June he threw forward his whole army, crossed the Potomac, and captured Hagerstown. On the 22d of the month he entered Chambersburg, and then pressed on through Carlisle, to within a few miles of Harrisburg. The militia of Pennsylvania was hurriedly called out, and thousands of volunteers came pouring in from other States. General Hooker, still in command of the Army of the Potomac, pushed forward to confront his antagonist. It was evident that a great and decisive battle was at hand. General Lee rapidly concentrated his forces near the village of Gettysburg, capital of Adams County, Pennsylvania, while the Union Army was likewise gathered on the highlands beyond the town. On the very eve of battle the command of the Army of the Potomac, and of all the Federal forces, was transferred from General Hooker to General George G. Meade, who hastily drew up his army through the hill country in the direction of Gettysburg. After two years of indecisive warfare, it now seemed that the fate of the war, and perhaps of the American Republic itself, was to be staked on the issue of a single battle.

On the morning of the 1st of July the Union advance, led by Generals Reynolds and Beauford, moving westward from Gettysburg, encountered the Confederate division of General A. P. Hill, coming upon the road from

Hagerstown, and the struggle began. In the afternoon both divisions were strongly reinforced, and a severe battle was fought for the possession of Seminary Ridge. In this initial conflict the Confederates were victorious, and the Union line was forced from its position through the village and back to the high grounds on the south. Here, at nightfall, a stand was made, and a new battle-line was formed, reaching from the eminence called Round Top, where the left wing of the Union



GEORGE G. MEADE.

army rested, around the crest of the ridges to Cemetery Hill, where the center was posted, and thence to Wolf Hill, on Rock Creek. The position was well chosen and strong, and the whole Union army, with the exception of Sedgwick's corps, was hurried forward into place during the night. The Confederate forces were likewise brought into position on Seminary Ridge and on the high grounds to the left of Rock Creek, forming thus a semicircle about five miles in extent. The cavalry of both armies hung upon the flanks, doing

effective, but hardly participating in the main conflicts of the center.

On the morning of July 24 the battle was begun by General Longstreet on the Confederate right. That commander moved forward with impetuosity, and fell upon the Union left, under General Sickles. The struggle in this part of the field was for the possession of Great and Little Round Tops, and after terrible fighting, which lasted until six o'clock in the evening, these strong positions remained in

it was found that, on the whole, the position of the two armies had not been materially changed by the conflict, although nearly forty thousand Union and Confederate dead and wounded already bore evidence of the portentous character of the battle.

A general view of the field and of the situation showed that the National forces were wisely acting on the defensive. The Confederate army was making an invasion. It had come to a wall, and must break through or



BATTLE OF GETTYSBURG.

the hands of the Federals. In the center the battle was also severe, lasting for the greater part of the day, and being waged for the mastery of Cemetery Hill, which was the key to the Federal position. Here, too, notwithstanding the desperate assaults of the Confederates, the integrity of the National line was preserved till nightfall. On the Union right the Confederate onset was more successful, and that wing of the Federal army, under General Slocum, was somewhat shattered. But by ten o'clock at night, when the fighting had ceased,

suffer defeat. The burden of attack was therefore upon Lee's army, and from this he did not flinch. In the darkness of night both Generals made strenuous preparations for the renewal of the struggle on the morrow; but with the morning both seemed loath to begin. Doubtless both were well aware of the critical nature of the conflict. The whole nation, indeed, discerned that the crisis of the Civil War had been reached, and that, perhaps, before sunset the issue would be decided for or against the American Union.

The whole forenoon of the 3d of July was spent in preparations. There was little fighting, and that but desultory. At midday there was a lull along the whole line. Then burst forth the fiercest cannonade ever known on the American Continent. Until after two o'clock the hills and surrounding country were shaken with the thunders of more than two hundred heavy guns. The Confederate artillerymen concentrated their fire on the Union center, at Cemetery Hill, and this place became a scene of indescribable uproar and death. The Union batteries, under direction of General Hunt, drew back beyond the crest, in order to cool the guns, and also for economy of ammunition. The consequent slackening of fire was construed by the Confederates as signifying that their cannonade had been successful; and then came the crisis. The cannonade ceased. A Confederate column, numbering nearly twenty thousand, and about three-fourths of a mile in length, headed by the Virginians, under General Pickett, moved forward for the final and desperate charge against the Union center.

It was doubtless the finest military spectacle ever witnessed west of the Atlantic; but the onset was in vain, and the brave men who made it were mowed down with terrible slaughter. The head of the Confederate column reached the Union line, but there sank into the earth. Then the whole was hurled back in ruin and rout. Victory hovered over the National army, and it only remained for Lee, with his broken legions, to turn back towards the Potomac. The entire Confederate loss in this, the greatest battle of the war, was nearly thirty thousand; that of the Federals, in killed, wounded, and missing, twenty-three thousand one hundred and eighty-six. It was strongly hoped by the Government that when the Confederate charge was broken and the retreat begun, General Meade would be able to spring forward from his position and perhaps complete the war by destroying the forces of his antagonist before they could recross the river; but the condition of the Union army would not permit of such a movement. General Lee accordingly withdrew his forces into Virginia, and the Federals took up their old position along the Potomac and the Rappahannock. Such were the more important military movements of 1863.

Meanwhile, other difficulties had accumulated like mountains around the Administration. The war debt was piling up to infinity. At the time it was not so clearly seen as it was afterwards that the war must soon end or National bankruptcy ensue. The last call for volunteers had not been fully met, and there were not wanting those in portions of the North who purposely impeded the gathering of new forces. The anti-war party became more bold and open, and denounced the measures of the Government. On the 3d of March, 1863, a CONSCRIPTION ACT was passed by Congress, and two months afterwards the President ordered a general draft of three hundred thousand men. All able-bodied citizens between the ages of twenty and forty-five were subject to the requisition.

The measure furnished fuel for the fires which the anti-war party had kindled in the North. Bitter denunciations of the Government and its policy were heard in the Border States, and in some places the draft-officers were forcibly resisted. On the 13th of July a serious crisis was reached in New York. A vast mob rose in arms in the city, demolished the buildings which were occupied by the Provost Marshals, burned the Colored Orphan Asylum, attacked the police, and killed about a hundred people, most of whom were negroes. For three days the authorities of the city were set at defiance. On the second day of the reign of terror, Governor Seymour arrived and addressed the mob in a mild-mannered way, promising that the draft should be suspended, and advising the rioters to disperse. But they gave little heed to his admonition, and went on with the work of destruction. General Wool, commander of the military district of New York, then took the matter in hand; but even the troops at his disposal were at first unable to overawe the insurgents. Some volunteer regiments, however, came trooping home from Gettysburg. The Metropolitan Police Companies were compactly organized, and the insurrection was put down with a strong hand. The news of the fall of Vicksburg and the defeat of Lee at Gettysburg threw a damper on these insurrectionary proceedings, and acts of domestic violence ceased. Nevertheless, the anti-war spirit continued to express itself in parts of the North, and in



PICKETT'S CHARGE AT GETTYSBURG.

order to counteract it, the President, on the 19th of August, issued a proclamation suspending the writ of *habeas corpus* throughout the Union.

One of the lessons of the hour was the insufficiency of the conscription as a method of filling the Union army. That army was composed of volunteers who had espoused the cause of the Government with a tolerably keen sense of the principles involved and a fervid patriotism for the flag of the Union. The introduction, into this great army, of recruits taken by the draft was a process quite foreign to the sentiments of the people. Only about fifty thousand men were added directly to the National forces by conscription. But in other respects the measure was salutary. It was seen that the Government would not scruple, in the last resort, to draw upon the human resources of the country by force. Volunteering was greatly quickened by the draft, and the plan of employing substitutes became generally prevalent in the last year of the war. Such, however, were the terrible losses by battle and disease and the expiration of enlistments, that in October of 1863 the President was constrained to issue another call for three hundred thousand men. At the same time it was provided that any delinquency in meeting the demand would be supplied by a draft in the following January. By these active measures the columns of the Union army were made more powerful than ever. With the approach of winter the disparity between the Union and Confederate forces began to be apparent to the whole world. In the armies of the South there were already symptoms of exhaustion, and the most rigorous conscription was necessary to fill the thin, but still courageous, ranks of the Confederacy. It was on the 20th of June in this year that West Virginia, separated from the Old Dominion, was organized and admitted as the thirty-fifth State of the Union.

We come now to consider those movements by which the war was ended. The military operations of 1864 began, as in the previous year, in the West. In the beginning of February, General Sherman left Vicksburg with the purpose of destroying the railroad connections of Eastern Mississippi. Marching off toward Alabama, he reached Meridian on the


15th of the month, and tore up the tracks of the railways from Mobile to Corinth and from Vicksburg to Montgomery, for a distance of a hundred and fifty miles. Bridges were burned, locomotives and cars destroyed, and vast quantities of cotton and corn given to the flames. General Sherman had expected the arrival at Meridian of a strong force of Federal cavalry, under command of General Smith, advancing from Memphis. The latter made his way into Mississippi, but was met, a hundred miles north of Meridian, by the cavalry army of Forrest and driven back to Memphis. General Sherman, disappointed by this failure, retraced his course to Vicksburg, while Forrest continued his raid northward into Tennessee, where, on the 24th of March, he occupied Union City. He then pressed on to Paducah, Kentucky, where he assaulted Fort Anderson, in the suburbs of the town, but was repulsed, with the loss of three hundred men. He then turned back into Tennessee, and came upon Fort Pillow, on the Mississippi, seventy miles above Memphis. This place was held by five hundred and sixty soldiers, about half of whom were Negroes. Forrest, having gained the outer defenses, demanded a surrender, but was refused. He then ordered an assault, and carried the fort by storm, in the course of which nearly all of the Negro soldiers were slaughtered.

In the spring of 1864 occurred the Red River expedition, conducted by General Banks. The object of the movement was the capture of Shreveport, the seat of the Confederate Government of Louisiana. The plan embraced the advance of a strong land force up Red River, to be supported by a fleet of gunboats under command of Admiral Porter. The army was arranged in three divisions. The first, numbering ten thousand, advanced from Vicksburg, under command of General Smith; the second, led by General Banks in person, proceeded to New Orleans; while the third, under command of General Steele, set out from Little Rock. In the beginning of March, General Smith's division moved forward to Red River, and was joined by Porter with the fleet. On the 14th of the month, the advance reached Fort de Russy, which was taken by assault. The Confederates retreated up the river to Alexandria, and on the 16th

that city was occupied by the Federals. Three days afterwards Natchitoches was occupied. But at this point the road was deflected from the river, and further cooperation between the army and the gun-boats was impossible. The flotilla proceeded up the stream toward Shreveport, and the land forces whirled off in a circuit to the left.

On the 8th of April, when the advance brigades were approaching the town of Mansfield, they were suddenly attacked by the Confederates in full force, and advantageously

difficulty that the flotilla descended the river from the direction of Shreveport, for the Confederates had now planted batteries on the banks. When the Federal retreat had proceeded as far as Alexandria, the movement was again checked by the low stage of the river. The waters had so receded that the gun-boats could not pass the rapids. The squadron was finally saved from its peril by the skill of Colonel Bailey, of Wisconsin. He constructed a dam across the river, raising the water so that the vessels could be floated over,



BAILEY'S DAM ON RED RIVER

posted. A short and bloody battle took place, in which the Federals were completely routed. The victors made a vigorous pursuit as far as Pleasant Hill, where they were met, on the next day, by the main body of the Union army. A second and general engagement here ensued, in which the Federals were only saved from a complete defeat by the hard fighting of the division of General Smith, who covered the retreat to the river. Nearly three thousand men, twenty pieces of artillery, and the supply trains of the Federal army were lost in these disastrous battles. It was with

The whole expedition broke to pieces, and returned as rapidly as possible to the Mississippi. When General Steele, who had, in the meantime, advanced from Little Rock toward Shreveport, heard of the Federal defeats, he withdrew, after several severe encounters with the Confederates. To the National Government, the Red River expedition was a source of much shame and mortification. General Banks was relieved of his command, and General Canby was appointed to succeed him.

The time had now come when the evolution of military talent consequent upon the

war reached its climax in the ascendancy of General Ulysses S. Grant. By degrees, through every kind of hardship and contumely, that commander had emerged from the obscurity which surrounded him at the beginning of the conflict, and stood forth, in silence and modesty unparalleled, as the leading figure of the times. After Vicksburg and Chattanooga, nothing could stay his progress to the command-in-chief. Congress responded to the spirit of the country by reviving the high grade of *Lieutenant-General*, and conferring it on Grant. This brought with it the appointment, by the President, on the 2d of March, 1864, to the command-in-chief of the land and naval forces of the United States. No fewer than seven hundred thousand Union soldiers were now to move at his command. The first month after his appointment was spent in planning the great campaigns of the year. These were two in number. The Army of the Potomac, under immediate command of Meade and the General-in-chief, was to advance upon Richmond, still defended by the army of Northern Virginia, under Lee. At the same time General Sherman, commanding the army at Chattanooga, now numbering a hundred thousand men, was to march against Atlanta. It was defended by the Confederates, under General Johnston. To these two great movements all other military operations were to be subordinated. Grant sent his orders to Sherman for the grand movement which was destined to end the war, and the 1st of May, 1864, was fixed as the date of the advance.

On the 7th of that month General Sherman moved forward from Chattanooga. At Dalton he was confronted by the Confederate army, sixty thousand strong. After some maneuvering and fighting, he succeeded in turning Johnston's flank, and obliged him to

fall back to Resaca. Two hard-fought battles occurred at this place, on the 14th and 15th of May, in which the Union army was victorious, and the Confederates obliged to retreat by way of Calhoun and Kingston to Dallas. At the latter place, on the 28th of the month, Johnston made a second stand. He intrenched himself and fought valiantly, but was again outnumbered and outflanked, and compelled to fall back to Lost Mountain. From this position also he was forced, on the 17th of June, after three days of desultory fighting.

The next stand of the Confederates was made on the Great and Little Kenesaw Mount-



GRANT WRITING ORDERS TO SHERMAN FOR THE GRAND ADVANCE

ains. From this line, on the 22d of June, the division of General Hood made a fierce attack on the Union center, but was repulsed with heavy losses. Five days afterwards General Sherman attempted to carry Kenesaw by storm. The assault was made with great audacity, but ended in a dreadful repulse and a loss of nearly three thousand men. Sherman, undismayed by his reverse, then resumed his former tactics, outflanked his antagonist, and on the 3d of July compelled him to retreat across the Chattahoochee. By the 10th of the month the whole Confederate army had been forced back within the defenses of Atlanta.

A siege immediately ensued. Atlanta was a place of the greatest importance to the Con-

federacy. Here were located the machine-shops, foundries, car-works and depôts of supplies, upon the possession of which so much depended. The Confederate Government had, in the meantime, become dissatisfied with the military policy of General Joseph E. Johnston. That cautious and skillful commander had adopted the plan of falling back before the superior forces of Sherman, of contracting his lines, and of maintaining, by a sort of Fabian policy, the destinies of the campaign. But



JAMES B. McPHERSON.

this method was not pleasing to the authorities at Richmond, and when Atlanta was besieged Johnston was superseded by the rash but daring General J. B. Hood. It was the policy of the latter to fight at whatever hazard. On the 20th, 22d, and 28th of July, he made three desperate assaults on the Union lines around Atlanta; but was repulsed in each engagement with dreadful losses. It was in the beginning of the second of these battles that the brave General James B. McPherson, the bosom

friend of Generals Grant and Sherman, and the pride of the Union army, was killed while reconnoitering the Confederate lines. In the three conflicts just referred to, the Confederates lost more men than Johnston had lost in all his masterly retreating and fighting between Chattanooga and Atlanta.

The siege of the latter city was now pressed with great vigor. Sherman tightened his grip from day to day. At last, by an incautious movement, Hood separated his army; the Union commander thrust a column between the two divisions, and the immediate evacuation of Atlanta followed. On the 2d of September, Sherman's army marched into the captured city. Since leaving Chattanooga, the Federals had lost in killed, wounded, and missing fully thirty thousand men, and the Confederate losses were even greater. By retiring from Atlanta, however, Hood, though he lost the city, saved his army. He now formed the plan of striking boldly northward into Tennessee, with the hope of compelling Sherman to evacuate Georgia. But the latter had no notion of losing his vantage ground, and after following Hood north of the Chattahoochee, he turned back to Atlanta.

Hood swept on through Northern Alabama, crossed the Tennessee River at Florence, and advanced on Nashville. General Thomas, with the Army of the Cumberland, had in the meantime been detached from Sherman's army and sent northward to confront Hood. General Schofield, who commanded the Federal forces in the southern part of the State, fell back before the Confederates and took post at Franklin, eighteen miles south of Nashville. Here, on the 30th of November, he was attacked by Hood, whom, after a hard-fought battle, he held in check until nightfall, when he escaped across the river and retreated within the defenses of Nashville. At the latter place, General Thomas rapidly concentrated his

forces. A line of intrenchments was drawn around the city on the south. Hood came on, confident of victory, and prepared to begin the siege by blockading the Cumberland; but before the work was fairly begun, General Thomas, on the 15th of December, moved out from his works, fell upon the Confederate army, and routed it, with a loss of killed, wounded, and prisoners of fully twenty-five thousand men. For many days of freezing weather, Hood's shattered and disorganized columns were pursued until at last the remnant found refuge in Alabama. The Confederate army was ruined, and the rash general who had led it to destruction was relieved of his command.


On the 14th of November, General Sherman burned Atlanta, and began his famous MARCH TO THE SEA. His army of veterans numbered sixty thousand men. Believing that Hood's army would be destroyed in Tennessee, and knowing that no Confederate force could withstand him in front, he cut his communications with the North, abandoned his base of supplies, and struck out boldly for the sea-coast, more than two hundred and fifty miles away.

Neither Sherman himself nor General Grant had any definite plan as to the terminus of the campaign; but the one had self-reliance, and the other was calmly confident of the result. The country also had come to know its leaders and to trust them in every hazard. When Sherman left Atlanta, and was lost to sight in the forests of Georgia, he was followed by the unwavering faith of the Nation.

As had been foreseen, the Confederates could offer no successful resistance to his progress. The Union army swept on through Macon and Milledgeville; reached the Ogeechee, and crossed in safety; captured Gibson and Waynesborough; and on the 10th of December arrived in the vicinity of Savannah.

On the 13th, Fort McAllister, below the city, was carried by storm by the division of General Hazen. On the night of the 20th General Hardee, the Confederate commandant, escaped from Savannah with fifteen thousand men, and retreated to Charleston. On the following morning the National advance entered, and on the 22d General Sherman made his head-quarters in Savannah. On his march from Atlanta he had lost only five hundred and sixty-seven men.

The month of January, 1865, was spent by the Union army in the city. On the 1st of February, General Sherman, having garrisoned the place, began his march against



SHERMAN'S MARCH TO THE SEA.

Columbia, the capital of South Carolina. To the Confederates the further progress of the invasion through the swamps and morasses of the State had seemed impossible. Now that the veteran legions were again in motion, alarm and terror pervaded the country. Governor Magrath had already summoned to the field every white man in the State between the ages of sixteen and sixty; but the requisition was comparatively ineffectual. Nevertheless, the Confederates formed a line of defense along the Salkehatchie, and prepared to dispute Sherman's march northward. It was all in vain. The passages of the river were forced, and on the 11th of the month the Confederate lines of communication be-

tween Charleston and Augusta was cut off. On the next day Orangeburg was taken by the Seventeenth Corps. On the 14th the fords and bridges of the Congaree were carried, and the State road opened in the direction of Columbia. Several divisions pressed rapidly forward; bridges were thrown across the Broad and Saluda Rivers, and the capital lay at the mercy of the conquerors. On the morning of the 17th Mayor Goodwin and a committee of the Common Council came out in carriages, and the city was formally surrendered.

As soon as it became certain that Columbia must fall into the hands of the Federals, General Hardee, commandant of Charleston, determined to abandon that city also, and to join Generals Beauregard and Johnston in North Carolina. Accordingly, on the day of the capture of the capital, guards were detailed to destroy all the warehouses, stores of cotton, and dépôts of supplies in Charleston. The torch was applied, the flames raged, and consternation spread throughout the city. The great dépôt of the North-western Railway, where a large quantity of powder was stored, caught fire, blew up with terrific violence, and buried two hundred people in the ruins. Not until four squares in the best part of the city were laid in ashes, was the conflagration checked. During the same night, General Hardee, with his fourteen thousand troops, escaped from desolated Charleston, and made his way northward. On the morning of the 18th the news was borne to the National forces of James and Morris Islands. In the forenoon the Stars and Stripes were again raised over Forts Sumter, Ripley, and Pinckney. Mayor Muelbeth surrendered the city to a company which was sent up from Morris Island. The work of saving whatever might be rescued from the flames was at once begun, the citizens and Federal soldiers working together. By strenuous exertions, the principal arsenal was saved; a dépôt of rice was also preserved, and its contents distributed to the poor. Colonel Stewart L. Woodford, of New York, was appointed military Governor of the city; and relations more friendly than might have been expected were soon established between the soldiery and the people.

Columbia was, next after Atlanta, the

great arsenal of the Confederacy. Here were the machine-shops and foundries so necessary to the South in the prosecution of the war. Sherman gave orders for the destruction of all public property, and then immediately renewed his march northward. The course of the Union army now lay towards Charlotte, North Carolina. The National forces swept on without opposition as far as Wimsborough, where a junction was effected with the Twentieth Corps, under Shocum. Crossing the Great Pedee at Cheraw, Sherman pressed on towards Fayetteville, where he arrived without serious hinderance, and on the 11th of March took possession of the town.

Meanwhile, on the 8th of the month, an exciting episode of the campaign had been supplied by a dashing battle between Generals Hampton's and Kilpatrick's cavalry forces. To Hampton had been assigned the duty of defending the rear of Hardee's column on the retreat from Charleston. Resolving to intercept him, Kilpatrick cut through the Confederate lines. But the next morning the Union officer was surprised in his quarters, attacked and routed, himself barely escaping on foot into a swamp. Here, however, he suddenly rallied his forces, turned on the Confederates, and scattered them in a brilliant charge. Hampton also made a rally and returned to the onset. But Kilpatrick held his ground, until he was reinforced by a division of the Twentieth Corps under General Mitchell, when the Confederates were finally driven back. Kilpatrick then conducted his forces, without further molestation, to Fayetteville, where the other divisions of Sherman's army had already arrived.

After the overthrow of Hood, in Tennessee, General Johnston had at length been recalled to the command of the Confederate forces. His influence on the destinies of the campaign now began to be felt in front of Sherman. The advance of the Union army was rendered more difficult by the vigilance of the Confederate General. At Averasborough, on Cape Fear River, a short distance north of Fayetteville, General Hardee made a stand, but was repulsed with considerable loss. On the 19th of March, when Sherman was incautiously approaching Bentonville, the advance was furiously assailed by the Confederates, and

the Union army, after all its battles and victories, seemed for awhile in danger of defeat. But the brilliant fighting of the division of General Jefferson C. Davis saved the day,

the end of the great march, and here General Sherman met his antagonist, and entered into negotiations, not only for the surrender of the Confederate army, but also—and most unfor-



MEETING OF SHERMAN AND JOHNSTON

and two days afterwards Sherman entered Goldsborough unopposed. Here he was joined by a strong column from New Berne, under General Schofield, and another from Wilmington, under General Terry. The Federal army now turned to the north-west, and on the 13th of April entered Raleigh. This was

fortunately—for a general settlement of civil affairs in the South.

We have now followed the Union army in the West, on its great march from Chattanooga to Atlanta, from Atlanta to Savannah, from Savannah to Columbia, from Columbia to the final scene at Raleigh. While these decisive events were taking place, the famous cavalry raid of General Stoneman was in progress. About the middle of March, he set out from Knoxville, at the head of six thousand men. The expedition crossed the mount-

ains; Wilkesborough was captured, and Stoneman forced his way across the Yadkin, at Jonesville. It had been the plan of the campaign that the Union cavalry should make a diversion in favor of Sherman, by penetrating the western districts of South Carolina. But that commander, by the celerity of his movements, had already reached Goldsborough, in the North State, and was in no need of Stoneman's help. The movement of the latter, therefore, became an independent expedition, the general object being the destruction of public property, the capture of Confederate stores, and the tearing up of railways.

Turning to the North, the Union troopers



DAVID G. FARRAGUT

now traversed the western end of North Carolina, and entered Carroll County, Virginia. At Wytheville the railway was torn up, and then the whole line was destroyed from the bridge over New River to within four miles of Lynchburg. Christiansburg was captured, and the track of the railway obliterated for ninety miles. The expedition next turned to Jacksonville; thence southward; and then struck and destroyed the North Carolina Railroad between Danville and Greensborough. The track in the direction of Salisbury was torn up, and the factories at Salem burned. At Salisbury was located one of the great Confederate prisons for captured soldiers. It had been the aim

of Stoneman to overpower the Confederates and liberate the prisoners; but the latter were removed before the arrival of the Union cavalry. The town, however, was captured, and a vast store of ammunition, arms, provisions, clothing, and cotton fell into the hands of the raiders.

On the 19th of April, a division of Stoneman's force, under Major Moderwell, reached the great bridge by which the South Carolina Railway crosses the Catawba River. This magnificent structure, eleven hundred and fifty feet in length, was set on fire and completely destroyed. After a fight with Furgeson's Confederate cavalry, the Federals turned back to Dallas, where all the divisions were concentrated, and the raid was at an end. During the progress of the expedition, six thousand prisoners, forty-six pieces of artillery, and immense quantities of small arms had fallen into the hands of Stoneman's men. The amount of property destroyed, and the damage otherwise done to the tottering Confederacy, could not be estimated.

Greater still in importance were the events which had occurred on the Gulf and the Atlantic coast. In the beginning of August, 1864, Admiral David G. Farragut bore down with a powerful squadron upon the defenses of Mobile. The entrance to the harbor of that city was commanded, on the left, by Fort Gaines, and on the right by Fort Morgan. The harbor itself was defended by a Confederate fleet and the monster iron-clad ram *Tennessee*. On the 5th of August, Farragut prepared for battle, and ran past the forts into the harbor. In order to direct the movements of his vessels, the old Admiral mounted to the maintop of his flag-ship, the *Hartford*, where he was lashed to the rigging. From that high perch he gave his commands during the battle. One of the Union ships struck a torpedo and went to the bottom. The rest attacked and dispersed the Confederate squadron; but just as the day seemed won, the terrible *Tennessee* came down at full speed to strike and sink the *Hartford*. The latter avoided the blow, and then followed one of the fiercest conflicts of the war. The Union iron-clads closed around their black antagonist, and battered her with their beaks and fifteen-inch bolts of iron, until she surrendered. Two days

afterwards Fort Gaines was taken, and on the 23d of the month, Fort Morgan was obliged to capitulate. The port of Mobile was thus effectually sealed up to the Confederates.

Not less important to the Union cause was the capture of Fort Fisher. This powerful fortress commanded the entrance to Cape Fear River and Wilmington—the last sea-port held by the Confederate States. In December, 1864, Admiral Porter was sent, with the most powerful American squadron ever afloat, to besiege and take the fort. General Butler, with a force of six thousand five hundred men, accompanied the expedition.

The armament came before Fort Fisher, and on the day before Christmas began a bombardment. Troops were sent ashore to carry the works by storm. But when General Weitzel, who led the column, came near enough to the fort to reconnoiter, he decided that an assault could only end in the destruction of his army. General Butler also came to the same conclusion, and the enterprise was abandoned. Admiral Porter, however, remained before the fort with his fleet, while the land forces, under Butler, returned to Fortress Monroe. The outcome of the expedition was humiliating to the National authorities, and early in January *the same troops* were sent back to Wilmington, under General Terry. The siege was at once renewed by the combined army and fleet, and on the 15th of the month Fort Fisher was carried by storm. It was the last sea-port held by the Confederates, and their outlet to the sea was thus forever closed.

The control of Albemarle Sound had been obtained in the previous October. The work was accomplished by a daring exploit of Lieutenant Cushing, of the Federal navy. The Sound was at the time commanded by the tremendous Confederate iron ram, called the *Albatross*. Cushing undertook to destroy the dreaded vessel. With a number of daring volunteers he embarked on a small steamer, and on the night of the 27th of October entered the Roanoke. The ram lay at the harbor of Plymouth. The approach was made with great difficulty. Cushing, however, managed to get alongside, and with his own hands sank a terrible torpedo under the Confederate ship, exploded it, and left the ram a ruin. The brave adventure cost the lives or capture of

all of Cushing's party, except himself and one other who escaped. A few days afterwards the town of Plymouth was captured by the Federal troops.

During the progress of the war the commerce of the United States had suffered dreadfully from the attacks of Confederate cruisers. As early as 1861 the Confederate Congress had authorized privateers to prey upon the commerce of the United States. But since the independence of the Confederacy was not acknowledged, neutral nations would not permit privateers to bring their prizes into port. The act authorizing the work was therefore of little direct benefit to the Confederacy, but of great injury to the United States.


The first Confederate ship sent out was the *Savannah*, which was captured on the same day that she escaped from Charleston. In June of 1861 the *Santee*, commanded by Captain Raphael Semmes, ran the blockade at New Orleans, and for seven months wrought havoc with the Union merchantmen on the high seas. But in February of 1862, Semmes was chased into the harbor of Gibraltar, where he was obliged to sell his vessel and discharge his crew. In the previous October the Confederate ship *Nashville* ran out from Charleston, went to England and returned with a cargo worth \$3,000,000. In March of 1863, she was sunk by a Union iron-clad in the mouth of the Savannah River.

In course of time the coast of the Southern States was so completely blockaded that Confederate war-vessels could no longer be sent abroad. Another plan, therefore, had to be adopted to maintain the Confederate cruisers. In the emergency, the emissaries of the South sought the ship-yards of Great Britain, and from that vantage-ground began to build and equip their privateers. In spite of all remonstrances, the British Government connived at this proceeding, and here was laid the foundations of that difficulty which was destined to cost the treasury of England \$15,000,000. It was in the harbor of Liverpool that the privateer *Florida* was fitted out. Sailing from thence, in the summer of 1862, she succeeded in running into Mobile Bay. Escaping from that port in the following January, she destroyed fifteen Union merchantmen; was then captured in the harbor of

Bahia, Brazil, and was brought into Hampton Roads, where, by an accidental collision, she was sent to the bottom. Meanwhile, the *Georgia*, the *Olinde*, the *Shenandoah*, and the *Chickamauga*, all built at the shipyards of Glasgow, Scotland, escaped to sea, and made great havoc with the merchant-ships of the United States. When Fort Fisher was captured, the *Chickamauga* and another ship called the *Tallahassee*, were blown up by the Confederates. The *Georgia* was captured in 1863,

States, she never once entered a Confederate port, but continued on the high sea, capturing and burning.

Early in the summer of 1864, Semmes sailed into the harbor of Cherbourg, France, and was followed thither by Captain John A. Winslow, commander of the steamer *Kearsarge*. The French Government gave orders to Semmes to leave the port, and on the 19th of June he sailed out to give his antagonist battle. Seven miles from the shore, the two



DESTRUCTION OF THE ALBEMARLE

and the *Shenandoah* continued abroad until the close of the war.

But by far the most destructive of all the Confederate vessels was the famous *Alabama*, built at Liverpool. Her commander was Captain Semmes, the same who had cruised in the *Santee*. A majority of the crew of the *Alabama* were British subjects. Her armament was entirely British, and whenever occasion required, the British flag was carried. In her whole career, involving the destruction of sixty-six vessels, and a loss of ten million dollars to the merchant-service of the United

ships closed for the death struggle, and after a desperate battle of an hour's duration, the *Alabama* was shattered and sunk. Semmes and a part of his officers and crew were picked up by the English yacht *Dorchaund*, which had come out from the harbor to witness the battle, were carried to Southampton, and set at liberty.

We have now considered the military movements of 1864-65, in all parts of the field except at the center. We turn, then, to the critical and final campaigns of the Army of the Potomac, and of those divisions of the

National forces immediately associated therewith. After the great battle of Gettysburg, the shattered Confederate columns under General Lee were withdrawn into the Shenandoah Valley. He was followed by the Union cavalry under the command of General Gregg, who pressed after the Confederates, and at Shepherdstown gained some advantage over the division of General Fitzhugh Lee. General Meade himself, with the main body of the Army of the Potomac, entered Virginia near Berlin, and moved forward through Lovettsville to Warrenton. The Blue Ridge was thus again interposed between the two armies. It was the hope of Meade to preëccupy and hold the passes of the mountains, and to strike his antagonist a fatal blow when he should attempt to return to Richmond. But Lee's movements were marked with his usual caution and sagacity. He first made a feint of crowding his army through Manassas Gap, and succeeded in drawing thither the bulk of the Federal forces to contest the passage. He then, by a rapid march southward, gained Front Royal and Chester Gap, swept through the pass, and reached Culpeper in safety. General Meade, sorely disappointed in his expectations of a battle, advanced his army and took up a position on the Rappahannock.

A lull now ensued from July to September. Both the Union and Confederate armies were much weakened by the withdrawal of large numbers of troops to take part in the struggles of the South-west. From Lee's army Longstreet's whole corps had been detached for the aid of Bragg, who was hard pressed by Rose-

crans in Tennessee. Perceiving that his antagonist was weakened, General Meade crossed the Rappahannock, pressed Lee back to the south bank of the Rapidan, and himself occupied Culpeper. Soon, however, Howard's and Slocum's corps were withdrawn from the Army of the Potomac, and Meade, in his turn, was obliged to act on the defensive. But his ranks were rapidly filled with reinforcements,



“THE MAN ON HOB-BACK.”

and by the middle of October he was again strong enough to move forward. Lee had already assumed the offensive, and, by skillful movements, had succeeded in throwing his army on the Union flank. Then began the old race for the Potomac, and in that the Federals were successful, Meade reached Brístow Station in safety, and took up a strong position on the Heights of Centerville. Lee, in

turn, still back, and the two armies at last came to rest for the winter, the one at Culpeper and the other on the upper Rappahannock.

In the following spring no movement took place in this part of the field until the arrival of General Grant as Commander-in-chief. He took his station at the head of the Army of the Potomac; but retained General Meade in immediate command. The campaign which now ensued was one of the most memorable in history, and the story thereof has been reserved

in-chief, were to begin the final struggle with the veterans of Lee.

On the first day of the advance, Grant crossed the Rapidan and entered the Wilderness. It was a country of oak-woods and thickets, west of Chancellorsville. The Union army was immediately confronted and attacked by the Confederates. Through the 5th, 6th, and 7th of May the fighting continued incessantly, with terrible losses on both sides; but the results were indecisive. Lee retired within his intrenchment, and Grant made a flank



BATTLE OF SPOTSYLVANIA COURT-HOUSE.

for the closing narrative of the war. The forward movement of the Army of the Potomac was coincident with the advance of Sherman in the West. From the 1st of May, 1864, the Union anaconda began to tighten in folds ever more rigorous around the breaking body of the Confederacy. On the 3d of the month, the National camp at Culpeper was broken up, and the march on Richmond was begun. In three successive summers the Union army had been beaten back from that metropolis of the Confederacy. Now a hundred and forty thousand men, led by the General-

movement on the left in the direction of Spotsylvania Court House. Here followed, from the morning of the 9th to the night of the 12th, one of the bloodiest struggles of the war. The Federals gained some ground, and the division of General Johnson was captured. But the losses of Lee, who fought on the defensive, were less dreadful than those of his antagonist.

Meanwhile General Grant had detached Sheridan from the Army of the Potomac, and sent him on a cavalry raid around the left flank of Lee's army, and against Richmond.

The movement was executed with all the celerity and zeal for which Sheridan had now become famous. After crossing the North Anna he succeeded in retaking from the Confederates a large detachment of Union prisoners. On the 10th of May he was confronted at a place on Yellow Tavern by the command of General J. E. B. Stuart, and a fiery cavalry battle ensued, in which the Confederates were defeated with considerable losses, including General Stuart himself, who was mortally wounded on the field.

After Spottsylvania, Grant moved on to the left, crossed the Pamunkey to Hanover-town, and came to a place called Cold Harbor, twelve miles north-east of Richmond. Here, on the 1st of June, he made an attack on the Confederate lines, but was repulsed with heavy losses. On the morning of the 3d the assault was renewed, and in the brief space of a half hour nearly ten thousand Union soldiers fell dead or wounded before the Confederate intrenchments. The repulse of the Federals was complete, but they held their lines as firmly as ever.¹

Since the beginning of the campaign the losses of the Army of the Potomac, including the corps of Burnside, had reached the enormous aggregate of sixty thousand. During the same period the Confederates had lost in killed, wounded, and prisoners about thirty-five thousand men.

Whether or not General Grant conceded at this time the impossibility or, at least, the impracticability of taking Richmond by direct advance and assault from the north, may not be well determined. At any rate he decided

¹ General Grant, in his *Memoirs*, says: "I have always regretted that the last assault at Cold Harbor was ever made. . . . No advantage whatever was gained to compensate for the heavy loss we sustained. Indeed, the advantages, other than those of relative losses, were on the Confederate side."

to change his base of supplies to James River, with a view to the capture of Petersburg and the conquest of Richmond from the south-east.

General Butler had already moved his strong division from Fortress Monroe, and on the 5th of May had taken Bermuda Hundred and City Point, at the mouth of the Appomattox. Advancing against Petersburg, he was met on the 16th by the corps of General Beauregard, and driven back to his position at Bermuda Hundred, where he was obliged to intrench himself and act on the defensive. On the 15th of June, General Grant, then engaged in his change of base, brought his whole army into junction with Butler, and the combined forces moved against Petersburg.



DEATH OF GENERAL STUART.

On the 17th and 18th, several assaults were made on the Confederate intrenchments, but the works were too strong to be carried in that manner. Lee's army was hurried into the defenses, and by the close of June, Petersburg was regularly invested for a siege.

A branch campaign had, in the meantime, been under way in the Shenandoah Valley. On moving forward from the Rapidan, General Grant had despatched Sigel up the valley with a force of eight thousand men. On the 15th of May, while the latter was advancing southward, he was met at New Market, fifty miles above Winchester, by an army of Confederate cavalry, under General Breckinridge. The Union force was attacked and routed, and

the command of the flying divisions was transferred to General Hunter. Brockinridge, believing himself completely victorious in the valley, returned to Richmond, whereupon, Hunter fled about towards Lynchburg, came upon the Confederates at Piedmont, and gained a signal victory. From this place he pressed forward with his own troops and the cavalry force of General Averill, against Lynchburg; but finding himself in peril, he was obliged to

longer avail. The situation, however, was sufficiently alarming. Early, with a force of twenty thousand men, continued his course northward, and on the 5th of July, crossed the Potomac. Four days afterward he met the division of General Lewis Wallace, on the Monocacy, and drove him back with serious losses. But the check, given to the Confederates, by the valor of Wallace and his command, saved Washington and Baltimore from capture. Early dashed up within gunshot of these cities, then ordered a retreat, and on the 12th of the month, led back his forces across the Potomac, with vast quantities of plunder.

General Wright, who was now put in command of the forces in the valley, set out in pursuit of Early, and followed him as far as Winchester. There, on the 24th of July, he struck the Confederate rear, and gained a partial victory. But Early wheeled upon his antagonist, and the Union troops were in turn driven back across the Potomac. Following up his advantage, the Confederate General pressed on into Pennsylvania, burned Chambersburg, and returned into the valley laden with spoils.

General Grant was greatly annoyed with these vexatious raids, and was for a while perplexed to know how he should end them. At length, in the beginning of August, he consolidated the forces on the upper Potomac into a single army, and gave the command to

General Philip H. Sheridan. It was the destiny of this young and brilliant officer to rise grandly above the chaos of the last year of the war, and to contribute greatly, by his military genius, to the final success of the Union cause. The troops now placed under his command numbered nearly forty thousand, and with these he at once moved up the valley.

It was on the 19th of September that Sheridan came upon Early's army at Winchester.



PHILIP H. SHERIDAN

retreat across the mountains into West Virginia. The valley was thus again exposed to a Confederate invasion from the east.

Lee, now hard pressed at Petersburg, immediately despatched General Early, with orders to cross the Blue Ridge, sweep down the valley, invade Maryland, and threaten Washington City. Thus would the Confederate General compel Grant to loosen his grip on Petersburg, in order to save the National Capital. But the menace could no

Here a hard-fought battle ensued, and the Confederates were decisively defeated. Following up his advantage, the Union General a second time overtook his antagonist, and on the 22d of the month, again routed him at Fisher's Hill. The assault, in this instance, was made upon the Confederates in an entrenched position, and the Union victory was complete. Then came one of the saddest episodes of the war, in which the fruitful Shenandoah Valley, one of the few remaining store-houses of the Confederacy, was utterly ravaged. The Commander-in-chief had given Sheridan orders to spare nothing from destruction that might any longer furnish the means of subsistence to the enemy. The ruinous work was fearfully well done, and what with torch, and axe, and sword, there was nothing left between the Blue Ridge and the Alleghenies worth fighting for. Madened by this destruction, and stung by his defeats, the veteran Early now rallied his forces, gathered what reinforcements he could, and once more entered the valley. Sheridan had in the meantime set his army in a strong position

on Cedar Creek, a short distance from Strasburg, and feeling secure in the situation, had gone to Washington. Early had now everything to gain, and the opportunity seemed to offer. On the morning of the 19th of October he cautiously approached the Union camp, surprised, burst in, carried the position, captured the artillery, and sent the routed troops in confusion towards Winchester. The victors pursued as far as Middletown; then believing themselves completely triumphant, paused to eat and rest. Meanwhile, on the previous night, Sheridan had returned to Winchester, and was, at the time of the rout of his army, on his way from that place to the front. While riding forward, he heard the sound of battle, spurred on for twelve miles at full speed, met the panic-struck fugitives, rallied

them at his call, renewed their inspiration by his presence, turned upon the astonished Confederates, and gained one of the most signal victories of the war. Early's army was disorganized and ruined. It was the end of strife in the valley of the Shenandoah.

Having thus cleared the horizon of Virginia, and full of confidence in the success of Sherman's great expedition to the sea, Grant now sat sternly down to the investment of Petersburg. All fall and winter long the siege was pressed with varying success. As early as the 30th of July an attempt had been made to carry the place by storm. A mine was exploded under one of the forts, and an assaulting column sprang forward to gain the defenses. The attack, however, was repulsed,



SHERIDAN'S ARRIVAL AT CEDAR CREEK

with serious losses. Then the siege went steadily forward until the 18th of August, when a division of the Union army seized the Weldon Railroad. The Confederates made several desperate assaults, in the hope of gaining their lost ground; but they were beaten in their struggles, each army losing thousands of men. On the 28th of September, the Federals stormed Battery Harrison, on the right bank of the James, and the next day General Paine's brigade of colored soldiers carried a powerful redoubt on Spring Hill. The 27th of October witnessed a bloody battle on the Boydton road, south of Petersburg. Then the Union army went into quarters for the winter.


The aggressive struggle was not renewed until the close of February. On the 27th of that month, General Sheridan, who had issued

from the Shenandoah Valley, came upon the forces of General Early at Waynesboro'ugh, defeated them, and then joined the Commander-in-chief at Peter-burg. During March, General Grant continued to press the siege, and waited impatiently for the opening of spring, that he might spread his forces, begin the campaign, and envelop Richmond. On the 1st of April the work began with a severe battle at Five Forks, on the South Side Rail-

road, an engagement in which the Confederates were defeated with a loss of six thousand prisoners.

On the following day Grant ordered an

assault along the whole line in front of Peter-burg, and the works were carried. The rim of iron and valor which Lee had so long main-



EXPLOSION OF THE MINE BEFORE PETER-BURG.

ained around the Confederate capital was shattered by the tremendous blow. On that night he, with his army and the members of the Confederate Government, fled from Richmond, and on the next morning that city, as well as Peter-burg, was entered by the Federal army. The warehouses of the ill-fated capital were fired by the retreating Confederates, and, notwithstanding the efforts of the

Union soldiers, the better part of the Southern metropolis was reduced to ruins.

It was the beginning of the swiftly coming end. Now was it perceived by all men that

the catastrophe was at hand, and that the strife could last but a few days longer. General Lee retreated as rapidly as possible to the south-west, hoping to join the army of General Johnston on its emergence from Carolina. But that army was destined never to emerge. The Confederates, flying from Petersburg, joined those on the retreat from Richmond at Amelia Court House. To this place Lee had ordered his supply trains, but the officer having the same in charge had foolishly mistaken his orders and driven the trains in the direction of Danville. Nearly one-half of the Confederate army, now growing hopeless, had to be dispersed through the country to gather supplies by foraging. The 4th and 5th of April, days precious to the sinking heart of Lee, were consumed with the delay.

The victorious Federals meanwhile pressed on in full pursuit, and on the morning of the 6th nearly the whole of the Union army was at Jetersville, on the Danville Railroad, ready to strike the Confederates at Amelia. Sheridan still pressed on by the left flank to the west, in the direction of Deatonsville. Ord came up with his division by way of the South Side Railroad to Burke's Station. Lee fell back to the west from Amelia Court House, and reached Deatonsville; but here he found the vigilant Sheridan planted squarely in his course. The division of Ewell, six thousand strong, was flung against the Federal position, but was hurled back, broken to pieces and captured. The policy of Lee was still to make a detour to the west and south, around the Federal left; and by strenuous exertions he managed to gain the Appomattox at Farmville, crossed to the northern bank, and burned the bridges. He would thus interpose the river as a barrier between himself and his relentless pursuers; but it was all in vain. Hoping against hope, he made a desperate effort to hold the Lynchburg Railroad, but Sheridan was there before him. On the 7th of April the Confederates had their last slight success in battle. For a moment the flame of hope was rekindled only to be blown out in despair. On that day General Grant, then at Farmville, addressed a note to the Confederate commander, expressing a desire that the further effusion of blood might be saved by the sur-

render of Lee's army. To this General Lee replied, by declaring his desire for peace, but adding that the occasion for the surrender of the Army of Northern Virginia had not yet arrived.

On the 8th the process of surrounding and hemming in the Confederates went vigorously forward. On the morning of the 9th, when it became known that the left wing of the Union army had secured the line of the Lynchburg Railroad—when the wrecks of Longstreet's veterans attempting to cover the retreat were confronted and driven back by Sheridan—the soul of the Confederate leader failed him. Seeing the utter uselessness of a further struggle, he sent General Grant a note, asking for a meeting preliminary to a surrender. The Union commander immediately complied with the request. At two o'clock on the afternoon of that day, Palm Sunday, the 9th of April, 1865, the two great Generals met each other in the parlor of William McLean, at Appomattox Court House. There the terms of surrender were discussed and settled. It was agreed that General Grant should put his proposition in the form of a military note, to which General Lee could return a formal answer. The Union commander accordingly drew up and presented the following memorandum:

APPOMATTOX COURT HOUSE, VA.,
April 9, 1865.

GENERAL.—In accordance with the substance of my letter to you of the 8th instant, I propose to receive the surrender of the Army of Northern Virginia on the following terms, to-wit: Rolls of all the officers and men to be made in duplicate; one copy to be given to an officer to be designated by me, the other to be retained by such other officer or officers as you may designate. The officers to give their individual paroles not to take up arms against the Government of the United States until properly exchanged, and each company or regimental commander to sign a like parole for the men of their commands. The arms, artillery, and public property, to be parked and stacked, and turned over to the officers appointed by me to receive them. This will not embrace the side-arms of the officers nor their private horses or baggage. This done, each officer and man will be allowed to return to his home, not to be disturbed by United States authority so long as they observe their paroles and the laws in force where they reside.

U. S. GRANT, Lieutenant-General.



P. MEYER SC.

SURRENDER OF GENERAL LEE

N. P. Meier

ART BY P. MEYER, SC.

To this memorandum General Lee responded as follows:

HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA, April 9, 1865.

GENERAL,—I received your letter of this date, containing the terms of the surrender of the ARMY of Northern Virginia, as proposed by you. As they are substantially the same as those expressed in your letter of the 8th instant, they are accepted. I will proceed to designate the proper officers to carry the stipulations into effect.

R. E. LEE, General.

With the downfall of Lee's army, the collapse of the Confederacy was complete. The destruction of the military power meant the destruction of everything upon which the South had depended. In the narrative of Sherman's march northward from Savannah to Raleigh, we have already recounted the end of that great campaign. The surrender of Johnston followed on the 26th of April, and on the same terms which had been conceded seventeen days previously by Grant to Lee at Appomattox. In the overthrow of their two great armies, the Confederates themselves saw the end of all things. The work was done. After four dreadful years of bloodshed, devastation, and sorrow, the Civil War in the United States had ended with the complete triumph of the Union cause. It only remained to extend the Federal authority over the Southern States, and to revive the functions of the National Government throughout the Union.

After the surrender of Lee and Johnston, there was no serious effort to prolong the resistance, or to reorganize the Confederacy. General Lee bade adieu at once to his war-worn veterans, and retired with shattered fortunes to private life. Mr. Davis and his Cabinet made their escape from Richmond to Danville, and there for a few days kept up the forms of government. From Danville they fled into North Carolina, and were then scattered. The ex-President with a few friends, made his way through South Carolina into Georgia, and encamped near the village of Irwinville. Meanwhile, the Union cavalry in that region were on the alert to make prisoners of the fugitives. The capture was finally effected on the 10th of May, by a division of the command of General

Wilson. It appeared, in the light of the sequel, that the Administration, more particularly President Lincoln, would have concived at the escape of Davis from the United States. But the capture was made, and the distinguished prisoner was on the hands of the Government. He was at once taken as a captive to Fortress Monroe, and was there kept in confinement until May of 1867. He was then removed to Richmond, to be tried on a charge of treason. Soon afterwards he was admitted to bail, Horace Greeley and other eminent Union men going on his bond. The cause remained untried for about a year and a half, and was then dismissed from court. It thus happened that the legal status of that error, fault, or crime, which the Confederate leaders had committed, was never legally determined, but left rather to dangle contentiously in the political sky of after times.

We may now review the course of civil events as they had occurred in the National Government in the last year of the war. In the autumn preceding the downfall of the Confederacy the Presidential election had been held, and Lincoln had been chosen for a second term. As Vice-President, Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee, was elected in place of Hannibal Hamlin. The opposing candidates, supported by the Democratic party, were General George B. McClellan, and George H. Pendleton, of Ohio. There had been a time after the outbreak of the war, when the spirit of party was so much allayed as to warrant the hope that the common cause of Republicans and Democrats would not be further imperiled by political animosity; but partisanship soon flamed up again, and the North became a scene of turmoil. The Democratic leaders grew more and more rampant in their denunciation; first, of the methods upon which the war was conducted; and then, of the war itself. In the Democratic national convention at Chicago a resolution was actually passed as a part of the platform declaring the war a failure, and demanding a cessation of hostilities until the arts of statesmanship should be exhausted in attempting a peaceable solution of the trouble. In General McClellan the party found a candidate to whom both the war Democrats and the anti-war faction could be attached.



GENERAL LEE TAKING LEAVE OF HIS SOLDIERS.

But the whole effort to defeat Lincoln, much less to stop the war, could but end in confusion and failure. Lincoln's majority was very heavy, McClellan carrying only the States of Kentucky, Delaware, and New Jersey. In the summer preceding the election the people of Nevada had, in accordance with an act of Congress, prepared a Constitution, and, on the 31st of October, the new Commonwealth was proclaimed as the thirty-sixth State of the Union. The gold and silver mines of Nevada had developed with such rapidity that they soon surpassed those of California in their yield of the precious metal.

During the progress of the Civil War the question of finance was, after the actual military operations of the field, the most serious with which the Government had to contend. At the outbreak of the conflict, even before the actual outbreak, the financial credit of the United States had sunk to the lowest ebb. By the organization of the army and the navy the expenses of the National Government had, at the very beginning, been swelled to an enormous aggregate. The price of gold and silver, as always happens in such emergencies, advanced so rapidly that the redemption of bank-notes in coin soon became impossible. On the 30th of December, 1861, the banks of New York, and afterwards those of the whole country, suspended specie payments. The premium on gold and silver rose higher and higher, and it soon became evident that those metals could no longer subsolve the purpose of a currency.

The situation was as novel as it was trying. Fortunately, the destinies of the treasury were in the hands of a man of genius. Salmon P. Chase, the Secretary, faced the issue, and began to devise a series of expedients, which, in the course of time, entered into the financial history of the country, and, as they were tested by experience, became imbedded in the National monetary system. Old things rapidly passed away, and all things became new under the Secretary's hands. As a temporary expedient he sought relief by issuing Treasury Notes, receivable as money, and bearing interest at the rate of seven and three-tenths per cent. The expedient was successful; but by the beginning of 1862 the expenses of the Government had risen to more than a million dollars a day, and

other measures, vaster and more permanent, had to be devised.

In order to meet the tremendous demands which were incessantly arising, Congress, on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, made haste to provide an INTERNAL REVENUE. This was made up from two general sources; first, a tax on *manufactures, incomes, and salaries*; and, second, a *stamp duty* on all legal documents. As soon as this system of revenue was provided for, another step was taken in the issuance by the treasury of a hundred and fifty millions of dollars, in non-interest-bearing LEGAL TENDER NOTES of the



SALMON P. CHASE

United States, to be used as money. Such was the beginning of that famous currency, which, under the name of *Greenbacks*, bore up the Nation during the war, survived the shocks of the Revolutionary epoch, and continued, after the subsidence of the conflict, to constitute one-half of the paper money used by the people of the United States.

But the Greenback currency, its issue again and again as the emergencies multiplied, was not of itself sufficient. A third great measure recommended by the Secretary, provided for by Congress, and carried out successfully, was the issuance and sale of UNITED STATES BONDS. These at first were made re-

deemable at any time after five years and under twenty years from date, and were, from this fact, called the FIVE-TWENTY BONDS. The interest upon them was fixed at six per cent, payable semi-annually in gold. The event showed that the clause making the interest payable *in gold*, rather than in the Greenback currency, tended to aggravate the disparity in the value of coin and paper money. But the interests of the bond-purchasers were consulted, and the policy of paying interest in coin was continued. The second series, called the TEN-FORTIES, was next issued, being redeemable by the Government at any time after ten and under forty years from date. The interest on this series was fixed at five per cent, and both principal and interest were made payable in coin. It became the policy of the Government to convert the short-time, high-rate bonds into the long-time, low-rate bonds. As the Five-Twenties became redeemable they were, by the holders, for the most part, converted into Ten-Forties, and when, in course of time, the latter fell due, they were in turn converted into the FOUR PERCENTS, which constituted the third general issue. At last, when the credit of the Government was fully re-established, and its ability demonstrated to discharge its debt to the last farthing, THREE-AND-A-HALF PERCENTS, and finally THREE PERCENTS, were provided for, into which form the great debt was mostly converted.

Meanwhile, the old banks of the United States disappeared. It became necessary to provide for the people something in the place of those local institutions, by means of which the ordinary business of the country must be transacted. An act was accordingly passed for the establishment of NATIONAL BANKS. The constitution of these was peculiar in the last degree. But the event justified the wisdom of the measure. The new financial institutions were born out of the exigency of the times, and their anomalous character must be accounted for by the existing conditions. The Bank Act of May, 1862, provided that, instead of gold, the new banks might use National Bonds as the basis of their currency. It was provided that each bank, on purchasing and depositing with the Treasurer of the United States the requisite amount of bonds,

might receive thereon, from the treasury, ninety per cent, of the valuation of the bonds deposited, in a NATIONAL CURRENCY, such currency to bear the name of the particular bank from which it was to be issued.

The new banks spread rapidly, and in a short time a mixed currency, composed about half and half of the Greenbacks and the National Bank bills, took the place of the old local paper money, which had formerly constituted the bulk of the currency employed by the people. Meanwhile, gold and silver, on account of the high and ever-increasing premiums thereon, disappeared from sight, and all of the financial transactions of the country, great and small, swam henceforth for about seventeen years in an ocean of self-sustaining paper money. The precious metals became an article of merchandise; but their fictitious connection with the national currency constituted a dangerous element of monetary speculation, which the financial jobbers of the country were not slow to discover, and to use with fatal effect. The currency of the National Banks was, as we have said, furnished, and the redemption of the same guaranteed, by the Treasury of the United States. By the measure above described, the means for prosecuting the Civil War were provided. At the end of the conflict, the National Debt proper had reached the astounding sum of nearly three thousand millions of dollars! Nor can it well be doubted that had the war continued through another year national bankruptcy must have ensued.

On the 4th of March, 1865, President Lincoln was inaugurated for his second term. The brief address which he delivered on that occasion was one of the most patriotic and able ever pronounced by a great man in a trying ordeal. He sought by calm and almost affectionate utterances to call back from their rebellious course the infatuated people of the Southern States, exhorting his countrymen, "with malice towards none, with charity for all," to go about the work of healing the Nation's wounds, and restoring political and social fellowship throughout the Union.


It will be remembered that at this time the war, though in its last great throes, was not ended. Within a month, however, the military power of the Confederacy was broken. Three days after the evacuation of Richmond

by Lee's army, the President visited that city, conferred with the authorities, and then returned to Washington. But, in the strange vicissitude of things, the tragedy of his own sad life had already entered its last act. On the evening of the 14th of April he attended Ford's Theater with his wife and a party of friends. As the play drew near its close, a disreputable actor, named John Wilkes Booth, stole unnoticed into the President's box, leveled a pistol at his head, and shot him through the brain. Lincoln fell forward in his seat, was borne from the building, lingered in an unconscious state until the following morning, and died. It was one of the greatest tragedies of modern times—the most atrocious and diabolical murder known in modern history. The assassin leaped out of the box upon the stage, escaped into the darkness, and fled.

It was immediately perceived that a murderous conspiracy had been formed to overthrow the Government by assassination. At the same hour another murderer, named Lewis Payne Powell, burst into the bed-chamber of Secretary Seward, who had been disabled by an accident, sprang upon the couch of the sick man, stabbed him nigh unto death, and made his escape into the night. The city was wild with alarm and excitement. The telegraph flashed the news throughout the land, and a tremor of alarm and rage ran everywhere. Troops of cavalry and the police of Washington departed in all directions to hunt down the conspirators. On the 26th of April, Booth was found concealed in a barn south of Frederickburg. Refusing to surrender, he was shot by Sergeant Boston Corbett, and was dragged forth from the burning building to die. Powell was caught, convicted, and hanged. His fellow-conspirators, David E. Herrold and George A. Atzerott, together

with Mrs. Mary E. Surratt, at whose house the plot was formed, were also condemned and executed. Michael O'Laughlin, Doctor Samuel A. Mudd, and Samuel Arnold were sentenced to imprisonment for life in the Dry Tortugas, and Edward Spangler for a term of six years.


Thus ended in darkness, but not in shame, the strange career of Abraham Lincoln. He was one of the most remarkable men of any age or country—a man in whom the qualities of genius and common sense were strangely mingled. He was prudent, far-sighted, and resolute; thoughtful, calm, and just; patient, tender-hearted, and great. The manner of his death consecrated his memory.



ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT LINCOLN

Thrown by murder from the high seat of power, he fell into the arms of the American people, who laid him down as tenderly as children lay their father on the couch of death. The funeral pageant was prepared on a scale never before equaled in the New World. From city to city, in one vast procession, the mourning people followed his remains to their last resting-place in Springfield. From all nations rose the voice of sympathy and shame—sympathy for his death, shame for the dark crime that caused it.

Lincoln fell at an hour when, to all human seeming, the American people could least spare his services. The great Rebellion of the Southern States was tottering into oblivion, but the restoration of the Union remained to



LAST HOUR OF BOOTH.

Copyright 1867, G. M. Dutton

be accomplished. Who but Lincoln, in such a crisis, was fitted for such a work? His temper, after the overthrow of Lee, showed conclusively the trend of his thoughts and sympathies—his sincere desire for peace, his love for all men of all sections.

The words of mercy were upon his lips,
 Forgiveness in his heart and on his pen,
 When the vile murderer brought swift eclipse
 To thoughts of peace on earth, good-will towards
 men.

The Old World and the New, from sea to sea,
 Uttered one voice of sympathy and shame!
 Sore heart, so stopped when it at last beat free;
 Sad life cut short just as its triumph came!

A deed accursed! Strokes have been struck before
 By the assassin's hand, whereof men doubt
 If more of horror or disgrace they bore;
 But thy foul crime, like Cain's, stands darkly
 out.

Vile hand! that branded murder on a strife,
 Whate'er its grounds, stoutly and nobly strive,
 And with the martyr's crown crownest a life
 With much to praise, little to be forgiven!¹

The death of Lincoln made necessary the immediate elevation of Andrew Johnson to the Presidency. On the day after the assassination he took the oath of office, and entered at once upon his duties as Chief Magistrate. He was


¹ From the London *Punch* of May 6, 1865.

a native of North Carolina, born in Raleigh, on the 29th of December, 1808. His boyhood was passed in poverty and neglect. The family was obscure in the last degree, and the son had no advantages of education. At the age of ten he was apprenticed to a tailor. In 1826 he removed with his mother to Tennessee, and settled at Greenville, in that State. Here he was married to an intelligent lady, who taught him to write and cipher. Here, by dint of native talent, force of will, and strength of character, he first earned the applause of his fellow-men. Here, through toil and hardship, he rose to distinction, and, after holding minor offices, was elected to Congress. As a member of the United States Senate in 1860-61, he opposed secession with all his vehement energies, even after the Legislature of his State had declared Tennessee out of the Union.

On the 4th of March, 1862, Johnson was appointed Military Governor of Tennessee, and entered upon his duties at Nashville. He began his administration and carried out his measures with all the vigor and passion of his

and elected to the Vice-presidency in place of Mr. Hamlin. Now, by the tragic death of the President, he was called suddenly to the assumption of responsibilities, second only in importance to those which Lincoln had borne at the outbreak of the war.

In his first Congressional message President Johnson recommended a policy of extreme severity toward the civil and military leaders of the Confederacy. The merciful tones of Lincoln were no longer heard from the White House, and for a season there was quaking and dread throughout the seceded States. On the 1st of February, 1865, Congress adopted an amendment to the Constitution, by which human slavery was abolished and forbidden in all the States and Territories of the Union. By the 18th of the following December the amendment had been ratified by the Legislatures of twenty-seven States, and was duly proclaimed as a part of the Constitution. The Emancipation Proclamation had been issued as a mil-



TOMB OF LINCOLN AT SPRINGFIELD

nature. There was no quailing, no spirit of compromise. His life was frequently imperiled; but he fed on danger, and grew strong under the onsets of his enemies. He held the office of Governor until 1864, when he was nominated

itary measure, and although the institution of slavery had fallen to pieces at the touch of the pen of Lincoln, it was deemed necessary to complete the work by statutory and Constitutional enactments. Thus were the doctrines

and logical results of the war incorporated forever in the fundamental law of the land.

From the first, the President was confronted with the great questions arising out of the conflict. What, for instance, should be done with the leaders of the Rebellion? On this issue the voice of Lincoln was heard out of the grave. On the 29th of May, 1865, the AMNISTY PROCLAMATION was issued by the President. By its provisions a general pardon was extended to all persons—except those specified in certain classes—who had participated in the organization and defense of the Confederacy.

lina, paraded the streets, and passed the reviewing stand, where the President and principal officers, civil and military, of the United States were on the platform. After this the soldiers, as an organized force, melted rapidly away, and were resolved into the ranks of citizen-ship.

The close of the war left the finances of the Nation in a condition most alarming. The war-debt, already piled mountains high, went on increasing until the beginning of 1866, and it was only by herculean exertions that national bankruptcy could be warded off. The yearly interest on the debt had increased to \$133,000,000 in gold. The expenses of the government had reached an aggregate of \$200,000,000 annually. But the augmented revenues of the Nation and the energy and skill of the financial management of the treasury proved sufficient to meet the enormous outlay, and at last the debt began to be slowly diminished. On the 5th of December, 1865, a resolution was passed in the House of Representatives pledging the faith of the United States to the full payment of the National indebtedness, both principal and interest.

During the whole period of the Civil War the vital interests, not to say the existence, of the United States were constantly menaced by the hostility of foreign powers. Of all the great monarchies of Europe, only Russia had been sincerely and at heart favorable to the cause of the Union. The Government of Great Britain, from first to last, sympathized with the Confederacy—not, indeed, that she was in love with the institution of slavery, but

that she secretly hoped for the dismemberment of the American Republic. Napoleon III., Emperor of the French, cherished plans, not a few, to aid the Confederate States, and to precipitate, if possible, the downfall of the Union. His schemes embraced particularly the institution of a French Empire in Mexico. In that country the distracted condition of affairs furnished abundant opportunities for foreign interference. A French army was sent into Mexico. The constituted authorities were overawed, an Imperial government was organized, and early in 1864 the crown was offered to Maximilian, archduke of Austria. The lat-



ANDREW JOHNSON

The condition of pardon was that those receiving it should take an oath of allegiance to the United States. The excepted persons might also be pardoned on special application to the President.

During the summer of 1865 the great armies were disbanded, and the victors and vanquished returned to their homes to resume the work of peace. One of the most striking scenes ever witnessed in the country was the great military parade and review at Washington City. It was the closing pageant of the war. About seventy-five thousand Union soldiers, including Sherman's army from Caro-



REVIEW OF THE UNION ARMY AT WASHINGTON.

Copyright, 1867, O. M. Dunham.

ter repaired to Mexico, set up his government, and sustained it for a season, with the aid of French and Austrian soldiers. But the Mexican President, Benito Pablo Juarez, headed a revolution against the usurping Maximilian; and the Government of the United States rebuked France for her palpable and willful violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Napoleon, at length, became alarmed, and withdrew his army. Maximilian, thus left without support, was quickly overthrown and driven from the capital. He fled to the city of Queretaro, where he was besieged, and finally taken prisoner. On the 13th of June, 1867, he was tried by court-martial, and condemned to be shot. Six days afterwards the sentence was carried into execution. Maximilian met his fate like a hero. His death and the sad insanity of the Empress Carlotta awakened the commiseration, if not the sympathy, of mankind for the ill-starred enterprise in which the misguided prince had lost his life, and his queen her reason. The scheme of Napoleon, who had hoped to profit by the calamitous civil war in the United States, to gain a foothold in the New World and restore the ascendancy of the Latin race west of the Atlantic, was justly brought to shame and contempt.

After a few weeks of successful operation, the first Atlantic telegraph, laid by Cyrus W. Field in 1858, had ceased to work. The friends of the enterprise were, for a season, greatly disheartened. Not so, however, with Mr. Field, who continued, both in Europe and America, to agitate the claims of his measure and to plead for assistance. He made fifty voyages across the Atlantic, and finally secured sufficient capital to begin the laying of a second cable. The work was begun from the coast of Ireland in the summer of 1865. When the steamer *Great Eastern* had proceeded more than twelve hundred miles on her way to America, the cable parted and was lost. But Mr. Field held on to his enterprise. Six millions of dollars had been spent in unsuccessful attempts, but still he persevered. In July of 1866 a third cable, two thousand miles in length, was coiled in the *Great Eastern*, and again the vessel started on her way. This time the work was completely successful. In a short time the same great vessel returned to mid-ocean, and, recovering the lost cable from


the depths, carried the second line successfully to the American coast. After twelve years of unremitting effort, Mr. Field received a gold medal from the Congress of his country, and the plaudits of all civilized nations.

On the 1st of November, 1864, an act was passed by Congress, establishing the POSTAL MONEY-ORDER SYSTEM of the United States. The design of the measure was to secure a safe and convenient method of transmitting small sums of money through the mails. Notwithstanding the invaluable benefits of the system, it was at first received with little favor. In 1870 there were two thousand and seventy-six post-offices from which money-orders were issued. During that year the amount transmitted was more than thirty-four millions of dollars. The orders for 1875 numbered five million six thousand three hundred and thirty-three, and the amount of money sent amounted to more than seventy-seven millions of dollars. Of all the orders issued during that year, only twenty-seven were paid to persons not entitled to the proceeds. Postal conventions have already been held, and the arrangements completed for the exchange of American money-orders with Switzerland, Great Britain, and Germany. The requirements of civilization will no doubt soon demand similar compacts among all enlightened nations.

The Administration of President Johnson is noted as the time when the Territories of the United States were given approximately their final form. The vast domains west of the Mississippi were reduced by Congressional enactments to proper geographical limits, and were organized with a view to an early admission into the Union as States. A large part of the work had been accomplished during the Administration of Lincoln. In March of 1861, the Territory of Dakota, destined, after twenty-seven years, to become two great States, was detached from Nebraska on the north, and given a distinct political organization. The Territory embraced an area of one hundred and fifty thousand square miles. The State of Kansas had at last, on the 29th of January, 1861, been admitted into the Union, under a constitution framed at Wyandotte. In February of 1863, Arizona, with an area of one hundred and thirteen thousand square miles, was separated from New Mexico on the west, and

organized as an independent Territory. On the 3d of March of the same year, Idaho was organized out of portions of Dakota, Nebraska, and Washington Territories, and on the 26th

miles. On the 1st of March, 1867, the Territory of Nebraska, reduced to its present area of seventy-six thousand square miles, was admitted into the Union as the thirty-seventh State.



DOWN THE YUKON, ALASKA.

of May, 1864, Montana, with an area of one hundred and thirty-six thousand square miles, was cut off from the eastern part of Idaho. By this measure the area of the latter Territory was reduced to eighty-six thousand square

Finally, on the 26th of July, 1868, the Territory of Wyoming, with an area of ninety-eight thousand square miles, was organized out of portions of Dakota, Idaho, and Utah. Thus were the Territories of the great West reduced

of the great forests, as represented in the accompanying plate.

The year 1867 was also signified by the Presidency of Grant. Two years previously this country had been explored by a party of American explorers, in a view of establishing telegraphic communication between the United States and Asia by way of Behring Strait. The report on the expedition showed that Alaska was by far more the worthless country which it had been supposed to be. It was found that the coast fisheries, including the products of the seal-islands, were of very great

value, and that the forests of spruce, pine and yellow cedar were among the most in the world. Negotiations for the purchase of the peninsula were accordingly opened with Russia by Mr. Seward, the American Secretary of State, and on the 30th of March, 1867, a treaty was concluded by which, for the sum of seven million two hundred thousand dollars, Alaska was purchased by the United States. The territory thus added to the domains of the Republic embraced an area of five hundred and eighty thousand square miles, and a population of twenty-nine thousand souls.

CHAPTER CXXV.—EPOCH OF RECONSTRUCTION.



VERY soon after his accession to the Chief Magistracy, serious disagreements arose between President Johnson and the two Houses of Congress. The difficulty grew out of the great question of reorganizing the Southern States. Strangely enough, the particular point in dispute was the theoretical one as to the relation which those States had sustained to the Federal Union during the Civil War. If both parties to the quarrel had limited their views to the settlement of the *practical* issues before them, the questions involved might have been of easy solution. But the one party was as stubborn and dogmatic as the other was angry and demagogical. The President held, in brief, that the Ordinances of Secession had been, in their very nature, null and void, and that therefore the seceded States had never been out of the Union. On the other hand, the majority in Congress held that the acts of secession were indeed illegal and unconstitutional, but that the seceded States had nevertheless been actually detached from the Union, and that special legislation and special guarantees were necessary to restore them to their former relation under the Government. Such was the real foundation of the disputes by which the question of reconstructing the Southern States was so seriously embarrassed. If the Chief Executive had been a man of Lincoln's character, or if Congress had been

less influenced by its passions, by its growing dislike of the President, and by many other ulterior motives, the difficulty might have been allayed or wholly obviated.

In the summer of 1865 the work of reconstruction was undertaken by the President, in accordance with his own plans. On the 9th of May he issued a proclamation for the restoration of Virginia to the Union. Twenty days afterward another proclamation was issued, establishing a provisional government for South Carolina, and at brief intervals similar measures were adopted in respect to the other States of the late Confederacy. On the 24th of June the President proclaimed all restrictions removed on trade and intercourse with the Southern States. On the 7th of the following September a second Amnesty Proclamation was issued, by which *all* persons who had upheld the Confederate cause, except the leaders, were unconditionally pardoned.

In the meantime, Tennessee had been reorganized, and in 1866 was restored to its place in the Union. But while these measures were carried out, Congress was pursuing its own line of policy with regard to the reconstruction of the Southern States. During the session of 1865-66 a Committee of Fifteen was appointed by that body to whom all matters appertaining to the reorganization of the States of the overthrown Confederacy should be referred. Soon afterwards the CIVIL RIGHTS BILL was passed, the object of which was to secure to the freed-

men of the South the full exercise of citizenship. The measure was opposed and vetoed by the President, but was immediately repassed by a two-thirds Congressional majority. It was the beginning of the open break between Mr. Johnson and Congress. On the occasion of the celebration of Washington's birthday, the bill was severely denounced by the President in a speech delivered in front of the Executive mansion. The position assumed by Congress was declared to be a new rebellion against the Government of the United States. In subsequent speeches and messages the same sentiments were reiterated, and the attitude of the Executive and the Legislative departments became constantly more unfriendly.

In the summer of 1866 a call was issued for a National convention, to be held in Philadelphia on the 14th of August. It was believed that the President was behind the movement. The objects had in view were not very clearly defined; but it was understood that the general condition of the country would be considered, measures of National policy discussed, and all the political elements in opposition to the majority in Congress be consolidated into a new political party, with which the President's name would be associated in leadership. At the appointed time delegates from all the States and Territories were present. Many members of the Republican party took part in the movement, and the convention was not lacking in enthusiasm. Still the meeting, as all other factious assemblages, exercised but little permanent influence on the affairs of the country.

The President, perceiving that the Philadelphia convention was of no effect, now made another effort to rally public opinion in favor of his policy. In the latter part of August he set out from Washington, accompanied by General Grant, Admiral Farragut, the leading members of the Cabinet, and other prominent officials, to make a tour of the Northern States. The ostensible object of the excursion was that the President might be present at the laying of the cornerstone of a monument to Senator Douglas at Chicago. Departing from the Capital, the Presidential party passed through Philadelphia, New York, and Albany, and after taking part in the ceremonies at Chicago, returned by way of St. Louis, Indianapolis, Louisville, Cincin-

nati, and Pittsburg. At all the principal towns and cities through which he passed the President spoke freely to the crowds in defence of his own policy, and in denunciation of that of Congress.

The whole journey was a scene of intense excitement and partisan animosity. The general effect of the President's course was disastrous to him and his political adherents. In the elections of the following autumn the measures and attitude of Congress were sustained, and most of the members of that body re-elected by increased popular majorities. Nevertheless, the result of the election had little effect in altering the President's views or softening his feelings towards the Legislative department of the Government. His stubborn nature yielded in nothing, even when the voice of the Northern people was heard as the voice of many waters.

By degrees the affairs and status of the Administration grew critical. When Congress convened, in December of 1866, the policy of the President was severely condemned. The attitude of all parties had strangely changed. It had been believed and feared that Mr. Johnson would pursue a course of angry retribution towards those who had been engaged in the rebellion. Now it was believed and openly charged that he had gone over to the Confederate party. Though he had begun from premises which had been laid by Lincoln, he had reached practical conclusions therefrom which were offensive, not to say shocking, to the great majority of those who had upheld the Government during the war. Congress, in its growing animosity to the President, had abandoned the milder principles of reconciliation, which Lincoln had evidently professed, and taken an attitude of relentless hostility towards the Confederate party in the South. Presently the Congressional committee appointed at the session of the previous year brought forward their report, embodying a full plan of reorganizing the Southern States. After much discussion the measures proposed by the committee were adopted by Congress, and the work of reconstruction was begun.

As the first condition for the readmission of a State into the Union, it was enacted that the people of the same, by their Legislative Assembly, or otherwise, should ratify the Four-

teenth Amendment to the Constitution, which declared the citizenship of all persons born or naturalized in the United States. In furtherance of this policy, Congress at the same session passed an act requiring that in the National Territories the elective franchise should be granted without distinction of race or color before such Territory should be admitted into the Union. A similar measure was adopted with regard to the District of Columbia, forbidding the further restriction of the right of suffrage to White men. To all of these acts President Johnson opposed his veto; but in every case his objection was overcome by the two-thirds' majority of Congress.

For all practical purposes, the question respecting the method of reorganizing the Southern States resolved itself to this: Should the *civil* or the *military* plan of reconstruction be adopted? From the beginning the President had urged the superiority of the civil method. It was seen, however, by Congress and the North that to follow this method freely would be to remand at once the control of the lately seceded States into the hands of the old Confederate party. Right or wrong, it was determined by the majority that this should not be done. It was clear that if the leaders of the late Confederacy should return from all the Southern States as Representatives and Senators, and should combine, as they were certain to do, with the Democratic Representatives and Senators from the Northern States, the Republican party would be immediately overwhelmed by an adverse majority. It was therefore determined in Congress that the military and suppressive method of governing the seceded States should be employed, and that an alliance between the Black Republicans of the South and the White Republicans of the North was the safest combination for the interests of the Union. This view of the case was intensified by the hostility of the Executive, and henceforth there was open political war between the two departments of the Government.

On the 2d of March, 1867, an act was passed by Congress by which the ten seceded States were divided into five military districts, each district to be under control of a governor appointed by the President. After appointing the commanders required by this law,

the chief magistrate asked the opinion of Mr. Stanbery, his Attorney-General, as to the validity of the Congressional measures of reconstruction. An answer was returned that most of the acts were null and void, and the President thereupon issued to the military commanders an order which virtually nullified the whole proceeding. Congress now passed a supplemental act declaring the meaning of the previous law, and the process of reorganization went on in accordance with the Congressional plan. The work, however, was greatly retarded by the distracted counsels of the Government, and the chaotic condition of affairs in the South. But in due time the States of Arkansas, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, North Carolina, and South Carolina were reconstructed, and in the months of June and July, 1868, were readmitted into the Union. In every case, however, the readmission was effected against the protest and over the veto of the President.

Meanwhile, a difficulty arose in the President's Cabinet which led to his impeachment. On the 21st of February, 1868, he notified Edwin M. Stanton, Secretary of War, of his dismissal from office. Such a circumstance had never before arisen in the administrative history of the country. The act was regarded by Congress as a usurpation of authority and a violation of law on the part of the President. The reconstruction difficulties had already broken off all friendly relations between the two Houses and the Executive. Accordingly, on the 3d of March, articles of impeachment were agreed to by the House of Representatives, in accordance with the forms of the Constitution; and the cause against the President was immediately remanded to the Senate for trial. Proceedings were instituted in that body on the 23d of March, and continued until the 26th of May, when the question was submitted to a vote of the Senators, acting as judges, and Mr. Johnson was acquitted. His escape from an adverse verdict, however, was very narrow—a two-thirds' majority was required to convict, and but a *single vote* was wanting to that result. Salmon P. Chase, who, after his retirement from the Secretaryship of the Treasury, had been appointed Chief-Justice of the United States, presided over this remarkable trial, the first

of its kind which had ever distracted, not to say disgraced, the history of the country.

After the impeachment the Administration of Johnson drew sullenly to a close. The time for another Presidential election was at hand, and General Ulysses S. Grant was nominated by the Republicans for the Chief-magistracy. On the Democratic side the nomination was given to Horatio Seymour, of New York. The canvass was attended with great excitement. The attention of the people, still agitated by the recent strife through which the Nation had passed, could not be diverted from the question and issues of the Civil War. The principles recently agitated by the majority in Congress were made the basis of the Republican platform of 1868, and on that platform General Grant was chosen by a very large electoral majority. The votes of twenty-six States, amounting in the aggregate to two hundred and fourteen ballots, were cast in his favor, while his competitor received only the eighty votes of the remaining eleven States. Of the popular vote, however, Mr. Seymour obtained 2,703,600 against 3,013,188 given to General Grant. At the same election the choice for the Vice-presidency fell on Schuyler Colfax, of Indiana.

Ulysses S. Grant, eighteenth President of the United States, was a native of Ohio, born at Point Pleasant, in that State, April 27, 1822. His boyhood was uneventful. At the age of seventeen he entered the United States Military Academy, at West Point, and was graduated in 1843. As a Lieutenant and Captain he served with distinction, and was promoted for gallantry in the Mexican War. After the close of that conflict he retained his connection with the army for some years, and then resigned his commission. He became a merchant, resided near St. Louis, and afterwards at Galena, Illinois. At the outbreak of the Civil War he was living in obscurity, nor could any have foreseen the probability of his emergence. His first national reputation was won by the capture of Forts Henry and Donelson, in 1862. After Shiloh, he was conspicuous as a Union commander; but was for awhile held back by gloomy and adverse circumstances, sufficient to have driven a less resolute and taciturn spirit from the field of

view. With Vicksburg his star came into the ascendant, and was never again clouded. In March of 1864 he received the appointment of Lieutenant-General and Commander-in-Chief of the Union army. His subsequent career at the head of that army has been already narrated. At the close of the war his reputation, though strictly military, was very great, and his complications in the imbroglio between President Johnson and Congress heightened rather than diminished the estimation in which he was held by his countrymen.

At the Republican Convention in Chicago, on the 21st of May, 1868, General Grant had



ULYSSES S. GRANT.


no competitor; he was unanimously nominated on the first ballot. On the day following his inauguration as President he sent to the Senate the following nominations for his Cabinet: For Secretary of State, Elihu B. Washburne, of Illinois; for Secretary of the Treasury, Alexander T. Stewart, of New York; for Secretary of the Interior, Jacob D. Cox, of Ohio; for Secretary of the Navy, Adolph E. Borie, of Pennsylvania; for Secretary of War, John M. Schofield, of Illinois; for Postmaster-General, John A. J. Cresswell, of Maryland; for Attorney-General, E. R. Hoar, of Massachusetts. These nominations were at once confirmed; but it was soon discovered

that Mr. Stewart, being an importer of foreign goods, was ineligible to a position in the Cabinet. George S. Boutwell, of Massachusetts, was accordingly appointed to the vacant position. Mr. Washburne also gave up his office to accept the position of Minister to France, and the vacancy was filled by the appointment of Hamilton Fish, of New York.

The first event by which the new Administration was signalized was the completion of the Pacific Railroad. We have seen how this vast enterprise was projected as early as 1853, but ten years elapsed before the work of construction was actually begun. The first division of the road extended from Omaha,

filled by three-fourths of the States, and in the following year became a part of the Constitution. A few weeks before the expiration of Johnson's term the Fifteenth Amendment was adopted by Congress, providing that the rights of citizens of the United States *to vote* should not be denied or abridged on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. This article also, which was intended to confer the right of suffrage on the emancipated Black men of the South, was submitted to the States, received the sanction of three-fourths of the Legislatures, and on the 30th of March, 1870, was proclaimed by the President as a part of the Constitution.

During the last years of the war, and the decade following, the monetary affairs of the United States were in such condition as to furnish opportunity for great frauds and the wildest speculations. The buying and selling of gold, made necessary at first by the exigencies of commerce, became at length a fictitious process, and was so manipulated by the speculators, especially those having their haunts about the Gold Room in New York City, as to unsettle the business of the whole country. Crisis after crisis was reached and passed, marking so many disasters to the monetary affairs of the people. In the fall of 1869 occurred the most extraordinary excitement of all. Perhaps no other scheme of equal extent and shrewd contrivance was ever concocted in the financial marts of the world. A



CENTRAL PACIFIC RAILWAY, SIERRA NEVADA.

company of unscrupulous speculators in New York, headed by Jay Gould and James Fisk, jr., succeeded in producing what is known as a "corner" in the gold-market, and brought the business interests of the metropolis to the verge of ruin. Some account of the conditions which made possible the nefarious transaction in question may serve to render the event intelligible to the reader.

During the Civil War the credit of the Government had declined to such an extent that at one time a dollar in gold was worth two hundred and eighty-six cents in paper currency. Doubtless a part of this extraordinary premium on the precious metal was occasioned by the plethora of the Greenback and National

Before the inauguration of President Grant, two additional amendments to the Constitution had been adopted by Congress. The first of these, known as the Fourteenth Amendment, extended the rights of citizenship to all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and declared the validity of the public debt. This amendment was submitted in 1867, was rati-

bank issues of paper money. But the greater part was due to an actual decline in the credit of the Government, a fear that the enormous war-debt would bear the Nation down to ultimate bankruptcy. After the restoration of the National authority, the value of paper money appreciated, and in the fall of 1869 the ratio of gold to the Greenback dollar had fallen off to about one hundred and thirty to one hundred. There were at this time in the banks of New York about \$15,000,000 in gold coin, and in the sub-treasury of the United States, in Wall Street, a hundred millions additional. The plan of Gould and Fisk was to get control, by purchase, of the greater part of the \$15,000,000; to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury from selling any part of the hundred millions under his authority; then, having control of the market, to advance the price of gold to a fabulous figure, sell out all which they held themselves, and retire from the field of slaughtered fortunes with accumulated millions of spoils.

Having carefully arranged the preliminaries, the conspirators, on the 13th of September, began their work by purchasing large sums of gold, at the same time constantly advancing the price. As has been said, the process was wholly fictitious. No real gold was delivered to the purchasers, the sellers simply agreeing to deliver at a certain price at a future date. One party of the gamblers thus became bound to do for the other what they could not do except by going into the market and buying the amounts which they were to deliver. But the purchasers soon exhausted the market, and they who were said to be "short on gold" were at their mercy.

By the 22d of September the plotters had succeeded in putting the market price of gold up to a hundred and forty. On the following day the price rose to one hundred and forty-four. The members of the conspiracy now boldly declared their determination to advance the rate to two hundred, and it seemed that on the morrow they would put their threat into execution. By this time the whole business of the country stood quivering like an aspen in the wind, nor might any well foresee the results of the crisis. On the morning of the 24th, known as Black Friday, the bidding in the Gold Room began with intense excitement.

The brokers of Fisk and Gould first advanced the price to a hundred and fifty, then to a hundred and fifty-five, and finally to one hundred and sixty, at which figure they were obliged to purchase several millions by a company of merchants, who had banded themselves together, determined to fight the gold-gamblers to the last. Just at this moment came a despatch that Mr. Boutwell, Secretary of the Treasury, had unsealed the hundred millions under his control, and had ordered four millions to be sold from the sub-treasury! The news occasioned an instantaneous panic. The price of gold went down twenty per cent, in less than as many minutes. The speculators were blown away in an uproar; but they managed, by accumulated frauds and corruptions, to carry off with them more than eleven million dollars as the profits of their game! Several months elapsed before the business of the country recovered from the effects of the shock.

During the first three months of 1870 the work of reconstructing the Southern States was completed. On the 24th of January the Senators and Representatives of Virginia were formally readmitted to their seats in Congress, and the Old Dominion once more took her place in the Union. On the 23d of February a like action was taken with regard to Mississippi, and on the 30th of March the work was finished by the readmission of Texas, the last of the seceded States. For the first time since December of 1860 the voice of the people of all of the States was heard in the councils of the Nation.

In the same year was completed the Ninth Census of the United States. It was a work of vast importance, and the results presented were of the most encouraging character. Notwithstanding the ravages of war, the last decade had been one of wonderful growth and progress. During that time the population had increased from 31,433,000 to 38,587,000. The center of population had now moved westward into the State of Ohio, and rested at a point fifty miles east of Cincinnati. The National debt, though still enormous, had been considerably reduced. The products of the United States had grown to a vast aggregate; even the cotton-crop of the South was regaining much of its former importance. American manufactures were competing with


those of England in the markets of the world. The Union now embraced thirty-seven States and eleven territories. From the narrow limits of the thirteen original Colonies, with their four hundred and twenty thousand square miles of territory, the National domain had spread to the vast area of three million six hundred and four thousand square miles. Few things have been more marvelous than the territorial growth of the United States. The purchase of Louisiana in 1803 more than doubled the geographical area of the Nation. The several Mexican acquisitions were only second in importance, while the recent Russian cession of Alaska was alone greater than the original Thirteen States. The nature of this territorial development will be best understood from an examination of the accompanying map.

President Grant was by nature a man of few projects. He was perhaps the least visionary of all the great Americans who have risen to distinction in the political history of the country. If he had any particular dream of distinguishing his Administration by some specific feature, it was the project of the annexation of Santo Domingo. He also had in mind the enterprise of extending and amplifying the relations, civil, political, and social, between the American Republic and Mexico. But with respect to the purchase of Santo Domingo he had a real anxiety. He promoted, and may be said to have originated, the agitation on that subject. In January of 1871 he appointed Senator Ben Wade, of Ohio; President Andrew D. White, of New York; and Dr. Samuel Howe, of Massachusetts, as a Board of Commissioners to visit Santo Domingo, and report upon the desirability of annexing that island to the United States. The question of annexation had been feebly before the American people for several years; but the actual proposal awakened earnest advocacy on one side, and strong opposition on the other. After three months spent abroad, the Commissioners returned and reported in favor of the proposed annexation. The matter was laid before Congress, but the opposition excited in that body was so great that the measure was defeated.

Now it was that the day of retribution came to Great Britain for her conduct towards the American Government during the Civil

War. The unfriendliness which she had shown to the United States, and the great and positive damages done to American commerce by the Confederate cruisers fitted out in the English ports, had been laid up by the Federal Government unto the day of reckoning. The United States held serious accounts against Great Britain, which must be settled in some equitable manner before relations of harmony could be re-established. The Confederate cruisers had been built and equipped in the ports of England with the full knowledge of the Government. Such a proceeding was in plain violation of the law of nations. Even if the independence of the Confederate States had been recognized, it would still have been unlawful for the private war-ships of that power to be built, equipped, manned and sent forth from the ports of a nation pretending neutrality and friendliness to the United States. Time and again Mr. Seward had remonstrated with the British authorities, but without effect. As a matter of fact, the great monarchies of Western Europe believed and hoped that the American Republic had gone to pieces, that the bubble had burst, that the fragments of exploded republicanism, considered as a type of human government—a type most dangerous to themselves—were already drifting in the whirlpool. As a consequence, they assumed a tone and manner toward the American Government, as if to say: "We have said as much; the profits are now to us."

After the Civil War, however, Great Britain became alarmed at her own conduct, and grew anxious for a settlement of the difficulty. On the 27th of February, 1871, a Joint High Commission, composed of five British and five American statesmen, assembled at Washington City. From the fact that the cruiser *Alabama* had done most of the injury complained of, the claims of the United States were called THE ALABAMA CLAIMS. After much discussion, the Commissioners framed a treaty, known as the Treaty of Washington, by which it was agreed that all claims of either nation against the other should be submitted to a board of arbitration, to be appointed by friendly nations. Such a high court was accordingly formed, and in the summer of 1872 convened at Geneva, Switzerland. The cause



THE JOINT HIGH COMMISSION IN SESSION.

of the two nations was impartially heard, and on the 14th of September was decided in favor of the United States. By the decision, Great Britain was obliged, for the wrongs which she had done, to pay to the Treasury of the American Government \$15,500,000.

The year 1871 was remarkable as being the date when the railroad construction of the United States reached its maximum. In that year no less than seven thousand six hundred and seventy miles of railroad were constructed,

tended to two thousand eight hundred and eighteen miles. Ten years later there were nine thousand and twenty-one miles of track. According to the reports for 1860, the railroads of the country had reached the enormous extent of thirty thousand six hundred and thirty-five miles, and in the next ten years, embracing the period of the Civil War, the amount was nearly doubled. Such is the victory of free enterprise, free industry, and free thought. It may well surprise and instruct the student of



BURNING OF CHICAGO.

There is, perhaps, no fact in the history of the world which exhibits so marvelous a development of the physical resources of a nation. Ere the mutterings of the Civil War, with its untold destruction of life and treasure, had died away, the recuperative power, enterprise, and genius of the American people were revealed as never before in establishing and extending the lines of commerce and travel. In 1830 there were but twenty-three miles of railway track in the New World. In 1840 the lines in the United States had been ex-

ended to two thousand eight hundred and eighteen miles. Ten years later there were nine thousand and twenty-one miles of track. According to the reports for 1860, the railroads of the country had reached the enormous extent of thirty thousand six hundred and thirty-five miles, and in the next ten years, embracing the period of the Civil War, the amount was nearly doubled. Such is the victory of free enterprise, free industry, and free thought. It may well surprise and instruct the student of

history that the United States of America, just emerged from the furnace of war, and burdened with an enormous debt, built in the single year 1871 more miles of railway than Spain, whose daring navigators went forth four hundred years ago to discover the Western hemisphere, has ever built in her whole career! The same year is noted for a calamity almost as vast in proportion as the enterprise just referred to was astonishing. The event in question was the burning of the city of Chicago. On the evening of the 8th of Octo-

ber a fire broke out in De Koven Street, and was driven by a high wind into the lumber-yards and wooden houses of the neighborhood. The flames spread with great rapidity, leaped the South Branch of the Chicago River, and began to roar through the business parts of the city. All that night and all the following day the deluge of fire rolled on; sprang across the main channel of the river, and swept into blackened ruins the whole district between the North Branch and Lake Michigan, as far northward as Lincoln Park. The area burned over was two thousand one hundred acres, or three and a third square miles. About two hundred lives were lost in the conflagration, and the property destroyed amounted to about \$200,000,000. No such terrible devastation had been witnessed since the burning of Moscow, in 1812. In the extent of the district burned over, the Chicago fire stands first; in the amount of property destroyed, second; and in the suffering occasioned, third, among the great conflagrations of history.

On the 21st of October, 1872, was settled the remaining dispute concerning the geographical boundaries of the United States. By the terms of the treaty of 1846 it was stipulated that the North-western boundary line, running westward along the forty-ninth parallel of latitude, should extend to the middle of the channel which separates the continent from Vancouver's Island, and thence southerly through the middle of said channel and of Fuca's Straits to the Pacific. But what was "the middle of said channel?" for there were several channels. The British Government claimed the Straits of Rosario to be the true line intended by the treaty, while the United States would have the Canal de Haro. So the question stood for a quarter of a century, and was then referred for settlement by arbitration to William I., Emperor of Germany. That monarch heard the cause, decided in favor of the United States, and the Canal de Haro became the international boundary.

The civil Administration of President Grant was embarrassed throughout by the military spirit and influences which still dominated the country. The President himself was a military man, a general of armies rather than a statesman. At this epoch the great men of the coun-

try had for the most part been connected with the war. Major-Generals and Brigadier-Generals swarmed in the halls of Congress, and thronged the White House. The President was very far from desiring to introduce or retain military methods in the conduct of the Government. He had, in fact, but little sympathy with war and the processes by which it is carried on. But, on the other hand, he was not in sympathy with political methods, and knew nothing of the arts of the demagogue. As a natural result, he fell back upon the methods with which he was best acquainted, and the Administration was said, especially by his opponents, to have a military cast. On the whole, however, the President retained his powerful hold on the American people, nor was it likely, in the Presidential campaign of 1872, that any other could supplant him in their affections and political confidence.

As the quadrennial term drew to a close, the political parties marshaled their forces for the contest. Many parts of the Chief Magistrate's policy had been subjected to severe criticism and heated controversy. The Congressional plan of reconstructing the Southern States had prevailed, and with that plan the President was in full accord. But the reconstruction measures had been unfavorably received in the South, and were generally denounced by the Democratic party. The elevation of the negro race to the full rights of citizenship was met with much rational opposition, to say nothing of race prejudice and political rancor. Owing to the disorganization of civil government in the Southern States, an opportunity was given in certain districts for bad and reckless men to band themselves together in lawlessness. Organizations known as Ku-Klux Clans were formed against the constituted authorities, and the latter were frequently what was called "carpet-bag governments;" that is, governments instituted by political adventurers who had gone from the North into the South with their *carpet-bags* in their hands. The military spirit was still rife in the country, and the issues of the Civil War were rediscussed with much bitterness.

On these issues the people divided in the election of 1872. The Republicans renominated General Grant for the Presidency. For the Vice-presidency Mr. Colfax declined a

renomination, and was replaced on the ticket by Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts. On the other side there was for a while much confusion. It was doubtlessly foreseen by the Democratic leaders that any one of their own number would have small show of success against the taciturn hero of the Civil War. In the meantime, a large number of prominent Republicans, dissatisfied with the Administration, personally piqued at President Grant, and perhaps sincerely desiring to promote certain alleged reforms in the Government, had formed a Liberal-Republican party, and had nominated for the Presidency Horace Greeley, the dis-



HORACE GREELEY.

tinguished editor of the *New York Tribune*. After some heating about, this nomination was accepted and ratified by the Democratic party, and the political contest was projected on this basis. It was destined to be the last act in the remarkable career of Horace Greeley. For more than thirty years he had been an acknowledged leader of public opinion in America. He had been a champion of human rights, an advocate of progress, an idealist, a philanthropist, a second Franklin, born out of due season. He had discussed with vehement energy and enthusiasm almost every question in which the people of the United States had any interest. After a life-time of unflinching in-

dustry he was now, at the age of sixty-one, thrown into the forefront of political strife.

The canvass was one of wild excitement and bitter denunciations. Mr. Greeley himself went before the people and spoke on the questions involved in the contest. But everything seemed adverse to his prospects. His own utterances, his strange personality, his long contentions with the Democratic party, the incongruity of his following, and many other things, were paraded effectively against him. He was overwhelmingly defeated. General Grant's majority was almost unprecedented in the political history of the country. Mr. Greeley, who had in the meantime retired from the editorship of the *Tribune*, attempted to resume his duties, but the shock had been too great for his physical and mental powers. He died in less than a month after the election, and with him ended the career of the greatest journalist which America has ever produced.

A few days after the Presidential election of 1872 the city of Boston was visited by a conflagration only second in its ravages to that of Chicago, in the previous year. On the evening of the 9th of November a fire broke out on the corner of Kingston and Summer streets, spread to the north-east, and continued with almost unabated fury until the morning of the 11th. The best portion of the city, embracing some of the finest business blocks in the United States, was laid in ashes. The burnt district covered an area of sixty-five acres. Eight hundred buildings, property to the value of eighty millions of dollars, and fifteen human lives were lost in the conflagration.

Our attention may now be turned for a moment to an event of some importance on the far-off Pacific Slope. In the spring of 1872 an order was issued to Superintendent Oleneal to remove the Modoc Indians from their lands, on the southern shore of Lake Klamath, Oregon, to a new reservation. The Indians, who had been greatly mistreated by former agents of the Government, refused to obey the order, and in the following November a body of troops was sent to force them into compliance. The Modocs resisted, kept up the war during the winter, and then retreated into an almost inaccessible region.

known as the Lava Beds. Here, in the following spring, the Indians were surrounded, but would not yield. On the 11th of April a conference was held between them and six members of the Peace Commission; but in the midst of the council the treacherous savages rose upon the kind-hearted men who sat beside them, and murdered General Canby and Dr. Thomas in cold blood. Mr. Meacham, another member of the Commission, was shot and stabbed, but escaped with his life. The Modocs were then besieged and bombarded in

The system of government instituted in the Southern States, under the reconstruction policy of Congress, was very unsatisfactory. The old Confederate party in the South embraced the best elements of society. The work



ATTACK ON PEACE COMMISSIONERS BY MODOC.

Copyright 1887, O. M. Doxham

their stronghold, but it was the 1st of June before General Davis and a force of regulars could compel Captain Jack and his murderous band to surrender. The chiefs were tried by court-martial, and executed in the following October.

of reorganizing the civil machinery was, for the most part, devolved upon White Republicans, who had gone into the South after the war, and on the Negroes, who were affiliated with them. Between the two parties thus constituted a great hostility existed, and in some parts of the country the civil authority was in constant chaos and turmoil. In 1873 a difficulty arose in Louisiana which broke the peace of the State and produced much excitement. Owing to the existence of double

election-boards, two sets of Presidential electors had been chosen in the previous autumn. At the same time two Governors, William P. Kellogg and John McEnery, were elected, and rival Legislatures were also returned by the rival boards. Two State governments were organized, and for awhile the Commonwealth was in a condition bordering on anarchy.

The dispute was at length referred to the Federal Government, and the President decided in favor of Kellogg and his party. The rival Government was accordingly disbanded; but on the 14th of September, 1874, the party opposed to the administration of Kellogg, and led by D. B. Penn, who had been returned as Lieutenant-Governor with McEnery, rose in arms and took possession of the State-house. Governor Kellogg fled to the Custom-house, and appealed to the President for help. The latter immediately ordered the adherents of Penn to disperse, and a body of National troops was sent to New Orleans to enforce the proclamation. On the assembling of the Legislature in the following December the difficulty broke out more violently than ever, and the soldiery was again called in to restore order and settle the dispute.

About the beginning of President Grant's second term the country was greatly disturbed by what was known as the CREDIT MOBILIER INVESTIGATION in Congress. The "Credit Mobilier of America" was a joint-stock company, organized in 1863, for the purpose of facilitating the construction of public works. In 1867 another company, which had undertaken to build the Pacific Railroad, purchased the charter of the Credit Mobilier, and the capital was increased to \$3,750,000. Owing to the profitableness of the work in which the company was engaged the stock rose rapidly in value, and enormous dividends were paid to the shareholders. The money was made by the subletting of the Pacific Railway contracts to the Credit Mobilier company by the directors of the railroad; that is, the managers of the railway company sublet the work to themselves as directors of the Credit Mobilier, at enormous prices. The railway was constructed in a large part by a subsidy, granted by the Government, and in this manner the directors of the Credit Mobilier got their hands without obstruction directly into the treasury

of the United States. It was with the Credit Mobilier a *sine qua non* that the door which they had thus opened into the treasury vaults should not be closed; and, to prevent such possible obstruction, the managers resorted to wholesale corruption. In 1872 a lawsuit in Pennsylvania developed the startling fact that much of the stock of the Credit Mobilier was owned by members of Congress! The managers of the company had placed their certificates in wholesale quantities to the credit of Representatives, Senators, and other high officers in the Government. On these certificates large dividends were declared and paid to the holders of the shares. Many were thus enriched without the expenditure of a dollar. A suspicion that members of Congress holding the certificates had voted corruptly in legislation affecting the Pacific Railroad at once seized the public mind, and led to a Congressional investigation, in the course of which many scandalous transactions were brought to light, and the faith of the people in the integrity of their public servants was greatly shaken.

In the autumn of 1873 occurred one of the most disastrous financial panics known in the history of the United States. The alarm was given by the failure of the great banking-house of Jay Cooke & Co., of Philadelphia. Other failures followed in rapid succession. Depositors everywhere hurried to the banks, and withdrew their money and securities. Business was suddenly paralyzed, and many months elapsed before confidence was sufficiently restored to enable merchants and bankers to engage in the usual transactions of trade. The primary cause of the panic was the fluctuations in the volume and value of the National currency. Out of this had arisen a wild spirit of speculation which sapped the foundations of business, destroyed financial confidence, and ended in disaster.

Not the least of the evil results of the monetary disturbance was the check given to the construction of the Northern Pacific Railway. As early as 1864 a company had been organized, under a charter granted by Congress, to construct a railway from Lake Superior to Puget Sound. The work also contemplated the running of a branch road, two hundred miles in length, down the valley of the Columbia River to Portland, Oregon. Large subsi-

dies were granted to the company by Congress, and other favorable legislation was expected to follow. In 1870 the work of construction was begun and carried westward from Duluth, Minnesota. Jay Cooke's banking-house made heavy loans to this company, accepting as security the bonds of the road, for it was confidently expected that such legislation would be obtained as should secure the success of the enterprise and bring the bonds to par. In this condition of affairs the Credit Mobilier scandal was blown with its shocking effluvia before the country, and no Congress would have dared to vote further subsidies to a railway enterprise. Jay Cooke's securities became comparatively worthless; then followed the failures and the panic. The work of constructing the Northern Pacific line was suddenly arrested, and it was only after years of delay that the enterprise was prosecuted to success. In 1875 the section of four hundred and fifty miles, extending from Duluth to Bismarek, Dakota, was put into operation. Then another span, a hundred and five miles in length, between Kalama and Tacoma, in Washington Territory, was completed, and finally the whole line. Meanwhile the attention of the country was turned to the Texas and Pacific Railway, which had been projected from Shreveport, Louisiana, and Texarkana, Arkansas, by way of El Paso, Texas, to San Diego, California, a distance from Shreveport of fifteen hundred and fourteen miles. In 1875 the main line had been carried westward a hundred and eighty-nine miles, to Dallas, Texas, while the line from Texarkana had progressed seventy-five miles towards El Paso.

On the 4th of March, 1875, the Territory of Colorado was authorized by Congress to form a State Constitution. On the 1st of July, in the following year, the instrument thus provided for was ratified by the people. A month later the President issued his proclamation, and the "Centennial State" took her place in the Union. The new Commonwealth embraced an area of one hundred and four thousand five hundred square miles, and a population of forty-two thousand souls. Public attention was directed to Colorado by the discovery of gold in 1852. Silver was discovered about the same time, and in the winter of 1858-9 the first colony of miners

was established on Clear Creek and in Gilpin County. The entire yield of gold up to the time of the admission of the State was estimated at more than seventy millions of dollars. Until 1859, Colorado constituted a part of Kansas; but in that year a convention was held in Denver, and in 1861 a distinct territorial organization was effected. Subsequently immigration became rapid and constant. Denver grew into an important city, and the new State was launched under auspices most favorable to her future rank and influence in the Union. It was at the epoch now under consideration that the great




CHARLES SUMNER.

men whose character and genius had been developed in the stormy times of the Civil War began to drop from the ranks by the hand of death. One of the first and most conspicuous of these was Edward M. Stanton, Secretary of War under Lincoln, and more recently one of the Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States. In 1870, General Robert E. Lee, President of Washington and Lee University; General George H. Thomas, and Admiral Farragut passed away. In 1872, William H. Seward, Professor Morse, Horace Greeley, and General Meade were all called from the scene of their earthly labors. On the 7th of May, 1873, Chief Justice Chase fell

under a stroke of paralysis at the home of his daughter, in New York City; and on the 11th of March, in the following year, Senator Charles Sumner, of Massachusetts, died at Washington. He was a native of Boston; born in 1811; liberally educated at Harvard College. At the age of thirty-five he entered the arena of public life, and in 1850 succeeded Daniel Webster in the Senate of the United States. This position he retained until the time of his death, speaking much and powerfully on all the great questions that

merits which will transmit his name to after times as that of a patriot statesman.

As the CENTENNIAL OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE drew near, the people made ready to celebrate the great event with appropriate ceremonies. As to the *form* of the celebration, an International Exposition of Arts and Industries was decided on; as to the *place*, the city of Philadelphia, hallowed by Revolutionary memories, was selected; as to the *time*, the period from the 10th of May to the 10th of November, 1876, was chosen. An appropria-



MAIN BUILDING, CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

agitated the Nation. His last days were spent in considering the interests and welfare of that country to whose service he had given the life-long energies of his genius. On the 22d of November, 1875, Vice-President Henry Wilson sank under a stroke of paralysis, and died in Washington City. Like Roger Sherman, he had risen from the shoemaker's bench to the highest honors of his country. Without the learning of Seward and Sumner—without the diplomatic skill of the one, or the oratorical fame of the other—he nevertheless possessed those great abilities and sterling


qualities which will transmit his name to after times as that of a patriot statesman. A sum of \$1,500,000 was made by Congress to promote the enterprise, and voluntary offerings and contributions were forwarded from every State and Territory of the Union. The city of Philadelphia did her part by opening Fairmount Park, one of the largest and most beautiful in the world, for the Exposition.

The management of the enterprise was intrusted to a commission, which was organized by the election of General Joseph R. Hawley, of Connecticut, as president; Alfred T. Goshorn, of Ohio, as director-general; and John L. Campbell, of Indiana, as secretary.

Under the direction of this commission five principal buildings were projected, and were brought to completion about the close of 1875. The largest of these great structures, called the Main Building, was eighteen hundred and eighty feet in length and four hundred and sixty-four feet wide, covering an area of a little more than twenty acres. The cost of the edifice was \$1,580,000. The building second in importance was the Memorial Hall, or Art Gallery, built of granite, iron, and glass, and covering an area of seventy-six thousand six hundred and fifty square feet. This was by far the most elegant and permanent of all the structures erected for the occasion. Machinery Hall, the third of the great edifices, was like the Main Building in general appearance, though less beautiful and grand. The ground-floor embraced an area of nearly thirteen acres. The cost of the structure was \$542,000. Agricultural Hall occupied a space of little more than ten acres, and was built at a cost of nearly \$260,000. The fifth and smallest of the principal buildings was Horticultural Hall, an edifice of the Moorish pattern, covering a space of one and three-fifths acres, and costing about \$300,000. The other structures of chief interest were the United States Government Building, the Woman's Pavilion, and the Department of Public Comfort. After these came the Government Buildings of Foreign Nations, the Model Dwellings and Bazars, School-houses and Restaurants, Judges' Halls, and Model Factories.

On the 5th of January, 1876, the reception

of articles for the Exposition was begun. A system of awards was adopted, and on the 10th of May the inaugural ceremonies were held under direction of the Centennial Commission, President Grant making the opening address. By this time the attention of the people had been fully aroused to the interest and importance of the event, and from the opening days of the Exposition the grounds were crowded with thousands and hundreds of thousands of visitors. The Exposition itself was perhaps the grandest and most interesting of its kind ever witnessed up to the date in question. All summer long the throng of citizens and strangers, gathered from every clime, poured into the spacious and beautiful park. Reports of the



INDEPENDENCE HALL.

proceedings and of the various exhibits were sent broadcast to every civilized country of the world. Distinguished personages, among them Dom Pedro II., Emperor of Brazil, came from various nations to gather instruction from the accumulated arts and industries of mankind. On the 4th of July the centennial of the great Declaration was appropriately celebrated throughout the country. The city of Philadelphia was crowded

with two hundred and fifty thousand strangers. In Independence Square the Declaration was read from the original manuscript by Richard Henry Lee, a grandson of him by whom the resolution to be free was first offered in Congress. A *National Ode* was then recited by Bayard Taylor, and the *Centennial Oration* delivered by William M. Evarts. At night the city was illuminated, and the ceremonies concluded with a brilliant display of fire-works.


The daily attendance in Fairmount Park varied from five thousand to two hundred and seventy-five thousand persons. The grounds were open for one hundred and fifty-eight days; the total receipts for admission were \$3,761,000, and the total number of visitors

given as a memento by the Executive Committee, and most of the Government Buildings of Foreign Nations were presented to the city of Philadelphia. It can not be doubted that the Exposition, considered as a whole, left a permanent impression for good on the minds of the American people, and contributed to the harmony and mutual interest of all the civilized States of the world.

During the last year of President Grant's Administration the country was disturbed by a war with the Sioux Indians. These fierce savages had, in 1867, made a treaty with the United States agreeing to relinquish all the territory south of the Niobrara, west of the one hundred and fourth meridian, and north

of the forty-sixth parallel of latitude. By this treaty the Sioux were confined to a large reservation in South-western Dakota, and to this reservation they agreed to retire by the 1st of January, 1876.

Meanwhile, however, gold was discovered among the Black Hills, a region



MEMORIAL HALL, CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

nine million seven hundred and eighty-six thousand. On the 10th of November the Exposition was formally closed by the President of the United States, attended by General Hawley, Chairman of the Centennial Commission, and Director Goshorn, of Cincinnati. Efforts were made, however, to secure, as far as practicable, the permanency of the Centennial display. Machinery Hall was purchased by the city of Philadelphia, but was afterwards removed from the grounds. After an attempt to preserve the Main Building it was sold by auction, and the materials removed. The Memorial Building was preserved intact, together with a large part of the art treasures, which were exhibited therein during the Centennial summer. The Woman's Pavilion was

the greater part of which belonged by the treaty to the Sioux reservation. But no treaty could keep the hungry horde of white gold-diggers and adventurers from overrunning the interdicted district. This gave the Sioux a good excuse, not to say a valid cause, for gratifying their native disposition by breaking over the limits of their reservation, and roaming at large through Wyoming and Montana, burning houses, stealing horses, and killing whoever opposed them.

The Government now undertook to drive the Sioux upon their reservation. A large force of regulars under Generals Terry and Crook was sent into the mountainous country of the Upper Yellowstone, and the Indians, to the number of several thousand, led by their

noted chieftain Sitting Bull, were crowded back against the Big Horn Mountains and River. Generals Custer and Reno, who were sent forward with the Seventh Cavalry to discover the whereabouts of the Indians, found them encamped in a large village, extending for nearly three miles along the left bank of

the Little Big Horn. On the 25th of June, General Custer, without waiting for reinforcements, charged headlong with his division into the Indian town, and was at once assailed by thousands of yelling warriors. Of the details of the struggle that ensued very little is known. General Custer and every man of his command fell in the fight. The conflict equaled, if it did not surpass in desperation and disaster, any other Indian battle ever fought in America. The whole loss of the Seventh Cavalry was two hundred and sixty-one killed, and fifty-two wounded. General Reno, who had been engaged with the savages at the lower end of the town, held his position on the bluff of the Little Big Horn until General Gibbon arrived with reinforcements and saved the remnant from destruction.

Other divisions of the army were soon hurried to the scene of hostility.

During the summer and autumn the Indians were beaten in several engagements, and negotiations were at length opened looking for the removal of the Sioux to the Indian Territory. But still a few desperate bands held out against the authority of the Government, and at the same time the civilized

nations of the Territory objected to having the fierce savages of the North for their neighbors.

On the 24th of November the Fourth Cavalry attacked and decisively defeated the Sioux at a pass in the Big Horn Mountains. The Indians lost severely in the engagement, and



BATTLE OF THE BIG HORN.—CUSTER'S DEATH.

their town, containing one hundred and seventy-three huts, was totally destroyed. The army then went into winter-quarters at various points in the hostile country; but active operations were still carried on by forays and brief expeditions during December and January. On the 5th of the latter month the main body

of the savages was overtaken and completely routed by the division of Colonel Miles.

The remaining bands, under Sitting Bull and Crazy Horse, being now able to offer no serious resistance, made their escape across the border, and became subject to the authorities of Canada. Here they remained until the following autumn, when the Government reopened negotiations with them for their return to their reservation in Dakota. A commission, headed by General Terry, met Sitting Bull and his principal warriors at Fort Walsh, on the Canadian frontier. Here a conference was held on the 8th of October. Full pardon for past offenses was offered to the Sioux on condition of their peaceable return and future good behavior. But the irreconcilable Sitting Bull and his savage chiefs rejected the proposals with scorn. The conference was broken off, and the Sioux were left at large in the British dominions north of Milk River. It was not until 1880 that, through the intervention of the Canadian Government, Sitting Bull and his band were induced to return to the reservation of the Yankton Sioux on the north bank of the Missouri River, Dakota.

In the meantime, with the subsidence of the interest occasioned by the centennial celebration, and the excitement caused by the war with the Sioux, came the Twenty-third Presidential election. Before the end of June, the National Conventions were held and standard-bearers selected by the political parties. General Rutherford B. Hayes, of Ohio, and William A. Wheeler, of New York, were chosen as candidates by the Republicans; Samuel A. Tilden, of New York, and Thomas A. Hendricks, of Indiana, by the Democrats. A third—the Independent Greenback—party also appeared, and presented as candidates Peter Cooper, of New York, and Samuel F. Cary, of Ohio. The canvass began early and with great asperity. The cry raised by the Democratic party was *Reform*—reform in the public service and in all the methods of administration. For it was alleged that many of the departments of the Government, and the officers presiding therein, had become corrupt in practice and in fact. The Republicans answered back with the cry of *Reform*—averring a willingness and an anxiety to cor-

rect public abuses of whatsoever sort, and to bring to punishment all who had dared to prostitute high places of honor to base uses. To this it was added that the Nationality of State Sovereignty, was not yet acknowledged in the South; and that the rights of the Black men must be protected with additional safeguards. The Independent party echoed the cry of *Reform*—monetary reform first, and all other reforms afterwards. For it was alleged by the leaders of this party that the measure of redeeming the National legal-tenders and other obligations of the United States in *gold*—which measure was advocated by both the other parties—was a project unjust to the debtor class, iniquitous in itself and impossible of fulfillment. And it was further argued by the independents that the money idea itself ought to be revolutionized, and that a National paper currency should be provided by the Government, and be based, not on specie, but on a bond bearing a low rate of interest and interchangeable, at the option of the holder, with the currency itself. But the advocates of this theory had only a slight political organization, and did not succeed in securing a single electoral vote. The real contest lay, as it had done for twenty years, between the Republicans and the Democrats. The canvass drew to a close; the election was held; the general result was ascertained; and both parties *claimed the victory!* The election was so evenly balanced between the candidates—there had been so much irregularity in the voting and subsequent electoral proceedings in the States of Florida, Louisiana, South Carolina, and Oregon, and the powers of Congress over the votes of such States were so vaguely defined under existing legislation—that no certain declaration of the result could be made. The public mind was confounded with perplexity and excitement, and more than once were heard the threatenings of civil war.

When Congress convened in December, the whole question of the disputed Presidency came at once before that body for settlement. The situation was seriously complicated by the political complexion of the Senate and the House of Representatives. In the former body the Republicans had a majority sufficient to con-

trol its action, while in the House the Democratic majority was still more decisive and equally willful.

The debates began, and seemed likely to be interminable. The question at issue was whether the electoral votes of the several States should, at the proper time, be opened and counted by the presiding officer of the Senate, in accordance with the immemorial and constitutional usage in such cases, or whether, in view of the existence of duplicate and spurious returns from some of the States, and of alleged gross frauds and irregularities in others, some additional court ought to be constituted to open and count the ballots.

Meanwhile, the necessity of doing something became more and more imperative. The great merchants and manufacturers of the country, and the Boards of Trade in the principal cities, grew clamorous for a speedy and peaceable adjustment of the difficulty. The spirit of compromise gained ground, and after much debating in Congress it was agreed that all the

disputed election returns should be referred to a JOINT HIGH COMMISSION, to consist of five members chosen from the United States Senate, five from the House of Representatives, and five from the Supreme Court. The judgment of the tribunal was to be final in all matters referred thereto for decision. The Commission was accordingly constituted. The counting was begun, as usual, in the presence of the Senate and the House of Representatives. When the disputed and duplicate returns were reached, they were referred, State by State, to the Joint High Commission, by which body the decision was made. On the 2d of March, *only two days before the time for the inauguration*, the final decision was rendered. The Republican candidates were declared elected. One hundred and eighty-five electoral votes were cast for Hayes and Wheeler, and one hundred and eighty-four for Tilden and Hendricks. The most dangerous political crisis in the history of the country passed harmlessly by without violence or bloodshed.¹

3

CHAPTER CXXVI.—LATEST PERIOD.



UTHERFORD BURCHARD HAYES, nineteenth President of the United States was born in Delaware, O., on the 4th of October, 1822.

His primary education was received in the public schools. Afterwards he was a student at the Norwalk Academy, and in 1837 at Webb's Prepara-

tory School, at Middletown, Connecticut. In the following year he entered the Freshman Class, at Kenyon College, and in 1842 was graduated from that institution with the highest honors. Three years afterwards he completed his legal studies at Harvard, and then began the practice of his profession at Marietta and Fremont, and finally as city solicitor in Cincinnati. Here he won a distinguished reputation as a lawyer. In the

¹The complete domination of party politics in the United States was never more unhappily illustrated than in the work of the Joint High Commission. The five members of the Court from the House of Representatives—that body being Democratic—were, of course, three Democrats and two Republicans; the five from the Senate—that body being Republican—were three Republicans and two Democrats; the five from the Supreme Court were, two Republicans, two Democrats, and Judge Joseph P. Bradley, who was called an Independent, but whose political antecedents and proclivities were Republican. When the proceedings began, it was at once

manifest that every Democratic member would vote for his candidates, whatever might be the proofs; that every Republican would support Hayes and Wheeler whatever might be the facts; and that Judge Bradley, who constituted the real Court, would decide according to his antecedents and proclivities. In no single instance during the proceedings did any member of the Court rise above his political bias. The decision, therefore, happy enough in its results, was simply a political intrigue—a work in which, on the whole, the Republican leaders were more sagacious and skillful than their antagonists.

Civil War he performed much honorable service in the Union cause; rose to the rank of Major-General, and in 1864, while still in the field, was elected to Congress. Three years later he was chosen Governor of his native State, and was re-elected in 1869, and again in 1875. At the Cincinnati Conven-

tion of his Administration. The patriotic and conciliatory utterances of the address did much to lead the country back to political quietude. The South was assured of right purposes on the part of the new Chief Magistrate. A radical reform in the civil service was avowed as a part of his policy, and a

speedy return to specie payments was recommended as a final cure for the deranged finances of the Nation. The immediate effect of these assurances, so evidently made in good faith and honesty, was to rally around the new Administration many of the better political elements in the hope of introducing a second "Era of Good Feeling," as peaceable and beneficent in its character as the former turbulence had been exciting and dangerous.

On the 8th of March the President sent to the Senate the names of those chosen for his Cabinet. In this, also, there were evidences of a new departure in the policy of the Government. The Cabinet, though eminently able and statesman-like, was noticeably non-partisan in



RUFUS B. HAYES.

tion of 1876 he had the good-fortune to be nominated for the Presidency over several of the most eminent men of the Nation.

In his inaugural address, delivered on the 5th of March,¹ President Hayes indicated the

its character. As Secretary of State, William M. Evarts, of New York, was chosen; John Sherman, of Ohio, was named as Secretary of the Treasury; George W. McCrary, of Iowa, Secretary of War; Richard W.

¹ The 4th of March fell on Sunday. The same thing has happened in the following years: 1733, 1781, 1821 (Monroe's inauguration, second term),

1849 (Taylor's inauguration), 1877 (Hayes's inauguration), and the same will occur hereafter as follows: 1917, 1945, 1973, 2001, 2029, 2057, 2085, 2125, 2153.


Thompson, of Indiana, Secretary of the Navy; Carl Schurz, of Missouri, Secretary of the Interior; Charles E. Devens, of Massachusetts, Attorney-General; and David M. Kee, of Tennessee, Postmaster-General. These nominations were duly ratified by the Senate, and the new Administration was ushered in under not unfavorable auspices.

The summer of 1877 was notable in American history for the great labor disturbance known as THE RAILROAD STRIKE. For several years the mining districts of the country had been troubled with disputes and outbreaks having their origin in the question of wages. The manufacturing towns and cities had witnessed similar troubles, and the great corporations, having control of the lines of travel and commerce, were frequently brought to a standstill by the determined opposition of their employes. The workmen and capitalists of the country had for some time maintained toward each other a kind of armed neutrality, alike prejudicial to the interests of both.

In the spring of this year the managers of the great railways leading from the sea-board to the West, declared a reduction of ten per cent in the wages of their workmen. This measure, which was to take effect at the middle of July, was violently resisted by the employes of the companies, and the most active steps were taken to prevent its success. The reduction was to take effect at that precise season of the year when the removal of the enormous grain product of the West would put upon the operatives of the railways the most excessive labors of the year. It was also the season when the receipts of railway traffic were larger, and when, therefore, there was least rational ground for a reduction of wages. The resistance to the measure was natural and inevitable. On the 16th of July the employes of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad left their

posts, and gathered such strength in Baltimore and Martinsburg, West Virginia, as to prevent the running of trains and set the authorities at defiance. The militia was called out by Governor Matthews, and sent to Martinsburg; but was soon dispersed by the strikers, who, for the time, remained masters of the line. The President then ordered General French to the scene with a body of regulars, and the blockade of the road was raised. On the 20th of the month a violent tumult occurred in Baltimore; but the troops succeeded in scattering the rioters, of whom nine were killed and many wounded.

By this time the strike had spread every-



THE PITTSBURG RIOT.

where. In less than a week the trains had been stopped on all the important roads between the Hudson and the Mississippi. Except in the cotton-growing States, the insurrection was universal. Travel ceased; freights perished en route; business was paralyzed. In Pittsburg the strikers, rioters, and dangerous classes, gathering in a mob to the number of twenty thousand, obtained complete control of the city, and for two days held a reign of terror unparalleled in the history of the country. The lawless violence, and madness of the scene recalled the days of the French Revolution. The Union Dépôt, all the machine-shops, and all the railroad buildings of the city were burned. One hundred and twenty-five

locomotives, and two thousand five hundred cars, laden with valuable merchandise, were destroyed amid the wildest havoc and uproar. The insurrection was finally suppressed by the regular troops and the Pennsylvania militia, but not until nearly a hundred lives had been lost, and property destroyed to the value of more than \$3,000,000.

On the 25th of July a terrible riot of like character occurred in Chicago. In this tumult fifteen of the insurgents were killed by the militia of the city. On the next day St. Louis was imperiled by a similar mob. San Francisco was also the scene of a dangerous outbreak, which was here directed against the Chinese immigrants and the managers of the lumber-yards. Cincinnati, Columbus, Indianapolis, Louisville, and Fort Wayne were for a while in danger, but escaped without serious loss of life or property. By the close of the month the alarming insurrection was at an end. Business and travel flowed back into their usual channels; but the sudden outbreak had given a shock to the public mind, and had revealed a hidden peril to American institutions.

To this period belongs the history of the NEZ PERCÉ WAR. The Indian tribe of this name had their haunts in Idaho. They had been known to the Government since 1806, when the first treaty was made with them by the explorers, Lewis and Clarke. Missionary stations had been established among them, and the Nation had remained on friendly terms until after the Mexican War. In 1854 the authorities of the United States purchased a part of the Nez Percé Territory, large reservations being made in North-western Idaho and North-eastern Oregon. But some of the chiefs refused to ratify the purchase, and continued to roam at large. These came in conflict with the White settlers who had made their way into the disputed regions, and hostilities at once ensued.

The war was begun by the savages in the usual predatory manner. General Howard, at this time commanding the department of the Columbia, marched against the hostile tribe with a small force of regulars, but the Nez Percés, led by their noted chieftain Joseph, fled first in this direction and then in that, avoiding battle. During the greater part of the summer the pursuit continued; still the

Indians could not be overtaken. In the fall they were chased through the mountains into Northern Montana, where they were confronted by other troops under command of Colonel Miles. The Nez Percés, thus hemmed in, were driven across the Missouri River, near the mouth of the Musselshell, and were finally surrounded in their camp north of the Bear Paw Mountains. Here, on the 4th of October, they were attacked by the forces of Colonel Miles; a hard battle was fought, and the Indians were completely routed. Only a few braves, led by their chief, White Bird, made their escape. All the rest were either killed or made prisoners. Three hundred and seventy-five of the captive Nez Percés were brought back to the military post on the Missouri. The troops of General Howard had made forced marches through a mountainous country for a distance of *sixteen hundred miles!* The campaign was crowned with complete success.

The year 1878 was noted in the financial history of the United States for the important Congressional measure, known as THE REMONETIZATION OF SILVER. When the American Republic was instituted in 1789 one of the most important matters imposed on the Treasury was the establishment of a system of coinage. At that time there might be said to be no unit of value in the Old Thirteen States. In general, the British system had prevailed, and the pound sterling, with its subdivisions of shillings and pence, was recognized as the money of account. The Revolution had dissipated coin from the country, and the devices of paper money used in the epoch of Independence were various and uncertain. By the first coinage regulations of the United States, the standard unit of value was the American Silver Dollar, containing three hundred and seventy-one and one-fourth grains of pure silver. The reason of fixing upon this particular weight was that the Spanish-American dollar, largely circulating at the time in the States, was found by analysis to contain exactly three hundred and seventy-one and one-fourth grains of pure metal. Since the people were already familiar with this dollar, and used it largely as a unit of accounting, Mr. Hamilton wisely adapted the new national standard to the existing dollar. By such a

measure it was practicable to recoin the Spanish dollar into the new American dollar.

From the date of the adoption of this standard, in 1792, until 1873, the quantity of pure metal in the standard unit had never been changed, though the amount of alloy contained in the dollar had been several times altered. From 1792 to 1849 this American silver dollar was the only standard unit of money and account. In the latter year, however, the discovery of gold in California led to the establishment and coinage of a *gold* dollar, and from that time forth the standard unit of value existed in *both metals*. For nearly a quarter of a century the double unit prevailed, during which time it may be said to have been difficult to determine whether, in accounting in the United States, gold was measured by the silver standard, or silver by the standard of gold. In the years 1873-4, at a time when, owing to the premium on gold and silver, both metals were out of circulation, a series of acts were passed upon by Congress bearing upon the standard of value, whereby the legal-tender quality of silver was first abridged, and then abolished. These enactments were completed by the report of the Coinage Committee in 1874, by which the silver dollar was finally omitted from the list of coins to be struck at the National Mints. The general effect of these acts was to leave the gold dollar of twenty-three and twenty-two hundredths grains the single standard unit of value in the United States.

In course of time, the ulterior object of this demonetization of silver became sufficiently apparent. The manipulators of the measure had foreseen that the National paper currency of the country was destined, in a few years to come to par in coin—that is, that specie-payments must soon be resumed by the Government. Meanwhile, there came the discovery of the inexhaustible silver-mines in the Western mountains. Thus was it also foreseen that silver must, ere long, be abundant and cheap. If that metal should be retained in the coinage, therefore, the payment of the National Debt would be proportionally easy. It was deemed expedient to strike down in time the legal-tender quality of silver, in order that the whole payment of the bonded indebtedness of the United States must be made in the more

costly metal, namely, by the single standard of gold.

In accordance with this project, THE RESUMPTION ACT was passed by Congress in 1875, whereby it was declared that on the 1st of January, 1879, the Government of the United States should begin to redeem its outstanding obligations *in coin*. As the time for resumption drew near and the premium on gold fell off, the question was raised as to the meaning of "coin" in the act for resuming specie payments; and now for the first time the attention of the people at large was aroused to the fact that, by the acts of 1873-4, the privilege of paying debts in silver had been taken away, and that after the beginning of 1879 all obligations, both public and private, must be discharged according to the measure of the gold dollar only. A great agitation followed. The cry for the remonetization of silver was heard everywhere. In vain did the bond-holding interest of the country exert itself to stay the tide. The question reached the Government; and early in 1878 a measure was passed by Congress for the restoration of the legal-tender quality of the old silver dollar, and providing for the compulsory coinage of that unit at the mints at a rate of not less than two millions of dollars a month. The President returned the bill with his objections, but the veto was crushed under a tremendous majority; for nearly three-fourths of the members of Congress, without respect to party affiliations, gave their support to the measure; and the old double standard of values was thus restored.

In the summer and fall of 1878 several of the Gulf States were scourged with a YELLOW-FEVER EPIDEMIC, unparalleled in the history of the country. The disease made its appearance in New Orleans, and from thence was quickly scattered among the other towns along the Lower Mississippi. Unfortunately the attention of the people in the Gulf country had been but little given to sanitary precautions, and the Southern cities were nearly all in a condition to invite the presence of the scourge. The terror soon spread from town to town, and the people began to fly from the pestilence. The cities of Memphis and Grenada became a scene of desolation. At Vicksburg the ravages of the plague were almost equally terrible; and even in the parish towns remote

from the river, and as far north as Nashville and Louisville, the horrors of the fatal m疾 were felt. All summer long the disease held on unabated. The helpless populations along the Lower Mississippi languished and died by thousands. In the Northern States a regular system of contributions was established, and men and treasure were poured out without stint. The efforts of the Howard Association, at New Orleans, Memphis, and elsewhere, were almost unequalled in heroism and sacrifice. After more than twenty thousand people had fallen victims to the plague, its ravages were at last stayed by the grateful frosts of October.

By the Eighteenth Article of the Treaty of Washington, it was agreed that the right of the inhabitants of the United States in certain sea-fisheries, which had hitherto belonged exclusively to the subjects of Great Britain, should be acknowledged and maintained. It was conceded, moreover, that the privilege of taking fish of every kind—excepting shell-fish—on the seacoast and shores, and in the bays, harbors, and creeks of the Provinces of Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward's Island, and the islands thereto adjacent, without restriction as to distance from the shore, should be guaranteed to American fishermen without prejudice or partiality. On the other hand, the Government of the United States agreed to relinquish the duties which had hitherto been charged on certain kinds of fish, imported by British subjects into American harbors.

Several other concessions of minor importance were mutually made by the two Governments; and in order to balance any discrepancy which might appear in the aggregate of such concessions, and to make the settlement of a vexed question full, fair, and final, it was further agreed, that any total advantage to the United States arising from the treaty might be compensated by a sum in gross, to be paid by the American Government to Great Britain. In order to determine what such sum might be, a Commission was provided for, to consist of one commissioner to be appointed by the Queen, one by the President of the United States, and a third—in case the Queen and the President should not agree on the third—by the Austrian Ambassador at the Court of St. James. This provision for the appointment of

a third commissioner or umpire was one of the strangest incidents of diplomatical history. As the event came to pass, the man who, by the terms of the treaty, held the power of appointing, and did appoint, the umpire, was Count Von Beust, a Bourbon in politics, a Saxon renegade, an upholder of the House of Hapsburg, a hater of all republican institutions. Thus it was that a question which had proved to be too serious for the decision of the Joint High Commission itself, was remanded for settlement to a political adventurer, temporarily resident in *London!*


According to the agreement, the Commission was constituted in the summer of 1877; and the sittings were held at Halifax. But little attention was given in the United States to the proceedings of the body until November, when the country was startled by the announcement, that by the casting vote of Mr. Delfosse, Belgian Minister to the United States, who had been named as umpire by the Austrian Ambassador at London, an award of \$5,000,000 had been made against the American Government! The decision was received with general surprise, both in the United States and in Europe, and for a while it seemed probable that the arbitration might be renounced as iniquitous. It was decided, however, that the award, whether just or unjust, would better stand; the beneficent principle of arbitration was worth more to the United States than the cost of the adverse decision. Accordingly in November, 1878, the amount awarded was paid—not without great popular dissatisfaction—to the British Government.

The year 1878 witnessed the establishment of a Resident Chinese Embassy at Washington. For twenty years the great and liberal treaty negotiated by Anson Burlingame had been in force between the United States and China. Under this compact the commercial relations of the two countries had been vastly extended, and a knowledge of the institutions, manners, and customs prevalent in the Celestial Empire so widely diffused as to break down, in some measure, the race-prejudice against the Chinese. The enlightened policy of the reigning Emperor had also contributed to establish more friendly intercourse with the United States. The idea of sending Resident Ambassadors to the American Government

had been entertained for several years. The Emperor had been assured that the Ministers of China would be received with all the courtesy shown to the most favored nation. The officers chosen by the Imperial Government as its representatives in the United States were Chen Lan P'u, Minister Plenipotentiary; Yung Wing, Assistant Envoy; and Yung Tsang Siang, Secretary of Legation. On the 28th of September the Embassy was received by the President, the ceremonies of the occasion being among the most novel ever witnessed in Washington City.

The history of modern times contains many pleasing evidences of the growing estimate

the United States, under patronage and control of the Government. This service had existed as a private enterprise since 1871. The plan proposed and adopted, on the 18th of June, 1878, embraced the establishment of regular stations and light-houses on all the exposed parts of the Atlantic coast, and along the great Lakes. Each station was to be manned by a band of seamen, experienced in the dangers of coast-storms, and drilled in the best methods of rescue and resuscitation. Boats of the most approved pattern were provided and equipped. A hundred appliances and inventions, suggested by the wants of the service, such as life-cars, with



LAUNCHING A LIFE-BOAT.

placed by civilized States upon the value of human life. In the legislation of Congress, several important acts of recent date bear witness to the general interest felt in the country on the subject of better protection for those who are exposed on land and sea. The question of affording succor to shipwrecked sailors has, in several instances, engrossed the attention of the Government, and many measures have been proposed with a view of giving greater security to "them that go down to the sea in ships." During the last session of the Forty-fifth Congress, a bill was proposed by Honorable Samuel S. Cox, of New York, for the re-organization of THE LIFE-SAVING SERVICE of

lawyers and mortars for firing shot-lines into vessels foundering at a distance from shore, were supplied, and their use skillfully taught to the brave men who were employed at the stations. The success of the enterprise has been so great as to reflect the highest credit upon its promoters. The number of lives saved through the direct agency of the service reaches to thousands annually, and the amount of human suffering and distress alleviated by this beneficent movement is beyond computation. So carefully are the exposed coasts of the United States now guarded that it is almost impossible for a foundering ship to be driven within sight of the shore without at

once beholding through the darkness the sudden glare of the red-light signal, flaming up from the bench, telling of friends near by, and rescue soon to come.

In accordance with the act of 1875, THE RESUMPTION OF SPECIE PAYMENTS was accomplished on the 1st day of January, 1879. For some time previous to the latter date the premium on gold had gradually declined, very slowly, indeed, as the date of resumption drew near. During the last month of 1878 the difference between the value of gold and paper dollars was so slight as to be scarcely perceptible in financial transactions. For some days the premium hovered about one per cent; then sank to the level, and disappeared. The Gold Room at New York City was closed, and metallic money reappeared on the counters of banks and in the safes of merchants. For more than seventeen years gold and silver coin had been used as merchandise rather than money, the legal-tender note of the Government constituting the standard of value. During this whole period the monetary affairs of the Government had been in a state of distraction. The monetary unit had been so fluctuating as to render legitimate business almost impracticable. The purchasing power of a dollar could hardly be predicted from one week to another. Resulting from this a rampant spirit of speculation had taken possession of the markets of the country, and the lawful transactions of the street, carried forward in accordance with the plain principles of political economy, suffered shipwreck. Meanwhile, *parvenu* statesmen gave lectures on the nature of debt and the danger of overproduction.

After the passage of the Resumption Act, and during the next four years, the value of the monetary unit steadily appreciated, and at the same time the debtors-classes of the country entered a period of great hardship; for their indebtedness constantly augmented in a ratio beyond the probability, if not the possibility, of payment. Financial ruin and bankruptcy supervened; and these calamities were only checked, not ended, by the abrogation of the Bankrupt Act, in 1878. With the epoch of Resumption, however, a certain measure of confidence was restored, and the reappearance of coin money was hailed by many as the beginning of a better era.

Thus passed away the Administration of Hayes. It was, on the whole, a peculiar quadrennium in American history. The methods of the President lacked emphasis in every particular. Nor did the after-judgment of many of the American people fail to renew the doubts concerning the legality of his election. The biennial choice of Congressmen in 1878, being the election for members of the Forty-sixth Congress, resulted in a clear majority for the Democrats in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. For a season everything seemed to foretoken the complete restoration to power of the Democratic party. The leaders of that party were strongly hopeful of success, and entered the campaign of 1880 with unusual enthusiasm. The Republican National Convention of that year was held in Chicago on the 2d and 3d of June. The platform of principles adopted was largely retrospective. The history of the party during its twenty years of supremacy in the Government was recited as the best reason why its loss of power should be continued by the people. The platform reaffirmed and emphasized the doctrine of National Sovereignty as opposed to the theory of State Rights; declared in favor of popular education; advocated a system of discriminating duties in favor of American industries; ratified the Administration of Hayes; and arraigned the Democratic party as unpatriotic in principle and fraudulent in practice. Upon this platform, after the greater part of two days had been consumed in balloting, General James A. Garfield, of Ohio, was nominated for President; and Chester A. Arthur, of New York, for Vice-President.

The Democratic National Convention assembled in Cincinnati, on the 22d of June. The platform of principles declared adherence to the doctrines and traditions of the party; opposed centralization in the Government; adhered to gold and silver money and paper convertible into coin; advocated a tariff for revenue only; denounced the Administration as the creature of a conspiracy; opposed the presence of troops at the polls; praised Samuel J. Tilden for his patriotism; declared for free ships, and an amendment to the Burlingame Treaty as against Chinese immigration; and appealed to the acts of the Forty-sixth Con-

gress as proof of the wisdom and economy of the party. After adopting this platform, the convention nominated for the Presidency, General Winfield S. Hancock, of New York; and for the Vice-presidency, William H. English, of Indiana.

Meanwhile, the National Greenback party had held a convention in Chicago, on the 9th of June, and nominated as standard-bearers General James B. Weaver, of Iowa, for President; and General Benjamin J. Chambers, of Texas, for Vice-President. The platform of principles declared in favor of the rights of the laborer as against the exactions of capital; denounced monopolies and syndicates; proclaimed the sovereign power of the Government over the coinage of metallic and the issuance of paper money; advocated the abolition of the National banking system, and the substitution therefor of a legal-tender currency; declared for the payment of the bonded debt of the United States as against all refunding schemes; denounced land-grants; opposed Chinese immigration and the increase of the standing army; favored the equal taxation of all property, and unrestricted suffrage; demanded reform in the methods of Congressional procedure, and appealed for support to the sense of justice in the American people.

During the canvass of 1880 the Third Party movement reached its climax for the decade. The more rational part of the principles of the Greenback party had in them at this time a quality which demanded the assent of a respectable minority of the American people. The correctness of the principles referred to, their truth in theory and rightfulness in practice, entered so strongly into the political current of the time that they were wafted higher and higher, until finally the question of the right and power of the Government to make legal-tender paper money, absolutely, in time of peace as well as in time of war, was carried for judgment to the Supreme Court of the United States; was there argued by able Constitutional lawyers before a full bench, and was decided, with only a single dissenting opinion, in favor of the Greenback theory of legal-tender paper money and its validity, independently of coin redemption. But, politically, the party representing these ideas was doomed to failure. As the canvass

progressed it became evident that the contest lay between the Republican and the Democratic party; also, that the long-standing sectional division into North and South was likely, once more, to decide the contest in favor of the former. That part of the Democratic platform which declared for a tariff for revenue only, alarmed the manufacturing interests and consolidated them in favor of the Republican candidates. The banking and bond-holding classes rallied with great unanimity to the same standard, and the old war spirit, aroused at the appearance of a "Solid South," insured a solid North against the Democracy. The election resulted in the choice of Garfield and Arthur. Two hundred and fourteen electoral votes, including those of all the Northern States, except New Jersey, Nevada, and four out of the five votes of California, were cast for the Republican candidates, and one hundred and fifty-five votes, including those of every Southern State, were given to Hancock and English. The candidate of the National party secured no electoral votes, though the popular vote given to Weaver aggregated three hundred and seven thousand, as against eighty-one thousand cast for Cooper and Cary in 1876.

The Administration of Hayes and the last session of the Forty-sixth Congress expired on the 4th of March, 1881. The closing session had been chiefly occupied with the work of refunding the National debt. About \$750,000,000 of five and six per cent. bonds became due during the year, and to provide for the payment or refunding of this large sum was the most important matter claiming the attention of Congress. Late in the session a bill was passed by that body providing for the issuance by the Government of new bonds of two classes, both bearing three per cent. interest; the first class payable in from five to twenty years, and the second class in from one to ten years. The latter bonds were to be issued in small denominations adapted to the conditions of a popular loan. One provision of the bill required the National banks holding five and six per cent. bonds to surrender the same—the bonds having fallen due—and to receive instead the new three per cents. This clause of the law aroused the antagonism of the banks, and by every possible means they

sought to prevent the passage of the bill. The capitalists of the country in general pursued the same course—this, for the reasons that the loan was too popular in its character, and that the bonds were of so short a time that the Government would be able to control their redemption at its pleasure.

These considerations were specially repugnant to the bond-holders as a class. Nevertheless, on the last day of the session the bill for refunding, having been passed by Congress, was laid before the President for his signature; but his approval was withheld. A veto message was returned to Congress, and the advocates of the measure being unable to command the requisite two-thirds majority, the bill failed to become a law. Thus the session closed without any provision for the seven hundred and fifty millions of dollars in bonds falling due in 1881. The whole duty of providing for this large fraction of the public debt was remanded to another Administration and another Congress.

After retiring from the Presidency, General Grant, with his family and a company of personal friends, set out to visit the countries of Europe and Asia, and to make a tour of the world. Though the expedition was intended to be private, it at once attracted the most conspicuous attention, both at home and abroad. The departure from Philadelphia, in May of 1877, proved to be the beginning of a pageant, which, in its extent and magnificence, was never before accorded to a private citizen of any nation of the earth. Wherever the Ex-President went, he was welcomed with huzzas and dismissed with plaudits. First in England—at Liverpool, Manchester, London—and afterwards, in mid-summer, in Belgium, Switzerland, Prussia, and France, everywhere the General's coming was announced by the thunder of cannon and a chorus of cheers. A short stay in Italy was followed by a voyage to Alexandria and a brief sojourn in Egypt. Thence the company proceeded to Palestine, and afterwards to Greece. The following spring found the General and his party again in Italy, and the summer carried them into Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. The next countries visited were Austria and Russia, while for the winter the distinguished tourists chose the south of France and Spain. To land

was then visited, and in January of 1879 the company embarked from Marseilles for the East. The following year was spent in India, Burmah, Siam, China, and Japan. In the fall of 1879 the party returned to San Francisco, bearing with them the highest tokens of esteem which the great nations of the Old World could bestow upon the honored representative of the New.

The Census of 1880 was undertaken with more system and care than ever before in the history of the country. The work was intrusted to the general superintendency of Professor Francis A. Walker, under whose direction the Census of 1870 had been conducted. During the decade the same astounding progress which had marked the previous history of the United States was more than ever illustrated. In every source of National power, in every element of National vigor, the development of the country had continued without abatement. The total population of the Union now amounted to 50,152,866—an increase since 1870 of more than 1,000,000 inhabitants a year. The population of the great State of New York had risen to 5,083,173. Nevada, the least populous of the States, showed an enumeration of 62,265. Of the 11,584,188 added to the population during the last decade, 2,246,551 had been contributed by immigration, of whom about 85,000 annually had come from Germany. The number of cities having a population of over one hundred thousand inhabitants had increased from fourteen to twenty-five. The center of population had moved westward about fifty miles, and now rested near the city of Cincinnati.

The statistics of trade and industry were likewise gratifying to National pride. The current of the precious metals, which for many years had been constantly flowing from the United States to foreign countries, turned strongly in 1880 towards America. The importation of specie during the year just mentioned in excess of the exportation amounted to \$75,892,111. During the greater part of the period covered by the census, abundant crops had followed in almost unbroken succession, and the overplus in the great staples peculiar to our soil and climate had gone to enrich the country, and to stimulate those fundamental industries upon which national per-

petuity and individual happiness are ultimately founded.

During the Administration of Hayes several eminent Americans passed from the scene of their earthly activities. Among these may be mentioned Senator Oliver P. Morton, of Indiana, who, after battling for many years against the encroachments of paralysis, died at his home in Indianapolis, November 1, 1877. Still more universally felt was the loss of the great poet and journalist, William Cullen Bryant, who, on the 12th of June, 1878, at the advanced age of eighty-four, passed from among the living. For more than sixty

years his name had been known and honored wherever the English language is spoken. In his death one of the brightest lights of American literature was extinguished. On the 19th of December, in the same year, the illustrious Bayard Taylor, recently appointed American Minister to the German Empire, died suddenly at Berlin. His life had been devoted almost exclusively to literature, and almost every department of letters, from the common tasks of journalism to the highest charms of poetry, had been adorned by his genius. His death, at the early age of fifty-four, left a gap not easily to be filled in the ranks of literary toilers. On the 1st of November, 1879, Senator Zachariah Chandler, of Michigan, one of the organizers of the Republican party, and a great leader of that party in the times of the Civil War, died suddenly in Chicago;

and on the 24th of February, 1881, another Senator, Matthew H. Carpenter, of Wisconsin, expired, after a lingering illness, at Washington City.

James A. Garfield, twentieth President of the United States, was born at Orange, Cuyahoga County, Ohio, November 19, 1831. He was left in infancy to the sole care of his mother, and the rude surroundings of a backwoods home. The boy gathered from country toil a sound constitution, and from country schools the rudiments of education. Under such discipline he developed unusual faculties,

and became well known, even in youth, as a promising lad—afterwards a skillful mechanic. Further on, we find him serving as driver and pilot of a canal-boat, plying the Ohio and Pennsylvania Canal. At the age of seventeen he attended the high-school in Chester, where he extended his studies to algebra, Latin, and Greek. In 1851 he entered Hiram College, in which institution he remained as student and instructor until 1854. In that year he entered Williams College, and two years afterward was graduated with honor. Returning to Ohio, he was made first a pro-



JAMES A. GARFIELD.

fessor, and afterwards president of Hiram College. In this position he was serving at the outbreak of the Civil War, when he left his post to enter the army. Meanwhile, he had studied law, imbibed a love for politics, and been elected to the Ohio State Senate.

As a soldier, Garfield was first made a Lieutenant-Colonel, and afterwards Colonel of the Forty-second Regiment of Ohio Volunteers. He was soon promoted to a Brigadier-generalship, and did good service in Kentucky and Tennessee. He was made Chief of Staff to General Rosecrans, and bore a distinguished

part in the battle of Chickamauga. Soon afterwards, while still in the field, he was elected by the people of his district to the House of Representatives, in which body he served continuously for seventeen years. In 1879 he was elected to the United States Senate, and hard upon this followed his nomination and election to the Presidency.

In his inaugural address of March 4th, 1881, Garfield presented a retrospect of the progress of American civilization during the last quarter of a century. The country was congratulated on its high rank among the nations. The leading topics of politics were briefly reviewed, and the policy of the Executive department of the Government set forth with clearness and precision. The public-school system of the United States was recommended to the jealous care of the people. Regret was expressed for the estrangement of the South and for the heart-burnings of the Civil War, which still remained in the Nation. The maintenance of the present National banking system was recommended, and also the repression of the practices of polygamy. The President advocated, finally, the restriction of Chinese immigration, and the maintenance of the equal rights of the enfranchised Black men of the South.

On the following day the President sent to the Senate for confirmation the names of the members of his Cabinet. The nominations were: For Secretary of State, James G. Blaine, of Maine; for Secretary of the Treasury, William Windom, of Minnesota; for Secretary of War, Robert T. Lincoln, of Illinois; for Secretary of the Navy, William H. Hunt, of Louisiana; for Secretary of the Interior, Samuel J. Kirkwood, of Iowa; for Attorney-General, Wayne MacVeagh, of Pennsylvania; for Postmaster-General, Thomas L. James, of New York. The nominations were promptly confirmed, and the new Administration entered upon its duties.

The first issue which engaged the attention of the Government after Garfield's inauguration was the proposed Reform of the Civil Service. This question had been inherited from the Administration of Hayes, under whom several spasmodic efforts had been made to introduce better methods in the selection of persons to fill the appointive offices of the

United States. The real issue was—and has always been—whether the choice of the officials of the Government should be made on the ground of the character and fitness of the candidates, or on the principle of distributing political patronage to those who had best served the party; whether men should be promoted from the lower to the higher grades of official life, and retained according to the value and proficiency of their services, or whether they should be elevated to position in proportion to their success in carrying elections and maintaining the party in power.

The members of Congress, to whom the help of efficient supporters in their own districts and States seemed essential, and by whom the patronage of the Government had been mostly dispensed since the days of Jackson, held strongly to the old order of things, unwilling to relinquish their influence over the appointing power. President Hayes, after vainly attempting to establish the opposite policy, abandoned the field near the close of his Administration. The National Republican platform of 1880 vaguely indorsed Civil-service Reform as a principle of the party; and some expectation existed that Garfield would take up the policy of his predecessor. But with the incoming of the new Administration the rush of the politicians for office was unprecedented in the history of the country. The place-seekers, who claimed to have "carried the election," swarmed into Washington, and thronged the Executive mansion, clamoring for office, until all plans and purposes of reform in the civil service were crushed out of sight and trampled under feet of men.

This break from the principles of the Republican platform was soon followed with a serious political disaster, having its ultimate origin in the same question. A division arose in the ranks of the Republican party, which for a while threatened the disruption and ruin of that organization. The two wings of the Republicans were nick-named the "Half-breeds" and the "Stalwarts;" the latter, headed by Senator Calkins, of New York, being the division which had so resolutely supported General Grant for the Presidency in the Chicago Convention; the former, led by Mr. Blaine, now Secretary of State, and indorsed by the President himself, had control of the

Government and were numerically stronger than their opponents. The Stalwarts claimed their proportional part of the appointive offices of the Government, and the right of dispensing the same after the manner which had prevailed through several preceding Administrations—that is, the right to distribute the offices in the several States under the form of patronage by the Senators and Representatives of those States in Congress. The President, supported by his division of the party, and by the professed reform element in politics, insisted in naming the officers in the various States ac-

the Republican ranks was such as to threaten the dismemberment of the party.

Such was the condition of affairs at the adjournment of the Senate, in June. A few days afterwards, the President made arrangements to visit Williams College, where his two sons were to be entered for their education, intending to pass, after the Williams Commencement, a short vacation with his wife, who was sick, at the sea-side. On the morning of July 24, in company with Secretary Blaine and a few friends, he entered the Baltimore Railway station at Washington, preparatory to taking the train to Long Branch, New Jersey. A moment afterwards, he was approached by a miserable political miscreant named Charles Jules Guiteau, who, from behind and unperceived, came within a few feet of the company, drew a pistol, and fired upon the Chief Magistrate of the Republic. The aim of the assassin was too well taken, and the second shot struck the President centrally in the right side of the back. The bleeding man was quickly borne away to the Executive mansion, and the vile wretch who had committed the crime was hurried to prison.


For a while the hearts of the American people vibrated between hope and fear. The best surgical aid was procured, and bulletins were daily issued, containing a brief account of the President's condition. The conviction grew day by day that he would ultimately recover. Two surgical operations were performed with a view of improving his chances for life; but a series of relapses occurred, and the President gradually weakened under his suffering. As a last hope he was, on the 6th of September, carefully conveyed from Washington City to Elberon, where he was placed in a cottage hotel only a few yards from the surf. Here for a brief period hope again revived; but blood-poisoning at length ensued, and the patient sank day by day. At last, on the eightieth day after the shot was fired, namely, on the evening of September 19th, the anniversary of the battle of Chickamauga, in which Garfield had won his chief military reputation, his vital powers suddenly gave way under exhaustion, and in a few moments death closed the scene. Through the whole period of his prostration, he had borne the pain and anguish of his situation with the greatest forti-



JAMES G. BLAINE.

cording to his own wishes and what he conceived to be the fitness of things.

The contest soon came to a crisis. The war between the two factions in the party broke out in respect to the offices in New York. The collectorship of customs for the port of New York is the best appointive office in the gift of the Government. To fill this position the President appointed Judge William Robertson, and the appointment was bitterly antagonized by the New York Senators, Roscoe Conkling and Thomas C. Platt, who, failing to prevent the confirmation of Robertson, resigned their seats, returned to their State, and failed of a reelection. The breach thus effected in



ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT GARFIELD.

COPYRIGHT, 1894, BY G. F. TAYLOR.

tude and heroism. Nor can it be doubted that the great crime which laid him low heightened, rather than eclipsed, the luster of his life.

On the following day Vice-President Chester A. Arthur, then in New York, took the oath of office, and immediately repaired to Washington. For the fourth time in the history of the Republic, the duties of the Chief Magistracy were devolved on the Vice-President. The funeral of Garfield was observed first at Washington, whither the body was taken and placed in state in the rotunda of the Capitol. Here it was viewed by tens of thousands of people on the 22d and 23d of September. Garfield had chosen Lake View Cemetery, at Cleveland, as the place of his burial, and thither the remains were conveyed, by way of Philadelphia and Pittsburg. As in the case of Lincoln's death, the processions and ceremonies *en route* became a continuous pageant. On the 26th of September the body was laid in its final resting-place. The day of the burial was observed throughout the country in great assemblies gathered from hamlet and town and city, all anxious to testify their sorrow for the calamity which had come upon the country in the President's death.

We may here pause to narrate briefly the further events connected with the assassination and the assassin. Guiteau proved to be a half-crazy adventurer—a fool. He at once proclaimed the work which he had done, acknowledging that he had shot the President, and saying that he did so merely to *remove him*, and save the country. And here began that extreme unwisdom of the authorities which characterized all the future proceedings. Two plain constructions of the case were possible: Either Guiteau was a sane man, in the ordinary sense of that word, and had committed the greatest and vilest of political assassinations; or else he was a lunatic, who, under the influence of an insane hallucination, had shot and killed the President. Plain common sense, prudence, patriotism, political sagacity, and the whole array of facts regarding the prisoner's

character and conduct, pointed unmistakably to his lunacy, and to the second construction given above. But prejudice, anger, folly, shortsightedness, and the more vengeful passions which flamed up in the excitement of the hour, all backed and aggravated by the criminal wickedness of the American newspapers—ready, for the sake of mere sensationalism, to espouse any theory or promote any course in order to keep the air white with their own miserable editions—conspired to establish the theory of Guiteau's sanity, with the appalling conclusion that the President of the United



CHESTER A. ARTHUR

States had been *politically assassinated*. This theory was urged and preached with insane ferocity until it prevailed. The voice of reason was drowned, and the opportunity to save the American people from the indelible stain of political assassination, was scorned and put aside. Guiteau was indicted and tried for murder. During the whole course of the trial, the assemblage around the court-room in Washington was little less than a mob. The proceedings ended with a conviction, and a condemnation to death. Then followed another sensational imprisonment, and on the 30th of

June, 1882, the wretch was taken from the jail to the place of execution and hanged.

Chester A. Arthur, thus called to be President of the United States, was born in Franklin County, Vermont, October 5, 1830. He was of Irish parentage; was educated at Union College, from which institution he was graduated in 1849. For a while he taught school in his native State, and then went to New York City to study law. He was soon admitted to the bar, and rose rapidly to distinction. During the Civil War he was Quartermaster-General of the State of New York, filling the



ROBERT T. LINCOLN

office with great credit to himself and the Government. From 1865 to 1871 he practiced law in New York, and was then appointed collector of customs for that port. This position he held until July, 1878, when he was removed by President Hayes. Returning to the practice of his profession for two years, he was nominated and elected to the Vice-presidency. Then followed the killing of Garfield, and the accession of Arthur to the Chief Magistracy of the Union.

The assumption of the duties of the Presidential office by the new Executive was at-

tended with little ceremony or formality. On the 22d of September the oath of office was a *second time* administered to him at the Capitol by Chief-Justice Waite. After this, in the presence of a few who were gathered in the apartment, he delivered an appropriate address, referring in a touching manner to the death of his predecessor. Those present, including General Grant, Ex-President Hayes, Senator Sherman, and his brother, the General of the Army, then paid their respects, and the ceremony was at an end.

In accordance with the custom, the members of the existing Cabinet at once resigned their offices. The resignations, however, were not accepted, the President inviting all the members to retain their places. For the time all did so, except Mr. Windom, Secretary of the Treasury, who retired, and was succeeded by Judge Charles J. Folger, of New York. Mr. MacVeagh also resigned a short time afterwards, and the President appointed as his successor Benjamin H. Brewster, of Philadelphia. The next of the old Garfield Cabinet to retire were Mr. Blaine, Secretary of State, and Mr. James, Postmaster-General, who were succeeded in their respective offices by Frederick T. Frelinghuysen, of New Jersey, and Timothy O. Howe, of Wisconsin. Mr. Lincoln—so great was the charm of that illustrious name—remained, as by common consent, at the head of the Department of War. Besides the changes here referred to, not much disposition was shown to revolutionize the policy of the Government by the new Administration. The people generally, without respect to party lines, gave a tolerably cordial support to him who had been so suddenly, and by so calamitous a method, called to the Presidency.

The new Administration inherited the troubles and complications of its predecessor. The first and one of the most serious difficulties of the time was the important State trial relating to the alleged STAR-ROUTE CONSPIRACY. Under the recent conduct of affairs in the Post-office Department of the Government, there had been organized a class of fast-mail

routes, known as the Star Routes, the ostensible object being to carry the mails with rapidity and certainty into distant, and almost inaccessible portions of the Western States and Territories. The law governing the letting of mail contracts restricted the action of the Postmaster-General and his subordinates to definite limits of expenditure; but one clause of the law gave to the department the discretionary power to *expedite* such mail routes as seemed to be weaker and less efficient than the service required. This gave to certain officers of the Government the opportunity to let the contracts for many mail lines at a *minimum*, and then, under their discretionary power, to "expedite" the same lines into efficiency at exorbitant rates, the end and aim being to divide the spoils among the parties to the contract.

This alleged Star-Route conspiracy to defraud the Government was unearthed during the Garfield Administration, and Attorney-General MacVeagh was directed by the President to prosecute the reputed conspirators. Indictments were presented by the grand jury against Ex-United States Senator Stephen W. Dorsey, of Arkansas; Second Assistant Postmaster-General Thomas J. Brady, of Indiana; and several others of less note. Mr. MacVeagh, however, seemed, in the conduct of the Department of Justice, to act with little spirit and no success. After his retirement from office, and the appointment of Brewster as Attorney-General, matters were quickened into sharp activity, and those indicted for conspiracy were brought to trial. After several weeks of stormy prosecution and defense, the case went to the jury, who brought in a verdict absurdly convicting certain subordinates of participating in a conspiracy, which could not have existed without the guilt of their superiors! This scandal, occupying the public mind in the summer of 1882, contributed much to the defeat of the Republican party in the State elections of the following November—a defeat so general as to remain, by overwhelming majorities, the control of the House of Representatives to the Democrats.

We may here turn aside from the course of political events—from the mere spectacular aspect of public affairs—to notice briefly some features of the beneficent progress of physical

science. History, as a means of delineating the course of human events, is, within the present century, departing more and more from the methods of the old annalists, whose attention was wholly directed to the civil, political, and military movements of society. It is now beginning to be perceived that the sources of human happiness, the origins of human advancement, lie far removed from the fictitious splendors of public life. Yielding to this tendency in history, we shall here notice a few of those salutary inventions which have done so much in our day to add to the comfort, the prosperity, and the honor of the American people.

It is safe to aver that the recent rapid addition by inventive processes to the resources of physical happiness, and to intellectual development as well, is the most striking feature of the civilization of our time. At no other age in the history of the world has a practical knowledge of the laws of nature been so widely and so rapidly diffused. At no other epoch has the subjection of natural agents to the will of man been so wonderfully displayed. It may be truthfully averred that the old life of the human race is giving place to the new life, based on scientific research, and energized by the knowledge that the conditions of our environment in the world are as benevolent as they are unchangeable.

It has remained for the present era, and to American genius, to solve the problem of oral communication between persons at a distance from each other. A knowledge of the laws of sound and electricity has enabled the scientists of our day to devise an apparatus for transmitting, or at least reproducing, the human voice at a distance of hundreds, or even thousands, of miles. The history of the TELEPHONE must stand as a reminder to after ages of the inventive skill and scientific progress of the last quarter of the Nineteenth Century. This instrument, like many similar inventions, seems to have been the work of several ingenious minds, directed at nearly the same time to the same problem. The solution, however, may be properly accredited to Eliha P. Gray, of Chicago, and Alexander Graham Bell, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. It should be mentioned, also, that Amos E. Dolbear, of Tufts' College, Massa-

chusetts, and Thomas A. Edison, of New Jersey, likewise succeeded in solving the difficulties in the way of telephonic communication, or, at least, in answering practically some of the minor questions in the way of success.

The telephone may be defined as an instrument for the reproduction of sound, particularly the sounds of the human voice, by the agency of electricity, at long distances from the origin of the vocal disturbance. It is now well known that the phenomenon called sound consists of a wave agitation communicated through the particles of some medium to the organ of hearing. Every particular sound has its own physical equivalent in the system of waves in which it is written. The only thing, therefore, that is necessary in order to carry a sound in its integrity to any distance, is to transmit its physical equivalent, and to re-deliver that equivalent to some organ of hearing capable of receiving it.

Upon these principles the telephone was produced—created. Every sound which falls by impact upon the sheet-iron disk of the instrument communicates thereto a sort of tremor. This tremor causes the disk to approach and recede from the magnetic pole placed just behind the diaphragm. A current of electricity is thus induced, pulsates along the wire to the other end, and is delivered to the metallic disk of the second instrument, many miles away, just as it was produced in the first. The ear of the hearer receives from the second instrument the exact physical equivalent of the sound, or sounds, which were delivered against the disk of the first instrument, and thus the utterance is received at a distance just as it was given forth.

As already said, the invention of the telephone stands chiefly to the credit of Professors Gray and Bell. It should be recorded that as early as 1837 the philosopher Page succeeded, by means of electro-magnetism, in transmitting musical tones to a distance. It was not, however, until 1877 that Professor Bell, in a public lecture given at Salem, Massachusetts, astonished his audience, and the whole country as well, by receiving and transmitting vocal messages from Boston, twenty miles away. Incredulity had no more a place as it respected the feasibility of talking to persons at a distance. The experiments of Gray at Chicago,

a few days later in the same month, were equally successful. Messages were distinctly delivered between that city and Milwaukee, a distance of eighty-five miles, nor could it be longer doubted that a new era in the means of communication had come.

The Bell telephone, with many modifications and improvements, sprang into rapid use. Within reasonable limits of distance the new method of transmitting intelligence by direct vocal utterance, soon took the place of all slower and less convenient means of inter-communication. The appearance of the simple instrument was one of the many harbingers of the auspicious time when the constant interchange of thought and sentiment between man and man, community and community, nation and nation, shall conduce to the peace of the world, and the good-fellowship of the human race.

After the telephone came the PHONOGRAPH. The new instrument was in some sense the complement of its predecessor. Both inventions are based upon the same principle of science. The discovery that every sound has its physical equivalent in a wave or agitation which affects the particles of matter composing the material through which the sound is transmitted led almost inevitably to the other discovery of *catching* and *retaining* that physical equivalent or wave in the surface of some body, and to the reproduction of the original sound therefrom. Such is the fundamental principle of the interesting but, thus far, little useful instrument known as the phonograph. The same was invented by Thomas A. Edison, of Menlo Park, in the year 1877. The instrument differs considerably in structure and purpose from the *Vibrograph* and *Phonautograph* which preceded it. The latter two instruments were made simply to *write* sound vibrations; the former, to reproduce *audibly* the sounds themselves.

The Phonograph consists of three principal parts,—the sender or funnel-shaped tube, with its open mouth-piece standing toward the operator; the diaphragm and stylus connected therewith, which receives the sound spoken into the tube; and thirdly, the revolving cylinder, with its sheet-coating of tin-foil laid over the surface of a spiral groove to receive the indentations of the point of the stylus.

The mode of operation is very simple. The cylinder is revolved; and the point of the stylus, when there is no sound agitation in the funnel or mouth-piece, makes a smooth, continuous depression in the tin-foil over the spiral groove. But when any sound is thrown into the mouth-piece the iron disk or diaphragm is agitated; this agitation is carried through the stylus and written in irregular marks, dots, and peculiar figures in the tin-foil over the groove. When the utterance which is to be reproduced has been completed, the instrument is stopped, the stylus thrown back from the groove, and the cylinder revolved backward to the place of starting. The stylus is then returned to its place in the groove, and the cylinder is revolved forward at the same rate of rapidity as before. As the point of the stylus plays up and down in the indentations and through the figures in the tin-foil, produced by its own previous agitation, a quiver exactly equivalent to that which was produced by the utterance in the mouth-piece is communicated *backwards* to the diaphragm, and by it is flung through the mouth-piece into the air. This agitation is of course the exact physical equivalent of the original sound, or, more properly, *is* the sound itself. Thus it is that the phonograph is made to talk, to sing, to cry; to utter, in short, any sound sufficiently powerful to produce a perceptible tremor in the mouth-piece and diaphragm of the instrument.

Much progress has already been made towards the utilization of the phonograph as a practical addition to the civilizing apparatus of our time. It may be said, indeed, that all the difficulties in the way of such a result have been removed. Mr. Edison has carried forward his work to such a degree of perfection that the instrument may be practically employed in correspondence and literary composition. The problem has been to stereotype, so to speak, the tin-foil record of what has been uttered in the mouth-piece, and thus to preserve in a permanent form the potency of vanished sounds. Nor does it require a great stretch of the imagination to see in the invention of the phonograph one of the greatest achievements of the age—a discovery, indeed, which may possibly revolutionize the whole method of learning. It would seem clear that nature has intended the *ear*, rather than the

eye, to be the organ of education. It is manifestly against the fitness of things that the eyes of all mankind should be strained, weakened, permanently injured in childhood, and the unnatural tasks which are imposed upon the delicate organ. It would seem to be more in accordance with the nature and capacities of man, and the general character of the external world, to reserve the eye for the discernment and appreciation of beauty, and to impose upon the ear the tedious and hard tasks of education. The Phonograph makes it possible to read by the ear instead of by the eye, and it is not beyond the range of probability that the book of the future, near or remote, will be written in phonographic plates and



THOMAS A. EDISON.

made to reveal its story directly to the waiting ear, rather than through the secondary medium of print to the enfeebled and tired eye of the reader.

But perhaps the most marked and valuable invention of the current age—the best calculated to affect favorably the welfare of the people, especially in great cities—is that of the **ELECTRIC LIGHT**. The introduction of this superior system of illumination marks an epoch more interesting and important in the history of our country than any political conflict or mere change of rulers. About the beginning of the eighth decade of the century

the project of introducing the electric light for general purposes of illumination began to be agitated. It was at once perceived that the advantages of such lighting were as many as they were obvious. The light is so powerful as to render practicable the performance of many mechanical operations as easily by night as by day. Again, the danger of fire from illuminating sources is almost wholly obviated by the new system. The ease and expedition of all kinds of night employment are greatly enhanced. A given amount of illumination can be produced much more cheaply by electricity than by any means of gas-lighting or ordinary combustion.

Among the first to demonstrate the feasibility of electric lighting was the philosopher Gramme, of Paris. In the early part of 1875 he successfully lighted his laboratory by means of electricity. Soon afterward the foundry of Ducommun & Co., of Mulhouse, was similarly lighted. In the course of the following year the apparatus for lighting by means of carbon candles was introduced into many of the principal factories of France and other leading countries of Europe. It may prove of interest in this connection to sketch briefly the principal features of the electric light system, and to trace the development of that system in our own and other countries.

Lighting by electricity is accomplished in several ways. In general, however, the principle by which the result is accomplished is one, and depends upon the resistance which the electrical current meets in its transmission through various substances. There are no perfect conductors of electricity. In proportion as the non-conductive quality is prevalent in a substance, especially in a metal, the resistance to the passage of electricity is pronounced, and the consequent disturbance among the molecular particles of the substance is great. Whenever such resistance is encountered in a circuit, the electricity is converted into heat, and when the resistance is great, the heat is, in turn, converted into light, or rather the heat becomes phenomenal in light; that is, the substance which offers the resistance glows with the transformed energy of the impeded current. Upon this simple principle all the apparatus for the production of the electric light is produced.

Among the metallic substances, the one best adapted by its low conductivity to such resistance and transformation of force, is platinum. The high degree of heat necessary to fuse this metal adds to its usefulness and availability for the purpose indicated. When an electrical current is forced along a platinum wire too small to transmit the entire volume, it becomes at once heated—first to a red, and then to a white glow—and is thus made to send forth a radiance like that of the sun. Of the non-metallic elements which offer similar resistance, the best is carbon. The infusibility of this substance renders it greatly superior to platinum for purposes of the electric light.

Near the beginning of the present century it was discovered by Sir Humphrey Davy that carbon points may be rendered incandescent by means of a powerful electrical current. The discovery was fully developed in the year 1809, while the philosopher just referred to was experimenting with the great battery of the Royal Institution of London. He observed—rather by accident than design, or previous anticipation—that a strong volume of electricity passing between two bits of wood charcoal produces tremendous heat, and a light like that of the sun. It appears, however, that Davy at first regarded the phenomenon rather in the nature of an interesting display of force than as a suggestion of the possibility of turning night into day.

For nearly three-quarters of a century the discovery made by Sir Humphrey lay dormant among the great mass of scientific facts revealed in the laboratory. In course of time, however, the nature of the new fact began to be apprehended. The electric lamp in many forms was proposed and tried. The scientists, Niardet, Wilde, Brush, Fuller, and many others of less note, busied themselves with the work of invention. Especially did Gramme and Siemens devote their scientific genius to the work of turning to good account the knowledge now fully possessed of the transformability of the electric current into light.

The experiments of the last named two distinguished inventors brought us to the dawn of the new era in artificial lighting. The Russian philosopher, Jablochkoff, carried the work still further by the practical introduction

of the carbon candle. Other scientists—Carré, Foucault, Serrin, Rapieff, and Werlemann—had, at an earlier or later day, thrown much additional information into the common stock of knowledge relative to the illuminating possibilities of electricity. Finally, the accumulated materials of science fell into the hands of that untutored but remarkably radical inventor, Thomas A. Edison, who gave himself with the utmost zeal to the work of removing the remaining difficulties in the problem.

Edison began his investigations in this line of invention in September of 1878, and in December of the following year gave to the public his first formal statement of results. After many experiments with platinum, he abandoned that material in favor of the carbon-arc *in vacuo*. The latter is, indeed, the essential feature of the Edison light. A small semicircle, or horseshoe, of some substance, such as a filament of bamboo reduced to the form of pure carbon, the two ends being attached to the poles of the generating-machine, or dynamo, as the engine is popularly called, is inclosed in a glass bulb, from which the air has been carefully withdrawn, and is rendered incandescent by the passage of an electric current. The other important features of Edison's discovery relate to the divisibility of the current, and its control and regulation in volume by the operator. These matters were fully mastered in the Edison invention, and the apparatus rendered as completely subject to management as are the other varieties of illuminating agencies.

It were vain to speculate upon the future of electric lighting. The question of artificial illumination has had much to do with the progress of the human race, particularly when aggregated into cities. Doubtless the old systems of lighting are destined in time to give place altogether to the splendors of the electric glow. The general effect of the change upon society must be as marked as it is salutary. Darkness, the enemy of good government and morality in great cities, will, in a great measure, be dispelled by the beneficent agent, over which the genius of Davy, Gramme, Brush, Edison, and a host of other explorers in the new continents of science has so completely triumphed. The ease, happiness, comfort, and welfare of mankind must be vastly multiplied,

and the future must be remodeled, in the glow that dispels the night, of that splendid fact that the progress of civilization depends, in a large measure, upon a knowledge of Nature's laws, and the diffusion of that knowledge among the people.

We may here notice, in a few brief paragraphs, some of the great achievements belonging to the last quarter of the Nineteenth Century in the matter of physical improvements. At no other time in modern history has civil engineering been turned to a better account than in the recent public works of the United States. First among these we may properly notice a few of the remarkable bridges which have been constructed within the period under contemplation. The principal place among such works may properly be given to the great Suspension Bridge over the strait known as East River, between New York and Brooklyn. The completion and formal opening of this work, which occurred on the 24th of May, 1883, was an event of so great interest as to evoke universal attention and elicit many descriptions.

The Brooklyn Bridge is the longest and largest structure of the kind in the world. The design was the work of the distinguished John A. Roebling, the originator of wire suspension-bridges, under whose supervision, and that of his son, Washington A. Roebling, the structure was completed.¹ The elder of these

¹ The personal history of the Roebings, father and son, in connection with their great work, is as pathetic as it is interesting. The elder engineer was injured while laying the foundation of one of the shore-piers on the 23d of July, 1869, and died of lockjaw. W. A. Roebling then took up his father's unfinished task. He continued the work of supervision for about two years, when he was prostrated with a peculiar form of paralysis known as the "Caisson disease," from which he never fully recovered. His mental faculties, however, remained unimpaired, and he was able to direct with his eye what his hands could no longer execute. While thus prostrated, his wife developed a genius almost equal to that of her husband and her father-in-law. The palsied engineer, thus reinforced, continued for five years to furnish the plans for the work. These plans were almost all drawn by his wife, who never flagged under the tasks imposed upon her. In 1876 Roebling was partly restored to health, and lived to hear the applause which his genius and enterprise had won.

two eminent engineers had already won for himself an enduring fame by the building of the first suspension-bridge across the chasm of Niagara, and also the still greater structure of the same character across the Ohio River, between Cincinnati and Covington. The latter structure, at the time of its erection, was by a thousand feet the longest of the kind in the world. The younger Roebling inherited much of his father's genius, and added a genius of his own. The construction of the bridge over East River could not have been put into hands more capable if all nations had been explored for engineers.

William C. Kingsley, President of the Bridge Trustees; and his predecessor in that office, Henry C. Murphy. The first plans and estimates were prepared in 1865. The company for the construction was organized two years afterwards. The capital was fixed at \$5,000,000. The enterprise was not pressed with due vigor until 1875, when the work was taken up by the State of New York. A Board of Managers was appointed to bring the bridge to completion at as early a date as possible. Congress also patronized the enterprise by an act of June, 1869, authorizing the construction. The formal opening in May of



EAST RIVER BRIDGE

The East River structure is what is known as a suspension bridge, being supported by four enormous wires, or cables, stretching from pier to pier in a single span, a distance of 1,595 feet. From the main towers to the anchorages on either side is 930 feet; from the anchorages outward to the termini of the approaches is, on the New York side, a distance of 1,562 feet; and on the Brooklyn side 972 feet; giving a total length of bridge and approaches of 5,989 feet. The total weight of the structure is 64,700 tons; the estimated capacity of support is 1,740 tons, and the "ultimate" resistance is calculated at 49,200 tons.

The Brooklyn bridge was first projected by

1883 drew the attention of the whole Nation to the metropolis, and proved by the interest which the event excited that even in America politics is not the best, at least not the only, vocation of mankind.

Perhaps the most notable example of the Cantilever Bridge as yet produced in the New World is the great structure of that order over the Niagara River, just above the village of Suspension Bridge, New York. It is the work of the distinguished civil engineer, C. G. Schneider, and is one of the most beautiful structures of its kind ever constructed. The bridge has a total length of 910 feet, and crosses the river with a single span of 470 feet.

The roadway is 239 feet above the water-level in the chasm below. The materials employed in the construction are steel and iron. The erection of any kind of staging in the river at this point was impossible, and what is called the "overhang" method of structure had to be adopted. Each of the great cantilevers were built out from the piers, section by section, until they had been advanced far enough from each side of the abyss to join their girders in the middle.

Still another of the most notable examples of successful bridge-building in the United States is that of the new Washington Bridge, extending from the upper extremity of Manhattan Island, across the gorge of the Harlem River to Westchester County, on the other side. The work is regarded as the most beautiful of its kind ever erected in America. The structure is of steel, and granite, and bronze. The chasm is spanned by two magnificent arches, having plate-girders of steel, each arch being from foot to foot a distance of 510 feet. The piers are of massive masonry, which rise to the level of the roadway. The viaduct is supported on vertical posts rising from the arches. The height of the roadway is 152 feet above the level of tide-water in the Harlem, being forty feet in excess of the like measurement under the East River Suspension Bridge. The approaches to the structure are broad viaducts of granite, carried on stone arches. All of the ornamentation is of bronze. The Washington Bridge was constructed in 1888-9, according to the designs and under the direction of the eminent civil engineer, Mr. William R. Hutton.

On the whole, the Administration of Arthur proved to be uneventful. The Government pursued the even tenor of its way, and the progress of the country was unchecked by serious calamity. In the domain of politics, we note here the gradual obliteration of those sharply defined issues which for the last quarter of a century had divided the two great parties. As a consequence, there was noticeable a healthful abatement of partisan rancor. It became every year more apparent that the questions at issue in the political arena were merely factitious, and that the clamors of partisanship were kept up by those who hoped to gather the spoils of the

political battle-field. Nor might any discern, in this decade, how much longer those ill-founded cries of alarm might serve to hold the people in line under the old party names. For the time being, however, the man who plowed or kept the flock, the mechanic, the artisan, the merchant, continued to come forth at the call of party leaders, and to vote, as had been his wont, on issues that were more imaginary than real.

To this general fact, that party questions were no longer vital and distinct, there was one notable exception. It can not be doubted that the American people were, from 1880 to 1890, really and sincerely divided on the question of the *TARIFF*. Whether the true policy of the United States is that of a free-trade or a protective system was a fundamental issue, and the decision was postponed. The policy of gathering immense revenues from customs duties during the Civil War, and in the decade thereafter, had become firmly imbedded as a factor in the industrial and commercial systems of the country. A great manufacturing interest had been stimulated into unusual, not to say inordinate, activity. Practically the political parties had become so much entangled with the finances and the industries of the country that no party discipline could withdraw and align the political forces in columns and battalions as of old. The question was fundamentally as ancient as the Republic. Ever and anon, from the very foundation of the Government, the tariff issue had obtruded itself upon the attention of the people. It may not be deemed inappropriate in this connection to state and briefly elucidate the various views which have been entertained on the subject.

First, we have what is called the doctrine of *FREE TRADE*, pure and simple. The theory is, in a word, as follows: The indications of profitable industry are founded in nature. The hints and suggestions of the natural world are the true indications of mankind as to how the various industries which human genius have devised are to be most profitably directed. Thus, a rich soil means agriculture. A barren soil is the indication of nature against agricultural pursuits. Beds of ore signify mining; veins of petroleum, oil-wells; a headlong river, water-power; hills of silica, glass-works; for-

ests of pine, ship-masts and coal-tar; bays and havens and rivers, commerce. Free trade says that these things are the voice and edict of the natural world as to how human industry shall be exerted. The way to wealth, prosperity, happiness, is to follow the edict of nature whithersoever it calls. To go against human nature is to go against self-interest and against common sense. *Laissez faire*, that is, "Let alone," is the fundamental motto of the system—hands off, and no meddling with the plain conditions which are imposed on man by his environments. Let him who lives in the fecund valley till the soil and gather a hundred-fold. Let him who inhabits the rocky upland, by river-side or bed of pent-up coal, devote his energies to manufacture. Let each procure from the other by exchange the necessities and conveniences of life which he could not himself produce but at a great disadvantage, and an irrational and needless expenditure of toil. Let the producer of raw material send it near or far to the manufacturer, and receive in turn the fabric which he must wear, even the food wherewith he must sustain his life. Why should he do otherwise? Why should either the man or the community struggle against the conditions of nature, and the immutable laws of industry, to produce the entire supply of things necessary for human comfort, convenience, and welfare? It is intended that men should live together in amity; that they should mutually depend one upon the other; that each should gain from the other's genius and exertion what he is unable to procure by his own endeavor and skill. Neighbors should be at peace. Different communities should not quarrel; should not put interdicts and checks upon the natural laws of intercourse and mutual dependency. Nations should not fight. The harmonious order of civilization requires a world-wide exchange of products. Men are happier and richer, and nations are more powerful, when they give themselves freely to the laws of their environments, and toil in those fields of industry to which both their own dispositions and the benevolent finger of nature point the way.

The theory continues: All contrivances of human law which controvert or oppose these fundamental conditions of legitimate industry are false in principle and pernicious in appli-

cation. If civil society assume to direct the industries of her people against the plain indications of nature, then society becomes a tyrant. The rule of action in such case is no longer free but despotic. All laws which tend to divert the industries of a nation from those pursuits which are indicated by the natural surroundings are hurtful, selfish, self-destructive, and, in the long run, weakening and degrading to the people. A tariff duty so laid as to build up one industry at the expense of another is a piece of barbarous intermeddling with both the principles of common sense and the inherent rights of men. If free trade makes one nation dependent on another, then it also makes that other nation dependent on the first. The one can no more afford to fight the other than the other can afford to fight it. Hence free trade as the great economic law among the nations. It is both sound in theory and beneficial in application. Hence a tariff for revenue only as the true principle of national action. It is the bottom economic policy of government relative to the interests of the people. Such is the general theory to which has been given the name of *Laissez faire*, but which is known among the English-speaking peoples by the more limited term, Free Trade.

The first remove from the doctrines above set forth is that of INCIDENTAL PROTECTION. The primary assumptions of this theory are nearly identical with those of free trade. Nearly all of the propositions advanced by the free-trader are accepted as correct by the incidental protectionist. The latter, however, holds some peculiar doctrines of his own. He claims that men, as the doctrine of *Laissez faire* teaches, should labor according to the indications of nature, and that the attempt on the part of Government to divert the industries of the people from one channel to another is contrary to right reason and sound policy. But he also holds that since a tariff is the common means adopted by most of the civilized States of the world to produce the revenue whereby the expenses of government are met and sustained, the same should be so levied as to be incidentally favorable to those industries of the people which are placed at a natural disadvantage. He does not hold that any tariff should be levied with the intention of protecting and fostering a given

industry, but that in every case the tax should be laid for *public purposes only*; that is, with the intention of sustaining the State, and be only *incidentally* directed to the protection of the weaker industry. These last assumptions furnish the ground of political divergence between free-traders proper and incidental protectionists. The latter take into consideration both the fundamental conditions of the argument and the peculiar character of the industries of the people. They claim that given pursuits may thus be strengthened and encouraged by legislative provisions, and that natural and political laws may be made to cooperate in varying and increasing the productive resources of the State.

The third general view relative to this question is known as the doctrine of LIMITED PROTECTION. The word "limited," in the definition, has respect to a *time* relation. The fundamental difference between this theory and the preceding is this: The incidental protectionist denies, and the limited protectionist affirms, the wisdom of levying tariff duties with the *intention* and *purpose* of protecting home industries. The limited protectionist would have the legislation of the State take particular cognizance of the character and variety of the industries of the people, and would have the laws enacted with constant reference to the encouragement of the weaker—generally the manufacturing—pursuits. The doctrine of incidental protection would stop short of this; would adopt the theory of "let alone," so far as the original purpose of legislation is concerned; but would, at the same time, so shape the tariff that a needed stimulus would be given to certain industries. The limited protectionist agrees with the free-trader in certain assumptions. The former, as well as the latter, assents to the proposition that the *original* condition of industry is found in nature—in the environment of the laborer. But he also urges that the necessity for a varied industry is so great, so important, to the welfare and independence of a people, as to justify the deflection of human energy by law to certain pursuits, which could not be profitably followed but for the fact of protection.

This principle the limited protectionist gives as a reason for tariff legislation, which he advocates. He would make the weaker industry

live and thrive by the side of the stronger. He would modify the crude rules of nature by the higher rules of human reason. He would not only adapt man to his environment, but would adapt the environment to him. He would keep in view the strength, the dignity, the independence, of the State, and would be willing to incur temporary disadvantages for the sake of permanent good. In the course of time, when, under the stimulus of a protective system, the industries of the State have become sufficiently varied, and sufficiently harmonized with original conditions, he would allow the system of protective duties to expire, and freedom of trade to supervene. But *until* that time, he would insist that the weaker, but not less essential, industries of a people should be encouraged and fostered by law. He would deny the justice or economy of that system which, in a new country, boundless in natural resources, but poor in capital, would constrain the people to bend themselves to the production of a few great staples, the manufacture of which, by foreign nations, would make them rich, and leave the original producers in perpetual vassalage and poverty.

The fourth general view is embodied in the theory of HIGH PROTECTION. In this the doctrine is boldly advanced that the bottom assumptions of free trade are specious and false. The influence of man upon his environment is so great as to make it virtually whatever the law of right reason would suggest. The suggestion of right reason is this: Every nation should be independent. Its complete sovereignty and equality should be secured by every means short of injustice. In order that a State may be independent and be able to mark out for itself a great destiny, its industries must afford employment for all the talents and faculties of man, and yield products adapted to all his wants. To devote the energies of a people to those industries *only*, which are suggested by the situation and environment, is to make man a slave to nature instead of nature's master. It may be sound reasoning for the people inhabiting a fertile valley to devote themselves *principally* to agricultural pursuits; but to do this to the exclusion of other industries is merely to narrow the energies of the race, make dependent the

laborer, and finally exhaust those very powers of nature which, for the present, seem to suggest one pursuit and forbid all others.

The theory of high protection continues thus: It is the duty of society to build up *any* industries in every locality, whatever may be the environment. If nature furnishes no suggestion of blast-furnaces and iron-works, then nature must be constrained by means of human law. The production of manufactured values should be so encouraged by tariff duties as to become profitable in *all* situations. Not only should every State, but every community and every man, be made comparatively independent. Every community should be able by its own industry to supply at least the larger part of its own wants. The spindle should be *made* to turn; the forge *made* to glow; the mill-wheel *made* to turn; the engine *made* to pant; and the towering furnace to fling up into the darkness of midnight its volcanic glare,—all this whether nature has or has not prepared the antecedents of such activity. And this can not be accomplished, or at least not well accomplished, in any other way than by the legal protection of those industries which do not flourish under the action of merely natural law. It is, in brief, the theory of the high protectionist that every community of men, by means of its own varied and independent activities, fostered and encouraged by the protective system of industries, should become in the body politic what the ganglion is in the nerve system of man,—an independent, local power, capable of originating its own action and directing its own energies.

There is still a fifth position occasionally assumed by publicists, and sometimes acted on by nations. This is the doctrine and practice of PROMOTORY TARIFFS. The idea here is that the mutual interdependence of nations is, on the whole, disadvantageous, and that each should be rendered *wholly* independent of the other. Some of the oldest peoples of the world have adopted this doctrine and policy. The Oriental nations, as a rule, have, until recent times, followed persistently the exclusive theory in their national affairs. The principle is, that if in any State or Nation certain industrial conditions and powers are wanting, then those powers and conditions should be produced by

means of law. Internal trade is, according to this doctrine, the principal thing, and commercial intercourse with foreign States a matter of secondary, or even dubious, advantage. If the price of the given home product be not sufficient to stimulate its production in such quantities as to meet all the requirements of the market, then that price should be raised by means of legislation, and raised again and again, until the foreign trade shall cease, and home manufacture be supplied in its place.

True, there are not many of the modern peoples who now carry the doctrine of protection to this extreme. But it is also true that, in the endeavor to prepare protective schedules under the system of limited or high protection, it has not infrequently happened that the tariff is fixed at such a scale as to act as a prohibitory duty, and turn aside entirely the foreign commerce in the article on which the tariff is laid.

Such, then, are the fundamental principles which underlie the great controversy, and furnish the issues of political divergence in the United States. The question is as old as the beginnings of civil progress in the New World. No sooner was the present governmental system in our country instituted, than the controversy broke out in the halls of legislation. The second statute ever enacted by Congress under the Constitution was passed for the purpose of "providing a revenue, and affording protection to American industry." The very necessities which gave rise to the Constitution were those relating to commerce, and interwoven with the tariff. From the beginning the question would not down. During the fourth and fifth decades of the century, the leading political agitations were produced by the revival of the tariff issue in our system. During the ascendancy of Henry Clay, his so-called "American system" became, for a season, the bottom principle of Whig politics. In the ante-bellum epoch the Whig party continued to favor the protective system, while the Democratic party espoused free trade. After the war the question slumbered for a season. In 1880 a paragraph in the national platform of the Democratic party was inserted—not, indeed, with the intention of evoking an old controversy from oblivion—which, by declaring in favor of a tariff for revenue only, unex-

pectedly precipitated the whole issue anew, and contributed to, perhaps determined, the defeat of the Democratic ticket. Even in those States where Democracy was in the ascendant the growth of great manufacturing establishments had brought in a vast army of artisans, who, in spite of all party affiliation, refused to support a platform which, according to their belief, was calculated to injure, if not destroy, the very business in which they were engaged.

Both the Democrats and the Republicans, in the ensuing quadrennium made strenuous efforts to align their party followers on this question; but neither was successful. The event showed that the Democrats were by no means unanimous for free trade, and that the Republicans were equally far from unanimity in their support of protection. It was found that large numbers of Republican leaders, whose financial interests lay in the direction of commerce rather than in manufactures, espoused the free-trade doctrine. Never was party discipline more strained on any subject than in the Presidential campaigns from 1876 to 1888. Especially during the Administration of Arthur and his successor did the tariff question gather head, and the white crests of conflicting tides were seen along the whole surface of political controversy. Nor may the publicist and historian of the passing age clearly foresee the solution of the problem. One thing, however, may be safely predicted, and that is, that the question in America will be decided, as it has already been decided by Great Britain, according to *self-interest*. No people will, in the long run, act against what it conceives to be its interest for the sake of supporting a given theory. When some party in power, whatever that party may be, shall become convinced that the *interest* of the United States requires the abolition of all protective duties, and the substitution therefor of a system of tariff for revenue only, then, and not till then, will the *Laissez-faire* theory of political economy take the place of that which has thus far prevailed on this side of the sea.

Hardly had the crime of Garfield's murder been perpetrated, and the Presidency transferred to Arthur, before the issue of naming his successor was raised by the ever-busy swarm of American politicians. To the calm-minded

observer it appears a thing of wonder that the people of the United States have thus far permitted themselves to be enjoled, hoodwinked, browbeaten, converted into slaves, by the ignorant hordes of interested adventurers who have arrogated to themselves the right of controlling the destiny of the American Republic. It can hardly be wondered that under the continuance of such a system a spirit of political pessimism has gained ground to the very verge of prevalence in the United States. Of a certainty, the party newspaper has been, and continues to be, the abettor and agent of Kakistocracy in America. And until the reign of that evangel of evil is ended, the people of the United States must continue to beat about blindly, moping and groaning under the despotism of the bad.

The year 1882 had hardly furnished a breathing time for the subsidence of passion until the great army of the interested went forth to arouse the country for another contest. In this haste might be seen the symptoms of fear, for it could not be doubted that both the political organizations had become alarmed lest through the failure of living issues the old combinations which had divided the country for a quarter of a century should go to pieces and leave the field to the people. But the time had not yet come for the breaking up of the political deeps, and the masses were still made to believe that the old questions were vital to the welfare of the country.

As the quadrennium came to a close, many prominent men were named in connection with the Presidential office. Among those most warmly advocated by the Republicans were James G. Blaine, of Maine; George F. Edmunds, of Vermont; President Chester A. Arthur; Joseph R. Hawley, of Connecticut; John Sherman, of Ohio; John A. Logan and Robert T. Lincoln, of Illinois; and General William T. Sherman, of Missouri. Among the Democrats the leaders most frequently urged for the nomination in 1884 were Benjamin F. Butler, of Massachusetts; Samuel J. Tilden and Grover Cleveland, of New York; Samuel J. Randall, of Pennsylvania; Thomas F. Bayard, of Delaware; Allen G. Thurman, of Ohio; John G. Carlisle, of Kentucky; Joseph E. McDonald and Thomas A. Hendricks, of Indiana. Early in

1884, Chicago was selected as the place of both the National conventions. The Greenback-Labor party held its convention at Indianapolis, in the month of April, and nominated General Butler for the Presidency, and A. M. West, of Mississippi, for the Vice-presidency. The Republican convention met on the 3d of May, and, after a spirited session of three days' duration, nominated James G. Blaine, of Maine, and General John A. Logan, of Illinois, for the Presidency and Vice-presi-

thing seemed to depend upon the electoral votes of New York and Indiana; and when the preliminary counting showed the latter State for the Democrats, the former became the single battle-field of the campaign. The event proved favorable to the Democrats, though their majority in the popular vote of New York was only 1,142. This small preponderance determined the result. It gave the vote of the Empire State to Cleveland and Hendricks, assuring to them 219 ballots in the Electoral College, against 182 votes for Blaine and Logan.

The sequel of the Presidential election of this year was less happy than generally happens under like circumstances. For six successive Administrations the Republican party had been in power. The quarter of a century covered by this ascendancy had been by far the most important since the Revolution. The United States of 1884 had been completely transformed from the United States of 1860. The great, and, on the whole, salutary changes which had taken place in the social condition and civil polity of the American people were, as always happens in such cases, claimed by the dominant party as the result of its management and control of National affairs. As a matter of fact, the Republican party was itself the *result* of a growth and development in the United



GENERAL WILLIAM T. SHERMAN.

dency, respectively. The Democratic delegates assembled on the 9th of July, and on the 11th completed their work by nominating for the Presidency, Grover Cleveland, of New York, and for the Vice-presidency, Thomas A. Hendricks, of Indiana. The nominations on both sides were received with considerable enthusiasm; but a considerable faction in each party refused to support the National ticket.

As the election of 1884 drew nigh, every-

State—merely one of the *effects*, instead of the *cause*, of the changed order of things. But the leaders of that party were, in a considerable degree, honest in claiming that the tremendous and beneficial changes which had passed, like the shadows of great clouds over the American landscape, were attributable to the long period of Republican ascendancy. To lose power, therefore, was political bitterness itself. For the Republican managers and office-holders to abdicate their

offices, and go forth among the people powerless, seemed to them the end of National greatness. Mr. Blaine himself, notwithstanding his equanimity and self-possession, felt keenly the humiliation of the overthrow. It was under his banner that his party had at last come to defeat. Soon after the election he delivered a speech which, far from being pacific in its tone, was, for the most part, a bitter invective against the South. The Republican newspapers, especially in the West, took up the hue and cry, and filled their columns with such matter as might well have appeared in the first year after the Civil War. By degrees, however, this feeling subsided, and near the close of Arthur's Administration the office-holders, as a class, began to trim their sails with the evident hope that the breezes of Civil Service Reform, to which the President-elect was pledged, might waft them still further on the high seas of enolument.

A short time before the retirement of Arthur from the Presidency, the command of the army of the United States was transferred from General William T. Sherman to Lieutenant-General Philip H. Sheridan. The former distinguished officer, one of the most talented and eminent soldiers of the century, having reached the age at which, according to an act of Congress, he might retire from active service, availed himself of the provision, and laid down his command. The formal papers with which he concluded his official relation with the army were marked with the same fervor and patriotism which had characterized all of his utterances since the time when he gave his services to the country in the dark days of disunion. Nor could it be said that the new

General, to whom the command of the American army was now intrusted, was less a patriot and soldier than his illustrious predecessor.

The recurrence of the birthday of Washington, 1885, was noted for the dedication of the great monument which had been building for so many years at the Capital. The erection of such a structure had been suggested as early as 1799. Nor could it well be doubted that the American people would, in due time,



LIEUTENANT-GENERAL PHILIP H. SHERIDAN.

rear some appropriate memorial to the Father of his Country. The work was not undertaken, however, until 1835. In that year an organization was elected to promote the enterprise. But for a long time after the beginning, the work of building lagged, and it was not until Congress, taunted at last into action by the annual denunciations of the press and people, undertook the prosecution of the enterprise, that it was brought to completion. The cost of the Washington Monument was about

81,500,000. It stands on the left bank of the Potomac, in the southern outskirts of Washington City. The structure was at the time of its erection the highest in the world. The shaft proper, without reckoning the foundation, is 555 feet in height, being thirty feet higher than the Cathedral at Cologne, and seventy-five feet higher than the Pyramid of Cheops in its present condition. The great obelisk is composed of more than eighteen thousand blocks of stone. They are mostly of white marble, and weigh several tons each. One hundred and eighty-one memorial stones, contributed by the different States of the



GROVER CLEVELAND.

Union, and by friendly foreign nations, are set at various places in the structure.

The dedication of the monument occurred on Saturday, the 21st of February. The ceremonies were of the most imposing character. A procession of more than six thousand persons marched from the base of the monument, along Pennsylvania Avenue to the Capitol, while salutes were fired from the batteries of the navy-yard. At the Capitol the procession was reviewed by the President of the United States. The concluding ceremonies were held in the House of Representatives, where a great throng of distinguished people had assembled—not so much to do honor to the occasion as to be honored by it. The principal oration, written

by Hon. Robert C. Winthrop, as well as the less formal addresses of the day, was well worthy of the event, and calculated to add—if aught could add—to the fame of him who was “first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his fellow-citizens.”

Grover Cleveland, twenty-second President of the United States, was born at Caldwell, New Jersey, March 18, 1837. Three years afterwards he was taken by his father and mother to Fayetteville, near Syracuse, New York. Here, in his boyhood, he received such limited education as the schools of the place afforded. For a while in his youth he was clerk in a village store. Afterward the family removed, first to Clinton and then to Holland Patent. At the latter place his father died, and young Cleveland, left to his own resources, went to New York and became a teacher in an asylum for the blind. After a short time, however, the young man, finding such pursuits un congenial to his tastes, went to Buffalo and engaged in the study of law. He was admitted to the bar in 1859, and, four years afterwards, began his public career as Assistant District Attorney. In 1869 he was elected Sheriff of Erie County, and in 1881 was chosen Mayor of Buffalo. His next promotion by his fellow-citizens was to the governorship of New York, to which position he was elected, in 1882, by the astonishing majority of 192,854—the majority being perhaps unparalleled in the history of American elections. It was while he still held this office that, in July of 1884, he was nominated by the Democratic party for the Presidency of the United States.

Much interest was manifested by the public in the constitution of the new Cabinet. On the day following the inauguration the nominations were sent to the Senate, and were as follows: For Secretary of State, Thomas F. Bayard, of Delaware; for Secretary of the Treasury, Daniel Manning, of New York; for Secretary of the Interior, Lucius Q. C. Lamar, of Mississippi; for Secretary of War, William C. Endicott, of Massachusetts; for Secretary of the Navy, William C. Whitney, of New York; for Postmaster-General, William F. Vilas, of Wisconsin; for Attorney-General, Augustus H. Garland, of Arkansas. The peculiarity of the appointments was that two of them were from New York. But the prejudice which

might arise on this account was fully counter-balanced by the high character and undoubted abilities of the men whom the President had chosen as the responsible advisers of his Administration.

The most serious question which confronted the new President, and which continued to beset his course through the whole quadrennium, was the distribution of official patronage. The Democratic party had come into power on a platform distinctly enunciating the doctrine of reform in the civil service. From almost the beginning of the Government it had been the custom of the party in power to distribute to its own partisans all the appointive offices. This usage, well established since the days of Jackson, had been the origin and cause of the greater part of the abuses which had existed in the various departments of the Government. Extreme party men had claimed always that "to the victors belong the spoils" of office. Of late years, however, the best political opinion of the country turned with disgust from the gross practice of rewarding men for mere party services, and in the evenly balanced Presidential contest of 1880 and 1884 it became all important that both the dominant parties should conciliate, at least by professions of sympathy, the growing phalanx of civil service reformers. They it was who in the late election, believing in the sincerity of Cleveland, had thrown their influence in his favor, and thereby secured his elevation to the Presidency. He went into office pledged to carry out the views of those by whose suffrages he had been raised to power. These views, moreover, were his own; and it thus happened that the new Administration was launched with "Civil-service Reform" inscribed on its pennon.

In the political management of States by party ascendancy, it ever happens that the practical application of the principles on which the party has come into power is attended with extreme difficulty. In the first place, the so-called principles are frequently formulated simply as a means to gather votes and reach success. After the election has been won and the party accedes to power, there is no further thought of carrying into effect the alleged "principles" by which party success has been achieved. In the contest of 1884

many of the Democratic leaders had upheld the banner of civil service merely as an expedient. To such elements of his party the President's sincere attempt at the beginning of his Administration to enforce the principles of the party platform by an actual reform in the system of appointments was little less than appalling. To them the declaration in favor of a better order of things relative to the appointive offices of the Government was purely nominal. They accordingly made a rush to gather the spoils of the victory which they claimed to have won. From the day of the inauguration a great crowd of office-seekers thronged the Capital, and the Chief Magistrate was besieged by hundreds and thousands of these whose principal claims to preferment were that they had served the party. During the first year of the new Administration it was a grave question whether or not the President would be able to stand by the flag of reform, or whether he would be driven to re-adopt the cast-off policy of satisfying with official appointments the hungry horde that surged around the Presidential mansion.

It was one of the peculiarities of the epoch upon which we here enter in American history that the memories and deeds of the Civil War seemed to arise again in the public mind by a sort of uncaused revival, the true origin of which it might be difficult to discover. Perhaps, on the whole, this renewal of interest should be chiefly ascribed to the fact that the great men whose genius had determined the destinies of that conflict now entered the shadows of old age, and became talkative about the stirring exploits of their youth and vigorous manhood. At this time began to appear that series of authoritative publications concerning the War for the Union, in which many of the leading participants related their part in the drama. This work, so important to the right understanding of the great struggle for and against the Union, was begun by General William T. Sherman, who, in 1875, published his *Memoirs*, narrating the story of that part of the war in which he had been a leader. This was not indeed the first of the publications on the subject. As early as 1870, Alexander H. Stephens, late Vice-President of the Confederacy, had completed his two volumes entitled the *War Between the*

States. In 1884, General Grant began the publication in the *Century Magazine* of a series of war articles which attracted universal attention, and which led to the preparation and issuance of his *Memoirs* in 1885-6. Similar contributions by many other eminent commanders of the Union and Confederate Armies followed in succession, until a large, able, and impartial literature was left on record for the instruction of after times.

The interest in the above publications was greatly heightened by the death, within a limited period, of a large number of the great Union Generals who had led their armies to



ULYSSES S. GRANT.

victory in the War of the Rebellion. It was in the early summer of the year 1885 that the attention of the people was called away from public affairs by the announcement that the veteran General, Ulysses S. Grant, had been stricken with a fatal malady, that his days would be few among the living. The hero of Vicksburg and Appomattox sank under the ravages of a malignant cancer which had fixed itself in his throat, and on the 23d of July he died quietly at a summer cottage on Mount McGregor, New York. For some months the silent hero, who had commanded the combined armies of the United States, had been engaged in the pathetic work of bring-

ing to completion his two volumes of *Memoirs*, from the sale of which—such is the gratitude of Republics—the resources of his family must be chiefly drawn. It was a race, with death for the goal. Scarcely had the entebled General laid down his pencil until the enemy knocked at the door. The last days of Grant were hallowed by the sympathies of the Nation which he had so gloriously defended. The news of his death passed over the land like the shadow of a great cloud. Almost every city and hamlet showed, in some appropriate way, its emblems of grief. The funeral ceremonies equaled, if they did not surpass, any which have ever been witnessed. The procession in New York City was perhaps the most solemn and imposing pageant ever exhibited in honor of the dead, at least since the funeral of the Duke of Wellington. On August 8, 1885, the body of General Grant was laid to rest in Riverside Park, overlooking the Hudson. There, on a summit from which may be seen the great river and the metropolis of the Nation, is the tomb of him whose courage and magnanimity in war will forever give him rank with the few master spirits who, by their heroic deeds, have honored the human race, and by their genius have changed the course of history.

Within less than three months from the funeral of Grant another distinguished Union commander fell. On the 29th of October General George B. McClellan, organizer of the Army of the Potomac, at one time General-in-Chief, subsequently Democratic candidate for the Presidency, and at a later period Governor of New Jersey, died at his home at St. Cloud, in that State. The conspicuous part which he had borne during the first two years of the war, his eminent abilities as a soldier and civilian, and his unblemished character as a man and citizen, combined to heighten the estimate of his life and services, and to evoke the sincerest expressions of national sorrow on the occasion of his death.¹

After another brief interval, a third great military leader fell in the person of General

¹The posthumous publication of *McClellan's Own Story*, under the auspices of his bereaved wife, is, on the whole, to be greatly regretted. As a contribution to the military—even the civil—history of the time, the work is valuable; but to

Winfield S. Hancock. This brave and generous commander was, at the time of his death, the Senior Major-General of the American army. Always a favorite with the people and the soldiers, he had, since the close of the war, occupied a conspicuous place before the public. In 1880 he was the Democratic candidate for the Presidency, and, though defeated by General Garfield, the defeat was without dishonor. His death, which occurred at his home on Governor's Island, on the 9th of February, 1886, was universally deplored, and the people omitted no mark of respect for the memory of him who, in the great struggle for the preservation of the Union, had won and borne the title of "Hero of Gettysburg." Thus have passed away the gallant Generals of the Army of the Potomac. George B. McClellan, Ambrose E. Burnside, Joseph Hooker, George G. Meade, and Winfield S. Hancock have, one by one, joined

"The innumerable caravan that moves
To that mysterious realm, who to each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of Death."

Before the close of the year 1886, still another among the greatest of the commanders of the Civil War ended his earthly career. Late in December, General John A. Logan, United States Senator from Illinois, fell sick at his home, called Calumet Place, in Washington City. His disease was rheumatism, to which he had been subject at intervals since his exposure and hardships in the early Western campaigns. After a few days' illness he became suddenly worse, sank into a comatose condition, and, on the 26th of the month, breathed his last. His military and civil career had been distinguished in the highest degree. At the outbreak of hostilities in 1861 few men did more than Logan to strengthen and unify the Union sentiment in the wavering Border States. His voice was a clarion, heard shrill and far above the confusion and uproar of the times. Resigning his seat in Congress, he had joined the first advance of the Union army, and fought in the battle of Bull Run. Without previous military training, he rose rapidly

McClellan's memory the book is damaging. In a few matters the civilians in authority over McClellan—but not Lincoln—are put on the defensive; but, taken altogether, the apology, the eulogy, works by contraries and mars the General's fame.

to distinction, and became the Voltaire or General *par excellence* of the war. After the close of the conflict he returned to political life, and was chosen to the United States Senate. In 1884 he was nominated for the Vice-presidency on the Republican ticket with James G. Blaine. That ticket being defeated, he resumed his duties in the Senate, and remained at his post until his death. The ceremonies of the funeral and the general voice of the American press indicated in an unmistakable manner the enduring place which he had merited and won in the affections of the people.

In the meantime, a distinguished civilian had fallen from high office. On November 25,



JOHN A. LOGAN

1885, Vice-President Thomas A. Hendricks, after what was supposed to be a trifling illness of a single day, died suddenly at his home, in Indianapolis. The fatal message came in the form of paralysis. Not a moment's warning was given of the approach of that pale courier who knocks impartially at the door of the peasant and the portal of the great. The life of Hendricks had been one of singular purity, and the amenities of his character had been conspicuous in the stormy arena of American politics. The high qualities of the man, combined with his distinction as Governor, Senator, and Vice-President, drew from the people many evidences of public and private respect for his memory. The body of the dead states-

man was buried in Crown Hill Cemetery, near Indianapolis, the funeral pageant surpassing in grandeur and solemnity any other display of



THOMAS A. HENDRICKS.

the kind ever witnessed in the Western States, except the funeral of Lincoln.

The death of the Vice-President was soon followed by that of Horatio Seymour, of New York. On the 12th of February, 1886, this distinguished citizen, who had been Governor of the Empire State, and in 1868 Democratic candidate for the Presidency against General Grant, died at his home in Utica. He had reached the age of seventy-six, and, though for many years living in retirement, had never ceased to hold a large share of the attention of his fellow-citizens. Still more distinguished in reputation and eminent in ability was Samuel J. Tilden, also of the Empire State, who died at his home, called Greystone, at Yonkers, near New York City, on the 4th of August, 1886. Mr. Tilden had lived to make a marked, perhaps an indelible, impression on the political thought of the epoch. He had acquired within the lines of his own party an influence and ascendancy far greater than that of any other statesman of his time. His intellectual force could not be doubted, nor could

it be claimed that he failed to apply his faculties assiduously to the greatest political questions of the age.

Mr. Tilden was born on the 14th of February, 1814, and was thus in the seventy-third year of his age at the time of his death. He had been a prominent figure in his native State for fully forty years, and had held many places of public trust and honor. In 1870-71 he was among the foremost in unearthing the astounding frauds and robberies which had been perpetrated on the city treasury of New York, and in the following year was sent to the General Assembly, where his services were invaluable. In 1874 he was elected Governor of New York by a majority of more than fifty thousand votes. In the executive office he was one of the ablest and most thorough-going men who ever occupied the gubernatorial chair of the State. In 1876 he was nominated for the Presidency, and in the election of that year received a large majority of the popular vote, only failing of a majority in the Electoral College because of the tactics of the leaders of the party in power. Neither he nor General Hayes was clearly elected, the Democrats having carried two or three States with the shot-gun, and the Republicans, by the aid of the Electoral Commission, having



SAMUEL TILDEN.

counted in the electoral votes of a State or two which they did not carry at all. After the contest, Mr. Tilden retired to private life,

but continued to guide the counsels of his party, and to influence public opinion, up to the date of his death. Perhaps one of his ablest—as it was his last—public paper was a general letter on the subject of "The Coast and Harbor Defenses of the United States," a publication which led to the legislation of the Forty-ninth Congress on that important subject. Thus, within the space of less than eleven months, four of those eminent American leaders, who had been candidates of the Democratic party for the Presidency of the United States, and the distinguished Vice-President, recently chosen by that party to the second place of honor in the Government, had fallen from their places in the ranks of the living.

To this list of the American great, whose activities have recently ended in death, must here be added the illustrious name of Henry Ward Beecher. To him, with little reservation, we may assign the first place among our orators and philanthropists. Nor is it likely that his equal in most of the sublime qualities of energy and manhood will soon be seen again on the stage of life. His personality was so large, so unique and striking, as to constitute the man in some sense *sui generis*. His kind is rare in the world, and the circumstances which aided in his development have passed away. That fact in American history—the institution of slavery—which brought out and displayed the higher moods of his anger and stormy eloquence, can not again arouse the indignation of genius. The knight and his dangerous foil sleep together in the dust.

Mr. Beecher had the happy fortune to retain his faculties unimpaired to the very close of his career. On the evening of the 5th of March, 1887, at his home in Brooklyn, surrounded by his family, without premonition or portent, the message came by apoplexy. An artery broke in that magnificent heavy brain that had been for more than forty years one of the greatest batteries of thought and action in the world; and the aged orator, nearing the close of his seventy-fourth year, sank into that deep sleep from which no power on earth could wake him. He lived until the morning of the 8th, and quietly entered the shadows. The sentiments awakened by his death, the circumstances of his sepulture, and

the common eulogium of mankind, proved beyond doubt the supreme place which he had occupied in the admiring esteem, not only of his countrymen, but of all the great peoples of the world.

To this brief mortuary record, for the ninth decade of the century, must also be added some reference to the death of Morrison Remick Waite, Chief-Justice of the United States. His decease came at his home in Washington City, on the 23d of March, 1888. The event suggests and justifies the addition of a few paragraphs relative to the history and *personnel* of the great tribunal over which Judge Waite presided during the last fourteen years of his life.



HENRY WALDORF HERR

In the formation of the Constitution of the United States, it was intended that the three General Departments of the Government should be of correlative rank and influence. The sequel, however, as developed in the actual working of our National system, has shown that the Executive and Legislative departments predominate, naturally—perhaps inevitably—over the judicial branch, and that, in the popular estimate at least, the Supreme Court is of small importance as compared with the Presidency and the two Houses of Congress. This disesteem of the judiciary is not verified by a broader and more philosophical view of the subject. The importance, especially of the conservative opinion of our

great National Court, in determining, at least negatively, the final validity of all legislation and all subordinate judicial decisions, can hardly be over-estimated. The same may be said of the Supreme Bench, considered as the only immovable breakwater against the unscrupulous and rampant spirit of party. It is fortunate that the offices of our Chief-Justice and of the associate Justices are *appointive*, and are thus removed, in great measure, from the perfidy of the convention and the passion of a partisan election. It may be of interest to glance for a moment at some of the vicissitudes through which the Supreme Court has passed since its organization in 1789. The Court was then instituted by the appointment of John Jay as Chief-Justice, who held the office until 1796, when he gave place to Oliver Ellsworth. The latter remained in office until, in 1800, the infirmities of age compelled his resignation. Then came the long and honorable ascendancy of Chief-Justice John Marshall, who presided over the Court from his appointment in 1801 to his death in 1835. This was the Golden Age of the American Supreme Court. From 1835 to 1837 there was an interregnum in the Chief-Justiceship, occasioned by the disagreement of President Jackson and the Senate of the United States. But in the latter year the President secured the confirmation of Judge Roger B. Taney as Chief-Justice, who entered upon his long term of twenty-seven years. It was his celebrated decision in case of the negro Dred Scott, relative to the status of the slave-race in America, that applied the torch to that immense heap of combustibles whose explosion was the Civil War.

After the death of Chief-Justice Taney, in 1864, President Lincoln appointed, as his successor, Salmon P. Chase, recently Secretary of the Treasury, and author of most of the financial measures and expedients by which the National credit had been buoyed up and preserved during the Rebellion. His official term extended to his death, in 1873, and covered the period when the important issues arising from the Civil War were under adjudication. To Chief-Justice Chase fell also, by virtue of his office, the duty of presiding at the impeachment of President Andrew Johnson. In 1874 the appointment of Morrison R. Waite as

Chief-Justice was made by President Grant, and the death of this able jurist devolved on President Cleveland the duty of naming his successor.

Chief-Justice Waite was born at Lyme, Connecticut, on the 29th of November, 1816. From the public school he was transferred to Yale College, and was graduated from that institution in 1837. He then became a student of law, and, after completing his course, removed to Ohio, where he entered upon the practice of his profession at Maumee City. After serving one term, in 1849-50, in the Legislature of the State, he removed to Toledo, which became henceforth his home, until his duties as Chief-Justice called him to Washington City. He had been frequently solicited to become a candidate for office, but had adhered to his profession until 1871-72, when he accepted from President Grant the appointment as member of the celebrated Board of Arbitration, to sit at Geneva, in the adjudication of the Alabama Claims. Here he was associated with Charles Francis Adams, Caleb Cushing, and William M. Evarts; and, though he was less known to the public than they, he, nevertheless, bore himself with honor among his colleagues. Shortly after his return the death of Chief-Justice Chase opened the way for Mr. Waite's appointment to the highest and most important judicial seat in America; and to this august position he brought a character, talents, and attainments equal to the responsibilities of his office.

During his occupancy of the Supreme Bench, Chief-Justice Waite steadily rose in the esteem and confidence of the Nation. He was not, perhaps, a man of the highest order of genius or of the very highest rank as a jurist; but, on the whole, the office of Chief-Justice was rarely, if ever, more worthily borne than by its latest occupant. He was a man of equable and judicial temper, little disposed, if disposed at all, to look beyond the Supreme Bench to a possibly higher seat. His death was from pneumonia, and was so sudden as to be announced to the country by the same despatches which gave first information of his serious sickness. He died peacefully, at his home. His funeral was held first in the hall of the House of Representatives, and afterward from his old residence in Toledo, at

which city his remains were finally committed to the tomb.

The death of Chief-Justice Waite made way for the return to the supreme judicial office in the United States of some member of the political party which had long been out of power. Since the epoch of the Civil War the court had been filled almost exclusively with judges who, by political affiliation, belonged to the Republican party. The first distinctly Democratic appointment which was made in the last quarter of a century was the recent one of Judge Lucius Q. C. Lamar, who, by the nomination of President Cleveland, was transferred from the Secretaryship of the Interior to the Supreme Bench. It thus happened, in the vicissitude of things, that the two political theories which were opposed to each other in the War for the Union, and are still opposed by party name, became confluent in the high court of the Nation. This circumstance was to some a source of alarm and prejudice; but the fear was not well founded. Partisan dispositions are less potent and dangerous—if, indeed, they assert themselves at all—on the Supreme Bench of the United States. Thus far in its history the court has, as a rule, been as pure in its administration and methods as it has been great in reputation. The muddy waters of party conflict have only occasionally reached as high as the chambers of our honored tribunal; and the fear that it may be otherwise hereafter may hopefully be put aside as a groundless and spectral chimaera of the hour. On May 1, 1888, the President appointed Judge Melville W. Fuller, of Chicago, to the vacant Chief-Justiceship.

The impression produced by the death of Chief-Justice Waite had scarcely passed when the decease of another citizen, most noted for high character and great talents, called the public attention to the rapid disappearance of the Nation's most distinguished representatives. On the 18th of April, at the Hoffman House, New York City, Honorable Roscoe Conkling, Ex-Senator of the United States, died after a brief and painful illness. A local inflammation, resulting in the formation of a puss-sack under the mastoid bone of the skull, led to the cutting of the skull in hope of saving Mr. Conkling's life; but he succumbed to the fatal malady and the shock of the operation.

Roscoe Conkling was born in Albany, New York, on the 30th of October, 1829. After the completion of an academic course of study, he went as a student of law to Utica, in 1846. On reaching his majority he was admitted to the bar, and was soon afterward appointed to the office of County Attorney. From the beginning of his career his great talents and remarkable force of character were manifest. He made a profound impression, first upon the local, and then upon the general, society of New York. In 1858 he was mayor of Utica, and in the same year was sent to the National House of Representatives. He had already become an able politician, and was soon recognized as the leader of the Republican



MORRIS H. WAITE.

party in his native State. His rise was rapid, and his influence became marked in the affairs of the Government. He served for six years in the Lower House, and in 1866 was elected to the Senate. In that body he aspired to leadership, and gradually attained it, though not without many struggles and contests with the great men of the epoch. He was twice reelected Senator—in 1872, and 1878; but in his third term, namely, in 1881, he found himself in such relations with the Garfield Administration as induced him to resign his seat. This step was regarded by many as the mistake of his political life. At any rate, he failed of a reelection, the Administration party getting control of the Legislature of New

York, and sending another in his place. After that date, Mr. Conkling retired to private life, and took up with the greatest success the practice of his profession in New York City.

Roscoe Conkling was a man of the highest courage and staunchest convictions. He never shone to greater advantage than when leading the forces of General Grant in the Chicago Convention of 1860. He was a born political general. His will, and persistency, and pride, gave him a power which, if it had been tempered with greater urbanity, could hardly have failed to crown his life with the highest honors of the Nation. His talents rose to the region of genius, and his presence was magnificent—an inspiration to his friends, a terror to his



ROS COE CONKLING.

enemies. As a summary of the results of his career, it may be said that, at the time of his death, none except his eminent rival, Mr. Blaine, might justly contest with him the proud rank of most distinguished private citizen of the United States.

Meanwhile, in the spring of 1886 had occurred one of the most serious labor agitations which had ever been witnessed in the United States. It was difficult to present an adequate statement of the causes, general and special, which produced these alarming troubles. Not until after the close of the Civil War did there appear the first symptoms of a renewal, in the New World, of the struggle which has been going on for so long a time in Europe between

the laboring classes and the capitalists. It had been hoped that such a conflict would never be renewed in the countries west of the Atlantic. Such a hope, however, was doomed to disappointment. The first well-marked symptoms of the appearance of serious labor strikes and insurrections occurred as early as 1847. The origin of these difficulties was in the coal and iron-producing regions of Pennsylvania and in some of the great manufactories of New England. For a while the disturbances produced but little alarm. It was not until the great railroad strike of 1877 that a general apprehension was excited with respect to the unfriendly relations of labor and capital. In the following year much uneasiness existed; but the better times, extending from 1879 to 1882, with the consequent favorable rate of wages, tended to remove, or at least to postpone, the renewal of trouble.

A series of bad crops ensued, and the average ability of the people to purchase was correspondingly diminished. The speculative mania, however, did not cease, and the large amounts of capital withdrawn from legitimate production and lost in visionary enterprises, still further reduced the means of employing labor. Stagnation ensued in business; stocks declined in value, manufactories were closed, and the difficulty of obtaining employment was greatly enhanced.

While these causes—half-natural, half-artificial—were at work, others, wholly fictitious, but powerful in their evil results, began to operate in the creation of strife and animosity. Monopolies grew and flourished to an extent hitherto unknown in the United States. On the other hand, labor discovered the salutary but dangerous power of combination. A rage for organizing took possession of the minds of the laboring men of the country, and to the arrogant front of monopoly was opposed the insurrectionary front of the working classes.

More serious still than the causes here referred to was the introduction into the United States of a large mass of ignorant foreign labor. The worst elements of several European States contributed freely to the manufactories and workshops of America, and a class of ideas utterly un-American became dominant in many of the leading establishments of the country. Communist theories of society

and anarchic views of government began to clash with the more sober republican opinions and practices of the people. To all this must be added the evils and abuses which seem to be incident to the wage-system of labor, and are, perhaps, inseparable therefrom. The result has been a growing jealousy of the two great parties to production, the laborer and the capitalist.

The opening of trade for the season of 1886 witnessed a series of strikes and labor imbroglios in all parts of the country. Such troubles were, however, confined for the most part to the cities and towns where labor was aggregated. The first serious trouble occurred on what is known as the Gould System of railways, reaching from the Mississippi to the South-west. A single workman, belonging to the Knights of Labor, and employed on a branch of the Texas and Pacific Railway, at that time under a receivership, and therefore beyond the control of Jay Gould and his subordinates, was discharged from his place. This action was resented by the Knights, and the laborers on a great part of the Gould system were ordered to strike. The movement was, for a season, successful, and the transportation of freights from St. Louis to the South-west ceased. Gradually, however, other workmen were substituted for the striking Knights; the movement of freights was resumed, and the strike ended in comparative failure; but this end was not reached until a severe riot in East St. Louis had occasioned the sacrifice of several innocent lives.

Far more alarming was the outbreak in Chicago. In that city the Socialistic and Anarchic elements were sufficiently powerful to present a bold front to the authorities, processions bearing red flags, and banners with communistic devices and mottoes, frequently paraded the streets, and were addressed by demagogues who avowed themselves the open enemies of society and the existing order. On the 4th of May a vast crowd of this reckless material collected in a place called the Haymarket, and were about to begin the usual inflammatory proceedings, when a band of policemen, mostly officers, drew near, with the evident purpose of controlling or dispersing the meeting. A terrible scene ensued. Dynamite bombs were thrown from

the crowd and exploded among the officers, several of whom were blown to pieces and others shockingly mangled. The mob was, in turn, attacked by the police, and many of the insurgents were shot down. Order was presently restored in the city; several of the leading Anarchists were arrested, brought to trial, condemned, and executed on the charge of inciting to murder. Many precautionary measures were also taken to prevent the recurrence of such tragedies as had been witnessed in the Haymarket Square. On the following day a similar, though less dangerous, outbreak occurred in Milwaukee; but in this city the insurrectionary movement was suppressed without serious loss of life. The attention of the American people—let us hope to some good end—was called, as never before, to the dangerous relations existing between the upper and nether sides of our municipal populations.

The summer of 1886 was memorable in American annals, on account of that great natural phenomenon known as the Charleston Earthquake. On the night of the 31st of August, at ten minutes before ten o'clock, it was discovered at Washington City, and at several other points where weather and signal-stations were established, that communications with Charleston, South Carolina, were suddenly cut off. The discovery was made by inquiries relative to the origin of a shock which had that moment been felt, with varying degrees of violence, throughout nearly the whole country east of the Mississippi and south of the Great Lakes. In a few minutes it was found that no telegraphic communication *from any side* could be had with Charleston; and it was at once perceived that that city had suffered from the convulsion. Measures were hastily devised for further investigation, and the result showed that the worst apprehensions were verified. Without a moment's warning the city had been rocked and rent to its very foundations. Hardly a building in the limits of Charleston, or in the country surrounding, had escaped serious injury, and perhaps one-half of all were in a state of semi-wreck or total ruin. With the exception of the great earthquake of New Madrid, in 1811, no other such scene of devastation and terror had ever before been witnessed within the limits of the United States.

Many scientists of national reputation hurried to the scene, and made a careful scrutiny of the phenomenon, with a view of contributing something to the exact knowledge of mankind respecting the causes and character of earthquakes. A few facts and principles were determined with tolerable accuracy. One was, that the point of origin, called the *epicenter*, of the great convulsion had been at a place about twenty miles from Charleston, and that the motion of the earth immediately over this

shock or convulsion, as a dropping or sliding of the region to one side, but rather a series of very quick and violent oscillations, by which the central country of the disturbance was, in the course of some five minutes, settled somewhat to seaward.

The whole coast in the central region of the disturbance was modified with respect to the sea, and the ocean itself was thrown into turmoil for leagues from the shore. The people of the city were in a state of the utmost consternation.

They fled from their falling houses to the public squares and parks and far into the country. Afraid to return into the ruins they threw up tents and light booths for protection, and abode for weeks away from their homes. The convulsion was by far the greatest that this continent has experienced within the historical epoch. The disaster to Charleston served to bring out some of the better qualities of our civilization.



EARTHQUAKE AT CHARLESTON

Copyright 1887 O. M. Dunham.

center had been nearly up and down—that is, vertical. A second point, tolerably well established, was that the isoseismic lines, or lines of equal disturbance, might be drawn around the epicenter in circles very nearly concentric, and that the circle of greatest disturbance was at some distance from the center. Still a third item of knowledge tolerably well established was that away from the epicenter—as illustrated in the ruins of Charleston—the agitation of the earth was not in the nature of a single

Assistance came from all quarters, and contributions poured in for the support and encouragement of the afflicted people. For several weeks a series of diminishing shocks continued to terrify the citizens and paralyze the efforts at restoration. But it was discovered in the course of time that these shocks were only the dying away of the great convulsion, and that they gave cause for hope of entire cessation rather than continued alarm. In the lapse of a few months the *debris* was

CHRONOLOGICAL CHART No. X.
MOST RECENT PERIOD.

From the American Centennial to the Year 1896.

PREPARED BY JOHN CLARK RIDPATH, L. L. D.

Copyrighted by the Jones Brothers Publishing Company, 1876

76. May 16-Nov. 10. International Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia.
 77. March 5. Inauguration of Rutherford B. Hayes as President.
 July 16. Beginning of the great railroad strike.
 July 25. Desastrous labor riot in Chicago.
 July-Sept. War with the Nez Percé Indians of Idaho.
 July-Aug. Fisheries Commission at Halifax and award against the United States.
 Invention of the telephone by Bell in Chicago, and of the phonograph by Edison.
 77-80. Tour of General Grant around the world.
 79. June 18. Passage of the Act establishing the Life-saving Service.
 Sept. Invention of the electrical light by Edison.
 Sept. 28. Reception of first resident Chinese embassy at Washington.
 79. Jan. 1. Resumption of specie payments by the United States.
 80. Taking of the tenth census of the United States.
 Nov. Success of the Republican party in the National election.
 80-81. Refunding of \$750,000,000 of the National debt.

UNITED STATES.

76. March. Assumption of title of Empress of India by Queen Victoria.
 Aug. 22. Benjamin Disraeli elevated to the peerage as Earl of Beaconsfield.
 77. Business depression and commercial distress throughout England.
 Outbreak of the Turco-Russian War.
 Lowest ebb of the fortunes of the Liberal party.
 78. Great distress in Ireland and revival of Home Rule question.
 Sept. British expedition undertaken in Afghanistan.
 79. Jan. Invasion of Zululand begun.
 Aug. End of the Zulu War and capture of the King.
 May 5. Treaty of Gadsden with the Yankok King.
 War with the Yankok King.
 Dec. 24. Capture and deposition of Yakob Khan, and end of the rebellion.
 80. Great success of the Liberal party in the Parliamentary elections.

GREAT BRITAIN.

77. End of the MacMahon regime.
 Definitive establishment of the Third Republic.
 Sept. 2. Death of Louis Adolphe Thiers.
 Accession of Jules Grevy to the presidency of the C. of Deputies.
 78. Constitution and forms of the Third Republic completed by the Dufaure ministry.
 79. June 1. Killing of the Prince Imperial in Zululand, South Africa.
 Termination of the administration of Marshal MacMahon.
 Jules Grevy becomes President of the Republic.
 80. Creation of the Freycinet Ministry by the Moderate Republicans.
 Assembly of Gambetta in the Legislature.
 Re-establishment of the religious orders in France; expulsion of the Jesuits.
 Passage of the Act for Secular Education.
 Henry Rochefort becomes leader of the Radical party.

FRANCE.

76. Threatened assendency of the German Empire.
 77. Attempted mediation of Emperor William to prevent war between Turkey and Russia.
 78. April. The Socialist Hotel fires on the Emperor.
 Great reaction against the German Ministry.
 Aug.-Oct. Bismarck presides over the Congress at Berlin.
 The Chancellor secures the support of Socialist representatives.
 79. Revival of the Anti-Semitic spirit in Germany.
 80. Proposed laws for the suppression of Jewish influence in the Empire.
 Bismarck demands an increase of the German Army.
 Assembly of the Chancellor in the affairs of Europe.

GERMANY.

76-78. Concluding years of the reign of Victor Emmanuel.
 77. Celebration of the Jubilee Anniversary of the Episcopate of the Pope.
 78. Jan. 9. Death of Victor Emmanuel and accession of Umberto I.
 Feb. 29. Election of Cardinal Pecci as Pope, with title of Leo XIII.
 Attempt of the king and government to suppress Socialism.
 79. Accession of the Italian Ministry.
 80. Dubious success of the government in the Balkans.
 The Pope issues an appeal to the Catholics.

ITALY.

76. Spread of the Nihilistic conspiracy against the Government.
 77. The zar espouses the cause of the Slavonic Christians.
 Makes war on the Turks and threatens Constantinople.
 78. The treaty of San Stefano extorted from Turkey and the Slavonic Christians.
 79. Solovoff shoots at the Emperor.
 Movement of general Turke against the Nihilists.
 Attempt to blow up the winter palace of the Czar.
 80. Nov. Explosion of railway mine under the Emperor's train.

RUSSIA.

76. Turkey. May 20. Assassination of Abdul Aziz and accession of Murad V.
 Aug. 31. Accession of Abdul Hamid II.
 Mexico. Success of the revolution headed by General Diaz.
 77. Turkey. March. The Porte participates in the London Conference.
 April 19. Issuance of the London protocol at Constantinople.
 June. Beginning of the Turco-Russian War.
 July 16-19. Battle of Tunda Brook and capture of Nicopolis.
 Aug. 19. Assault on Shipka Pass.
 Sept. 6-9. Battles of Plevena.
 Nov. 17. Capture of Kars.
 78. March 3. Treaty of San Stefano.
 July 13. Beginning of the Congress of Berlin.
 Austria. July. Acquisition of Bosnia and Herzegovina.
 Russia. Reform in educational and municipal statutes.
 Accession of the Marquis de Lorne to Governor-Generalship.
 China. Sending of first resident embassy to the United States.
 80. Mexico. Election of Emmanuel Gonzales to the presidency.

WORLD AT LARGE.

51. March 4. Inauguration of James A. Garfield as President.
 May-July. Agitation of the question of civil service reform.
 Factional division of the Republican party into Stalwarts and Half-Breeds.
 July 2. Assassination of President Garfield by Gaiter. (Breeds.)
 82. Aug.-Oct. Trial of the so-called Star-Route conspirators.
 85. May. Formal opening of the Suspension Bridge between New York and Brooklyn.
 Retirement of General Sherman and accession of Sheridan to the command of the army.
 82-83. Revival of the question of Free Trade and Protection to American industries.
 84. Nov. Success of the Democratic party elected to the presidency.
 85. Feb. 21. Dedication of the War Monument.
 March 4. Inauguration of Grover Cleveland as President.
 July 25. Death of General Ulysses Grant.
 Nov. 25. Death of Vice-President Schuyler Colver.
 81. Renewal of the battle for Home Rule in Ireland.
 March 2. Passage of the Coercion Bill against the Irish tenants.
 First International Monetary Conference held at the House of Commons.
 Passage of the Irish Land Bill.
 April 19. Death of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield.
 82. April. Alleged compact between Gladstone and Parnell.
 May 6. Murder of Lord Cavendish and Mr. Burke in Phoenix Park.
 Deamunation of the Land League and persecution of Irish leaders.
 83. Failure of the new Franchise Bill.
 Unfavorable progress of the Egyptian War.
 84. Attempts of the Irish party to force passage of Home Rule.
 Sending of Chinese Gordon to assist the Khedive.
 85. April 25. Two-thirds and death of 4 times.
 Rejection of the Liberal Budget by the House of Commons.
 Overthrow of Gladstone Ministry.
 The Marquis of Salisbury.
 Passage of the Act for the Suppression of the Opium Trade.
 81. Attempted reformation of the election laws.
 Leon Gambetta becomes Prime Minister.
 First International Monetary Conference held at Paris.
 82. General revival of business and industry and proclamation of political toleration.
 Dec. 21. Death of Leon Gambetta.
 83. Growing distrust against the Bonapartists.
 Expulsion of Prince Napoleon and certain Orleansist Princes.
 84. Increasing influence of the Socialist Republicans.
 Expulsion of the Emperor and the Franco-German War.
 Abrogation of the No-Divorce Law.
 85. Question of revising the Constitution and the general election.
 Ambiguous results of the general election.
 Jules Grevy re-elected to the presidency.
 General divorce for the establishment of the Republic.
 81. Controversy of Bismarck with the Houses of the German Parliament.
 Herr Windthorst appears as the leader of the Catholic party.
 The Chancellor opens negotiations with the Vatican.
 Meeting of the Emperors of Germany, Austria, and Russia at Danzig.
 The general elections carried against the government.
 82. Political affiliation of Bismarck and Herr Windthorst.
 Repeal of the Falk Laws against the Catholics.
 Attempt to repeal the Civil Marriage Law.
 83. Difficulty with the United States about the importation of the Lasker Resolutions.
 84. Alarm throughout Europe on account of the Spanish Revolution.
 Measures adopted under direction of Dr. Koch to prevent the spread of the Spanish Revolution.
 85. Promotion of a scheme for foreign colonies.
 Difficulty with Spain about the Island of Cuba.
 81. Renewal of Christian pilgrimages to Rome.
 Affair of the Lega della Democrazia.
 Passage of the law for universal suffrage.
 82. Attempt of the Pope to establish an independent ecclesiastical State.
 Resumption of specie payments by the Italian government.
 Strained relations of Italy and the French Republic.
 Great earthquake in the Island of Ischia destroys 7,500 persons.
 84. Attempt of the government to gain control of the Suez Canal.
 Invasion of the Asiatic cholera at Naples.
 85. Change in the policy of the Pope toward Turkey.
 81. March 11. Assassination of Alexander II. and accession of Alexander III.
 March. Execution of the assassins of Alexander II.
 The Nihilists create terror throughout Russia.
 82. Persecution of the Jews in Odessa.
 83. Resumption of the assassinations of the Nihilists.
 84. Issuance of the Edict of Grace to the Siberian prisoners.
 85. Establishment of friendly relations with German Emperor.
 Further suppression of nationality in Poland.
 Formation of triple alliance with Austria and Prussia.
 Settlement of the difficulty with England.
 81. Turkey. Beginning of complication with Russia relative to Armenia.
 Austria. Negotiation of the Angel treaty with the United States.
 82. Turkey. Rebellion and trial of Arabi Pasha.
 83. Turkey. The Porte agrees to the building of the Serbian railways.
 84. Turkey. Revolution at Philippopolis.
 Mexico. General Diaz again becomes President.
 85. Turkey. Sept. Eastern Roumelia organ rule of Prince Alexander.
 Cunda. Passage of the bill for enfranchisement of the Bulgarians.
 March. Outbreak of the Riel rebellion in the Netherlands.
 Nov. 6. Execution of Riel at Regen.

death of General John A. Logan,
death of General W. S. Hancock.
Great labor agitation in the United States.
architectic outbreak in the Haymarket, Chicago.

87-88. Renewal of the Free-Trade agitation.
88. March 19. Bill for telephone patent continued.
March 12. Conclusion of treaty for exclusion of
June 4. Passage of Act in New York for execution
Nov. Success of the Republican party in the
88-89. Organization and admission into the Union of
Dakota, Montana, and Washington.

89. March 4. Inauguration of Benjamin Har
April 26. Celebration of Centennial of Am
Feb. 1. Bill passed for the organization of
May 31. Disaster of the Johnstown flood.
Oct. Dec. Settling of the Pan-American
Institution of the Department of Agricul
April. Serious difficulty with Germany re
90. Adoption of the McKinley tariff bill
Renewal of the agitation for the free
Taking of the eleven census.
Difficulties in House of Representa
July 2-18. Admission of Idaho and
89. March 19. Bill for telephone patent continued.

Success of the Liberals in the Parliamentary elections.
Death of Gladstone to the place of Prime Minister
of the new Home Rule Bill in the House of Commons.
Feb. 1. Passage of the Education Bill in the
endency of Salisbury and crushing of the Parmentiers
of the London Times on Parnell, and his vindication.
Celebration of the Jubilee of Queen Victoria.
89. Jan. News of the death of Albert Ed
8. April 18. Passage of the new Marriage Act.
April 25. Passage of Act creating an Irish Land Commission.
Sept. First authentic intelligence received from Stanley and Emin Pasha
89. Jan. News of the death of Albert Ed
Attempts at a union of the Parmentiers and the Conservatives.
Feb. 18. Ratification of new extradition treaty with the United States.
Dec. 12. Death of Robert Browning at Venice.
Overthrow of Charles Stewart Parnell by a domestic scandal.
Feb. 4. Treaty of Great Britain, Germany, and the U. S. respecting

Fidelity to Germany.
of the Ministry of the Foreign.
and culmination of the Boulangist agitation.
88. Accession of M. Floquet to the Prime Ministry.
90. Explosion of Boulangism and exile of General
Boulangier.
International celebration of the Centennial of the
Revolution and the Republic at Paris.
90. Feb. 7. Arrest of the Duke of Orleans for the
Expulsion Law.
March 14. Formation of new Cabinet un
der M. de Freycinet, of the Revolution.
Aug. 5. Treaty with England to establish
over Zanzibar.

Accession of the Bismarck.
exodus of German emigrants to the United States.
initial alarm of war; conservative victory in the elections.
announcement of the fatal ailment of the Crown Prince.
88. March 3. Death of Emperor William I.
Accession of Frederick III. to his reign on ninety-nine da
June 15. Death of the Emperor and accession of his son
Aug. 13. Von Moltke succeeded by Waldersee as Gener
89. Beginning of rupture between the young Emperor
and the Anti-Socialist Bill rejected by the
Feb. 20. Elections result in great gains for
March 18. Bismarck is succeeded by Von
May 9. Attempt to exclude Jewish pupils.
June 20. Treaty with Great Britain, resp
July 1. Heligoland obtained from Englan

of Parliament and new election favorable to the Ministry.
earthquake in the Riviera.
becomes the third member of the coalition.
88. Celebration of the Jubilee Anniversary of the Pope as
delegate to Benevento.
89. Feb. 12. Passage of the Electoral Reform Bill.
Unsatisfactory results of the suffrage Law.
90. May 20. Treaty of commerce, navigation,

ment.
the government in suppressing the Revolutionary party.
period of peace and industrial prosperity in Russia.
90. Feb. 19. The Czar demands three million
rubles of Bulgaria for the military ex
penses.
June 3. Treaty with Germany and France
of anarchy.

89. Jan. 21. Overthrow and abduction of Prince Alexander.
Revival of trade with the United States.
Key. Conference at Constantinople on the Balkan ques
Brazil. Dec. 21. Decree of banishment against
Ex-Emperor Dom Pedro and the royal family.
Japan. Feb. 11. Proclamation of the new Im
perial Constitution.
Portugal. Dec. 28. Carlos I proclaimed King
30. Spain. Jan. 3. Resignation of the Minis
Germany. July 1. Dismissal of the Emperor
to withdraw Portuguese forces
from African provinces.
Belgium. June 18. Henry M. Stanley
Accession of George of Greece to the throne.
Brazil. June 23. Proclamation of new
Argentina. July 25. Revolution at Bu
Enos Ayres, and the German.
Holland. Nov. 23. Death of William I
son of Princess Wilhelmina.

91. Feb. Mafa riots in New Orleans and threatened war with Italy.
Oct. 16. Killing of American sailors in Valparaiso and hostile corresponden
92. Feb. 20. Decision of the Supreme Court upholding the McKinley Tariff Law.
March 10. Commercial treaty with Spain on principle of reciprocity.
July. Aug. Great strikes and civil war in the United States and Pennsylvania.
Aug.-Oct. Threatened spread of cholera into the United States.
Nov. Second election of Cleveland to the Presidency.
92-93. Celebration of the World's Columbian Exposition at Chicago.

93. March. Second inauguration of William McKinley as President.
Chinese laborers. Aug. 13. Passage of the Wilson-Gorman tariff bill.
by electricity. Nov. 1. Repeal of the Sherman Silver Law.
Oct.-Sept. Great financial panic and beginning of severe industrial
North Dakota, South
Feb. 2. Wrecking of the steamer Clear in San Francisco.
Reformers labor disturbances throughout the country.
Efforts at political reform in New York City.
Threatening dispute with Great Britain about seal fisheries.
Strikes of coal miners and of the American Railway Union.
July 8. Suppression of riots in Chicago by the army.
Sept. Prevalence of destructive forest fires in the Northwest.
95. Feb. 20. Death of Frederick Douglass.

May 20. Income tax declared unconstitutional.
June 17. Opening of Harlem Ship-canal.
95-96. Addition of \$202,000,000 to the bonded debt of the
United States.
Cons in the parties on the silver question.

91. Oct. 6. Death of Charles Stewart Parnell.
92. Jan. Parliamentary elections favorable to the Liberals.
Jan. 14. Death of Albert Victor, Duke of Clarence, heir presumptive to the
of the Liberal in the Parliamentary elections.
90. Feb. 4. Death of Alfred Tennyson.
Oct. 6. Death of Alfred Tennyson.
92. Feb. 17. Introduction of last Home Rule Bill by Mr Gladstone.
July 2. Strike of the bath-stewards in the Southampton.
July 6. Prince George, heir presumptive to the crown, marries the
Princess Mary, of Teck.
93. March 7. Resignation of the Premiership by Gladstone and ac
March 12. Election of John Lubbock in Queen's speech for disestablishment
of the Welsh Church.
95. June 22. Resignation of Bismarck's cabinet and recess-
ion of the Ministers of State.
Dec. 2. Alfred Austin appointed Poet Laureate.
96. Feb. Great Britain agrees that Russia may build
Trans-Siberian Railway through China.

92. Feb. 18. Resignation of the Cabinet and formation of new ministry under M.
of the Ministry of the Foreign.
Sept. 22. Centennial anniversary of the First Republic.
Nov. 28. Resignation of the Ministry.
Dec. 5. Formation of new Ministry under M. Floquet.
Feb. Expenses of the great scandal referred to the Panama Canal.
Feb.-March. Trial and condemnation of Count de Lesseps, and others.
April 5. Formation of a new Ministry under M. Charles Dupuy.
Aug. 25. The Court of the Republic sentenced Tribunal against the United States.
Oct. 17. Death of Marshal MacMahon at Paris.
Dec. 7. Explosion of a dynamite bomb in the Chamber of Deputies.
94. June 24. Assassination of President Sadi-Carnot by Sante
Dec. 1. Death of Count de Lesseps.
95. Jan. 18. Resignation of President Casimir Perier and
accession of Francois Felix Faure.
Sept. 1. Death of the bacteriologist, Louis Pasteur.

91. Jan. 1. Government takes possession of territory on the coast of Zanzibar.
June 4. Chancellor Caprivi secures the renewal of the Dreitbund.
Oct. 26. Death of Count von Moltke.
Dec. 18. Caprivi is made a count by Emperor William.
92. Feb. 22. Great riots of the workingmen in Berlin.
William II. 93. July 5. Opening of the Reichstag by the Emperor in person.
of the army.
94. April 23. Removal of the ban against Catholic orders, except-
ing the Jesuits.
Oct. 20. 1895. Resignation of Chancellor von Caprivi and accession
of Prince Hohenlohe.
Caprivi as Chancellor.
May 11. Bill for repression of socialism rejected by the
from the superior schools.
96. Jan. 18. Celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary
of the Empire.
in exchange for German possessions in Zanzibar.

94. Jan. 21. Resignation of the Crispin Cabinet and formation of new Ministry under
the Marquis Du Roldin.
92. May 6. Formation of the Rudini Cabinet and formation of new Ministry
under Signor Giolitti.
93. Oct. Ravages of the cholera at Palermo.
Nov. 24. Oct. 1895. The Ministry on account of the bank scandals.
95. Parliamentary elections carried by the Government
and friendship with Mexico.

91. Aug.-Nov. Prevalence of famine in twenty-one Russian provinces.
92. Aug.-Nov. Widespread devastation from Asiatic cholera.
Mortality reaches three thousand deaths daily.
93. Dec. End of the tariff difficulty with Germany.
94. Nov. Accession of Alexander III. at Livadia, and accession of
for the repression
95. Aug. Renewed activity of the nihilists.
96. Jan. Understanding reached with the sultan for
the free passage of the Parmentiers and control
of the Black Sea.

91. Egypt. Feb. 29. Defeat of Osman Digna's army at Tokar.
Canada. March 5. Parliamentary elections carried by the Conservatives.
Egypt. July. Ravages of cholera-epidemic.
Brazil. Nov. 4. Beginning of violent persecution of foreigners.
Brazil. Nov. 4. Declaration of martial law against the Monarchists.
92. Egypt. Jan. 7. Death of Tewfik and accession of Abbas Pascha as Khedive.
Spain. July 3. National celebration commemorating discovery of America
Mexico. Sept. 22. Election of Don Porfirio Diaz proclaimed President for four years.
93. Great earthquake at Zanzibar.
Switzerland. Dec. 15. Election of Charles Emmanuel Schenk as President.
94. China. Jan. 25. Burning of a temple at Canton results in 1,400 deaths.
Great earthquake at Zanzibar.
Belgium. April 10. Failure of the bill for Universal Suffrage.
Brazil. April. Successful progress of the Revolution.
South Africa. Dec. End of the war against King Lobengula and
the Matabele.

Europe. Jan. Coldest weather known within the century; freezing
Ivulia. June 26. Issuance of order for the suspension of the free
coinage of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.
Africa. Jan. Overrunning of Timbuctu by the French.
China. July. Beginning of war with Japan.

91. Aug.-Nov. Prevalence of famine in twenty-one Russian provinces.
92. Aug.-Nov. Widespread devastation from Asiatic cholera.
Mortality reaches three thousand deaths daily.
93. Dec. End of the tariff difficulty with Germany.
94. Nov. Accession of Alexander III. at Livadia, and accession of
for the repression
95. Aug. Renewed activity of the nihilists.
96. Jan. Understanding reached with the sultan for
the free passage of the Parmentiers and control
of the Black Sea.

91. Egypt. Feb. 29. Defeat of Osman Digna's army at Tokar.
Canada. March 5. Parliamentary elections carried by the Conservatives.
Egypt. July. Ravages of cholera-epidemic.
Brazil. Nov. 4. Beginning of violent persecution of foreigners.
Brazil. Nov. 4. Declaration of martial law against the Monarchists.
92. Egypt. Jan. 7. Death of Tewfik and accession of Abbas Pascha as Khedive.
Spain. July 3. National celebration commemorating discovery of America
Mexico. Sept. 22. Election of Don Porfirio Diaz proclaimed President for four years.
93. Great earthquake at Zanzibar.
Switzerland. Dec. 15. Election of Charles Emmanuel Schenk as President.
94. China. Jan. 25. Burning of a temple at Canton results in 1,400 deaths.
Great earthquake at Zanzibar.
Belgium. April 10. Failure of the bill for Universal Suffrage.
Brazil. April. Successful progress of the Revolution.
South Africa. Dec. End of the war against King Lobengula and
the Matabele.

Europe. Jan. Coldest weather known within the century; freezing
Ivulia. June 26. Issuance of order for the suspension of the free
coinage of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.
Africa. Jan. Overrunning of Timbuctu by the French.
China. July. Beginning of war with Japan.

91. Aug.-Nov. Prevalence of famine in twenty-one Russian provinces.
92. Aug.-Nov. Widespread devastation from Asiatic cholera.
Mortality reaches three thousand deaths daily.
93. Dec. End of the tariff difficulty with Germany.
94. Nov. Accession of Alexander III. at Livadia, and accession of
for the repression
95. Aug. Renewed activity of the nihilists.
96. Jan. Understanding reached with the sultan for
the free passage of the Parmentiers and control
of the Black Sea.

91. Egypt. Feb. 29. Defeat of Osman Digna's army at Tokar.
Canada. March 5. Parliamentary elections carried by the Conservatives.
Egypt. July. Ravages of cholera-epidemic.
Brazil. Nov. 4. Beginning of violent persecution of foreigners.
Brazil. Nov. 4. Declaration of martial law against the Monarchists.
92. Egypt. Jan. 7. Death of Tewfik and accession of Abbas Pascha as Khedive.
Spain. July 3. National celebration commemorating discovery of America
Mexico. Sept. 22. Election of Don Porfirio Diaz proclaimed President for four years.
93. Great earthquake at Zanzibar.
Switzerland. Dec. 15. Election of Charles Emmanuel Schenk as President.
94. China. Jan. 25. Burning of a temple at Canton results in 1,400 deaths.
Great earthquake at Zanzibar.
Belgium. April 10. Failure of the bill for Universal Suffrage.
Brazil. April. Successful progress of the Revolution.
South Africa. Dec. End of the war against King Lobengula and
the Matabele.

Europe. Jan. Coldest weather known within the century; freezing
Ivulia. June 26. Issuance of order for the suspension of the free
coinage of the Austro-Hungarian Empire.
Africa. Jan. Overrunning of Timbuctu by the French.
China. July. Beginning of war with Japan.

cleared away, business was resumed, and the people were again safe in their homes.

On the 4th of March, 1887, the second session of the Forty-ninth Congress expired by statutory limitation. The work of the body had not been so fruitful of results as had been desired and anticipated by the friends of the Government; but some important legislation had been effected. On the question of the tariff nothing of value was accomplished. True, a serious measure of revenue reform had been brought forward at an early date in the session; but owing to the opposition of that wing of the Democratic party headed by Samuel J. Randall, and committed to the doctrine of protection, as well as to the antagonism of the Republican majority in the Senate, the act failed of adoption. In fact, by the beginning of 1887, it had become apparent that the existing political parties could not be forced to align on the issue of free trade and tariff, and as a result no legislation looking to any actual reform in the current revenue system of the United States could be carried through Congress.

On the question of extending the Pension List, however, the case was different. A great majority of both parties could always be counted on to favor such measures as looked to the increase of benefits to the soldiers. At the first, only a limited number of pensions had been granted, and these only to actually disabled and injured veterans of the War for the Union. With the lapse of time, however, and the relaxation of party allegiance, it became more and more important to each of the parties to secure and hold the soldierly vote, without which it was felt that neither could maintain ascendancy in the government. Nor can it be denied that genuine patriotic sentiment and gratitude of the Nation to its defenders coincided in this respect with political ambition and selfishness. The Arrears of Pensions Act, making up to those who were already recipients of pensions such amounts as would have accrued if the benefit had dated from the time of disability, instead of from the time of granting the pension, was passed in 1879, and, at the same time, the list of beneficiaries was greatly enlarged.

The measure presented in the Forty-ninth Congress was designed to extend the Pension

List so as to include all regularly enlisted and honorably discharged soldiers of the Civil War, who had become, in whole or in part, dependent upon the aid of others for their maintenance and welfare. The measure was known as the Dependent Pensions Bill, and though many opposed the enactment of a law which appeared to fling away the bounty of the Government to the deserving and the undeserving, the evil and the just, alike, yet a majority was easily obtained for the measure in both Houses, and the act was passed. President Cleveland, however, interposed his veto, and the proposed law fell to the ground. A strenuous effort was made in the House of Representatives to pass the bill over the veto, but the movement failed.

By far the most important and noted piece of legislation of the session was incorporated in the act known as the Interstate Commerce Bill. For some fifteen years complaints against the methods and management of the railways of the United States had been heard on many sides, and in cases not a few the complaints had originated in actual abuses, some of which were willful, but most were merely incidental to the development of a system so vast and, on the whole, so beneficial to the public. In such a state of affairs the lasting benefit is always forgotten in the accidental hurt. That large class of people who, in despite of the teachings of history, still believe in the cure of all things by law, and that mankind are always about to perish for want of more legislation, became clamorous in their demand that Congress should take the railways by the throat and compel them to accept what may be called the system of uniformity as it respects all charges for service rendered. It was believed in Congress that to take up this call, and champion the alleged cause of the people, would be one of the most popular measures of the period. The Interstate Commerce Bill was accordingly prepared, with a multitude of lengthy and involved clauses requiring a commission of great lawyers for their interpretation. It was enacted that all freight carriage across State lines within the Union should be at the same rate per hundred for all distances, and between all places, and under substantially the same conditions, and that passenger fares should be uniform for all persons.

It must be borne in mind that, in the very nature of things, railways are unable to carry freight at as small a rate per hundred, or passengers at as small a charge per mile, between places approximate as between places at great distances. It must also be remembered that in some regions it is many times more expensive to build and operate a railroad than in others. To carry one of these great thoroughfares over the Rocky Mountains is a very different thing from stretching a similar track across the level prairies of Illinois. It must still further be considered that, in the nature of the case, competition will do its legitimate and inevitable work at an earlier date and more thoroughly between great cities, even when remotely situated, than between unimportant points, however near together. The traffic and travel between two villages is not sufficient to create competition among the carriers. It is as absurd to suppose that railway tariffs can be the same between New York and Chicago as they are between two Missouri towns, as it is to suppose that butter can command the same price in an Iowa village that it does in the Quincy Market of Boston. What should be said of an attempt in Congress to make the price of wheat and pork uniform throughout the United States.

The Interstate Commerce Bill was conceived against all the natural, manifest, and undeniable principles of the commercial world. It was passed with the belief that all discriminations in the charges made by railways doing business in more than one State could be prevented by law. It was passed as if to amend or abrogate those natural laws of trade and traffic which, in their kind, are as absolute and as beneficial as the law of gravitation. It was passed with the ulterior design of securing to its promoters the support of that ignorant and embittered race of men whose prejudices are out of all proportion to their knowledge of human rights, or their recognition of the paramount interests of the whole people. It was passed under the pernicious anti-democratic theory of governmental paternalism, which says that men are infants or imbeciles, unable to care for themselves unless they are fed, and led, and coddled by some motherly government, of which they are the irresponsible offspring. It is safe to say that

no other measure ever adopted by the American Congress was so difficult of application, or was so barren of results with respect to the interests which it was intended to promote. Disorder was the first-born of the Interstate Commerce Bill, and its last offspring was—apathy.

During the whole of Cleveland's Administration the public mind was swayed and excited by the movements of politics. The universality of partisan newspapers, the combination in their columns of all the news of the world with the invectives, misrepresentations, and counter-charges of party leaders, kept political questions constantly uppermost, to the detriment of social progress and industrial interests. Scarcely had President Cleveland entered upon his office as Chief Magistrate when the question of the succession to the Presidency was agitated. The echoes of the election of 1884 had not died away before the rising murmur of that of 1888 was heard.

By the last year of the current Administration it was seen that there would be no general break-up of the existing parties. It was also perceived that the issues between them must be *novæ*, rather than found in the existing state of affairs. The sentiment in the United States in favor of the Constitutional prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors had become somewhat extended and intensified since the last quadrennial election. But the discerning eye might perceive that the real issue was between the Republican and Democratic parties, and that the questions involved were to be rather those of the past than of the future.

One issue, however, presented itself which had a living and practical relation to affairs, and that was the question of PROTECTION TO AMERICAN INDUSTRY. Since the campaign of 1884, the agitation had been gradually extended. At the opening of the session, in 1887, the President, in his annual message to Congress, departed from all precedent, and devoted the whole document to the discussion of the single question of a *Reform of the Revenue System* of the United States. The existing rates of duty on imported articles of commerce had so greatly augmented the income of the Government that a large surplus had accumulated, and was still accumulating, in

the National Treasury. This fact was made the basis of the President's argument in favor of a new system of revenue, or, at least, an ample reduction in the tariff rates under the old. It was immediately charged by the Republicans that the project in question meant the substitution of the system of free trade in the United States, as against the system of protective duties. The question thus involved was made the bottom issue in the Presidential campaign of 1888.

As to the nominees of the various parties, it was, from the first, a foregone conclusion that Mr. Cleveland would be nominated for reelection by the Democrats. The result justified the expectation. The Democratic National Convention was held in St. Louis, on the 5th day of June, 1888, and Mr. Cleveland was renominated by acclamation. For the Vice-presidential nomination there was a considerable contest; but, after some balloting, the choice fell on Ex-Senator Allen G. Thurman, of Ohio. The Republican National Convention was held in Chicago, on the 19th day of June. Many candidates were ardently pressed upon the body, and the contest was long and spirited. It was believed, up to the time of the Convention, that Mr. Blaine, who was evidently the favorite of a great majority, would be again nominated for the Presidency. But the antagonisms which that statesman had awakened in his own party made it inexpedient to bring him forward again as the nominee. His name was, accordingly, not presented to the convention. The most prominent candidates were Senator John Sherman, of Ohio; Judge Walter Q. Gresham, of Chicago; Chauncey M. Depew, of New York; Ex-Governor Russell A. Alger, of Michigan; Ex-Senator Benjamin Harrison, of Indiana; and Senator William B. Allison, of Iowa. The voting was continued to the eighth ballot, when the choice fell upon Benjamin Harrison, of Indiana. In the evening, Levi P. Morton, of New York, was nominated for the Vice-presidency on the first ballot.

In the meantime, the Prohibition party had held its National Convention, at Indianapolis, and on the 30th of May had nominated for the Presidency General Clinton B. Fisk, of New Jersey, and for the Vice-presidency John A. Brooks, of Missouri. The Democratic platform

declared for a reform of the revenue system of the United States, and reaffirmed the principle of adjusting the tariff on imports, with strict regard to the actual needs of governmental expenditure. The Republican platform declared also for a reform of the tariff schedule, but at the same time stoutly affirmed the maintenance of the protective system, *as such*, as a part of the permanent policy of the United States. Both parties deferred to the patriotic sentiment of the country in favor of the soldiers, their rights and interests, and both endeavored, by the usual incidental circumstances of the hour, to gain the advantage of the other before the American people. The Prohibitionists entered the campaign on the distinct proposition that the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors should be prohibited throughout the United States by constitutional amendment. To this was added a clause in favor of extending the right of suffrage to women.

As the canvass progressed during the summer and autumn of 1888, it became evident that the result was in doubt. The contest was exceedingly close. As in 1880 and 1884, the critical States were New York, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Indiana. In all of the other Northern States the Republicans were almost certain to win, while the Democrats were equally certain of success in all the South. In the last weeks of the campaign, General Harrison grew in favor, and his party gained perceptibly to the close. The result showed success for the Republican candidate. He received two hundred and thirty-three electoral votes, against one hundred and sixty-eight votes for Mr. Cleveland. The latter, however, appeared to a better advantage on the popular count, having a considerable majority over General Harrison. General Fisk, the Prohibition candidate, received nearly three hundred thousand votes; but under the system of voting no electoral vote of any State was obtained for him in the so-called "College," by which the actual choice is made. As soon as the result was known, the excitement attendant upon the campaign subsided and political questions gave place to other interests.

The last days of Cleveland's Administration and of the Fiftieth Congress were signalized by the admission into the Union of Four:

NEW STATES, making the number forty-two. Since the incoming of Colorado, in 1876, no State had been added to the Republic. Meanwhile, the tremendous tides of population had continued to flow to the west and north-west, rapidly filling up the great Territories. Of these, the greatest was Dakota, with its area of one hundred and fifty thousand nine hundred and thirty-two square miles. In 1887 the question of dividing the Territory by a line running east and west was agitated, and the measure finally prevailed. Steps were taken by the people of both sections for admission into the Union. Montana, with her one hundred and forty-five thousand seven hundred and seventy-six square miles of territory, had meanwhile acquired a sufficient population; and Washington Territory, with its area of sixty-nine thousand nine hundred and ninety-four square miles, also knocked for admission. In the closing days of the Fiftieth Congress a bill was passed raising all these four Territories—South Dakota, North Dakota, Montana and Washington—to the plane of Statehood. The Act contemplated the adoption of State Constitutions, and a proclamation of admission by the next President. It thus happened that the honor of bringing in this great addition to the States of the Union was divided between the outgoing and incoming Administrations.

Another Act of Congress was also of National importance. Hitherto the Government had been administered through seven Departments, at the head of each of which was placed a Cabinet officer, the seven together constituting the advisers of the President. No provision for such an arrangement exists in the Constitution of the United States; but the statutes of the Nation provide for such a system as most in accordance with the Republican form of government. Early in 1889 a measure was brought forward in Congress, and adopted, for the institution of a new department, to be called the Department of Agriculture. Practically the measure involved the elevation of what had previously been an Agricultural Bureau in the Department of the Interior to the rank of a Cabinet office. Among foreign nations, France has been conspicuous for the patronage which the Government has given to the agricultural pursuits of that country. Hitherto in the United States,

though agriculture has been the greatest of all the producing interests of the people, it has been neglected for more political and less useful departments of American life and enterprise. By this act of Congress the Cabinet offices were increased in number to eight instead of seven.

Benjamin Harrison, twenty-third President of the United States, was born at North Bend, Ohio, on the 20th of August, 1833. He is the son of John Scott Harrison, a prominent citizen of his native State; grandson of President William Henry Harrison; great grandson of Benjamin Harrison, signer of the Declaration of Independence. In countries where attention is paid to honorable lineage, the circumstances of General Harrison's descent would be considered of much importance; but in America little attention is paid to one's ancestry, and more to himself.

Harrison's early life was passed, as that of other American boys, in attendance at school and at home duties on the farm. He was a student at the institution called Farmers' College for two years. Afterwards he attended Miami University, at Oxford, Ohio, and was graduated therefrom in June, 1852. He took in marriage the daughter of Dr. John W. Scott, president of the Oxford Female College. After a course of study he entered the profession of law, removing to Indianapolis and establishing himself in that city. With the outbreak of the war he became a soldier of the Union, and rose to the rank of Brevet Brigadier-General of Volunteers. Before the close of the war he was elected Reporter of Decisions of the Supreme Court of Indiana.

In the period following the Civil War, General Harrison rose to distinction as a civilian. In 1876 he was the unsuccessful candidate of the Republican party for Governor of Indiana. In 1881 he was elected to the United States Senate, where he won the reputation of a leader and statesman. In 1884 his name was prominently mentioned in connection with the Presidential nomination of his party, but Mr. Blaine was successful. After the lapse of four years, however, it was found at Chicago that General Harrison, more than any other, combined in himself all the elements of a successful candidate; and the event justified the choice of the party in


making him the standard-bearer in the ensuing campaign.

General Harrison was, in accordance with the usages of the Government, inaugurated President on the 4th of March, 1889. He had succeeded better than any of his predecessors in keeping his own counsels during the interim between his election and the inauguration. No one had discerned his purposes, and all waited with interest the expressions of his Inaugural Address. In that document he set forth the policy which he would favor as the Chief Executive, recommending the same general measures which the Republican party had advocated during the campaign.

On the day following the inaugural ceremonies, President Harrison sent in the nominations for his Cabinet officers, as follows: For Secretary of State, James G. Blaine, of Maine; for Secretary of the Treasury, William Windom, of Minnesota; for Secretary of War, Redfield Proctor, of Vermont; for Secretary of the Navy, Benjamin F. Tracy, of New York; for Postmaster-General, John Wanamaker, of Pennsylvania; for Secretary of the Interior, John W. Noble, of Missouri; for Attorney-General, William H. H. Miller, of Indiana; and for Secretary of Agriculture—the new department—Jeremiah Rusk, of Wisconsin. These appointments were immediately confirmed by the Senate, and the members of the new Administration assumed their respective official duties.

Within two months after Harrison's inauguration, an event occurred which recalled the mind of the American people to the striking incidents of the Revolutionary epoch. The event in question was the great CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION OF THE INSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN REPUBLIC. The particular date selected was the 30th of April, 1889, being

the centennial anniversary of the inauguration of Washington, at New York City. All of the ceremonies connected with the commemoration, in 1889, were associated, as far as practicable, with the scenes of the first inauguration. The event was so interesting in itself, and so distinctly National, as to warrant a few paragraphs descriptive of the scenes and incidents of the celebration.



BENJAMIN HARRISON.

The period extending from the year 1776 to the year 1789 was marked in the colonial history of the United States by several crises, different in kind, but each so well defined in character, as to be worthy of commemoration by the people of another and distant age. These critical periods were:

1. The Declaration of Independence.
2. The formation of the Constitution of the United States.

3. The adoption of the Constitution by the States.

4. The Institution of the New Government.

The Declaration of Independence was a *democratic* and *popular* revolution. By it, the allegiance of the Old Thirteen Colonies to the Mother Country was finally broken off. It was essentially destructive in its character. The first stages of all revolutions have this distinctive aspect. They destroy. It remains for a subsequent movement to rebuild. The revolution, in its first intent, abolishes and obliterates an existing order. It implies that the people have borne as long as possible some system which presses upon them, as if it were chains and fetters. It is to break the chains—real or imaginary—to throw off the fetters, that the revolution begins its career. Such was the case with our own destructive insurrection of 1776. It was leveled against the existing order, and was most happily successful.

In the second stage, we have another aspect. It was not long after the achievement of independence until the Revolutionary patriots came to see that mere independence was not enough; that mere destruction of popular abuses could not suffice for the future of America. Acting from these sentiments, the Fathers began to consult about rebuilding, or building anew, a structure in which civil liberty in America might find an abiding place. These discussions began almost as soon as independence was clearly gained. Washington and his friends earnestly debated the feasibility of a better system of government. Conferences were held, first at Mount Vernon, then at Annapolis; and finally a great convention of delegates was assembled at Philadelphia. This occurred, as we have said, in the summer of 1787. The result of the labors of this convention is well known. That strange compromise, called the Constitution of the United States, was produced and signed by the delegates, with Washington as their president. This, then, was the Epoch of Formation—the second of our Revolutionary crises.

Immediately after this event, a period of political agitation, the first real and general agitation known in the history of the United States, occurred. The new Constitution, bid before the States, was the bottom fact from which the stormy discussions of the next two

years sprang. Should that Constitution be adopted? or should it be rejected, and the old Confederate system of government be continued as before? On these questions there was a division of parties, and the controversy waxed violent. All the Old Thirteen States were shaken from center to boundary-line.

In a former part of the present work,¹ the story of the adoption of the Constitution by the several States has been narrated; nor is it necessary here to repeat the well-known account of how, in State after State, a majority of the delegates was at last secured in favor of the new system of government. This epoch of agitation, of controversy, and the final adoption, is the third great crisis to which we have made reference as belonging to our Revolutionary history.

After the Constitution had been adopted by nine or ten of the States, came the striking event of the institution of the New Government. The paper model of that government existed in the Constitution itself. How Washington was unanimously chosen as first Chief Magistrate of the New Republic, is known to all the world. A Congress was constituted by the election of a House of Representatives and a Senate, in accordance with the provisions of the new instrument. All things were made ready, as an architect might prepare materials for a structure. Then came the actual building of the temple. The scene was in Old New York—the New York of a hundred years ago.²

¹ See Vol. III, pp. 619-620.

² New York City, at the time of which we speak, was limited to the lower end of Manhattan Island. It was no more than a speck in comparison with the Centennial Metropolis of the Nation. Its northern limits were marked by the present building of the New York Times. Immediately north of this lay a lake, called the Collect Pond, about sixty feet in depth, covering that part of the city now occupied by the Tombs. It is said that the capitalists, even the adventurers, of that day, were without faith as to the future extension of the city northward. The population was approximately forty thousand. Water was distributed to the citizens in hydrants, and drawn from what was known as the Old Tin-water Pump, standing at the head of Pearl Street. No system of public street cleaning had been adopted. The streets were lighted with oil lamps. Much of the work was done by slaves, and slave auctions were at that time still a common occurrence.

It is an interesting historical by-study to note with care the varying sentiments with which the people of the United States contemplated the centennial return of the different crises above delineated. The masses were warm in their affections towards the *destructive* revolution accomplished by the Declaration of Independence and the war which followed. They took more interest in the fact of independence and the means by which it was accomplished than in any other part of the Revolutionary drama. With what zeal and success the centennial anniversary of the Declaration was observed in 1876, in the city of Philadelphia, has already been fully narrated.¹ The second centennial, that is, the centennial of the Formation of the Constitution, did not awaken in the United States any considerable degree of enthusiasm. The people took little interest in that part of our national history covering the development of our new institutional structure.

In 1887 there was in the city of Philadelphia an effort to commemorate the anniversary of the Constitution, and some local interest was excited in the event. But there was no wide-spread zeal, no throbbing of the popular heart over the coming of that anniversary. The same may be said with respect to observing the intermediate stages of the adoption of the Constitution by the States. No celebrations of more than local importance were held in any State in commemoration of this event. At the first, it was even doubted whether the centennial of the Institution of the Government itself could awaken sufficient public enthusiasm to warrant a national celebration.


Events, such as the formation of our Constitution, its adoption by the people of the States, and the setting up of the new form of government instead of the old, are not sufficiently spectacular and heroic to set the masses aglow, and to produce the requisite heat of a great national celebration. In New York City, however, the event of 1789 could not by any means be allowed to pass without an effort to impress upon the minds of the present generation the great movements of a century gone by. The New York Historical Society took the matter up, and as early as

March of 1884 a resolution was adopted to undertake the enterprise of a centennial celebration, commemorative of the founding of the Government, and particularly of the inauguration of Washington as first President. Soon afterwards a public meeting was held at the Fifth Avenue Hotel, and formal steps were taken for the prosecution of the work. It was not, however, until the close of 1887 that the enterprise was espoused by the municipality. At that time a committee of forty-nine citizens, with Mayor Abram S. Hewitt as chairman, was appointed for the general supervision of the project; and many capitalists, military men, merchants, and others, gave their influence and their means for the promotion of the cause.

At an early date it was determined that the celebration should conform as nearly as practicable to the ceremonies attending the actual inauguration of Washington. About this central idea all the other features of the event were clustered. The celebration was totally different in character from the great industrial and art expositions which have constituted the larger part of national centennial displays and festivities. The jubilees of France, the great World's Fairs of England, and our own Centennial Exposition at Philadelphia, in 1876, were of this kind. But in the case of the commemoration of the American Government, at New York, the feature of exposition was wholly omitted. Everything was designed to point backward to the events of a century ago, and to evoke, through the shadows of several generations, a vivid recollection of the manners and condition of the American people when the Republic of 1789 was instituted.

During the whole of 1888, and the first months of the centennial year, the preliminaries of the celebration were prosecuted with zeal. Meanwhile, the Presidential election had been held, in which the temporary ascendancy of the Democratic party was replaced by Republican success. Benjamin Harrison, of Indiana, was chosen President. Ex-President Cleveland retired at the close of his Administration to New York City, and became a resident of that metropolis. Happily enough, the incoming Chief Magistrate was intimately associated, in his family relations, with the great

¹ See pp. 188-190.



VIEWS IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

- 1, 1. Street view; 2, the Wash Monument, Madison Square; 3, Porch of the Church of Heavenly Rest; 4, The Masonic Temple; 5, statue in Madison Square; 6, National Academy of Design.

events of the Revolution. His great-grandfather, also named Benjamin Harrison, had presided in the Colonial Congress when the Declaration of Independence was adopted, Mr. Hancock being absent from the chair on that ever-memorable day. The son of that distinguished statesman had become ninth President of the United States, and now the great-grandson was chosen by the election of the American people to the same high office and dignity.

It was decided by the committee to devote two days, namely, the 30th of April and the 1st of May, to the celebration. For a fortnight before these days, the great trains on the railways centering in the metropolis began to pour out an unusual cargo of human life. The throngs were gathered from all parts of the Republic, but principally from the Old Thirteen States. For three days before the opening of the celebration, the Atlantic coast was visited with great rain-storms, which threatened to mar all that had been attempted; but the skies cleared, the air became fresh, and the sunshine bright. The rise of the centennial morning was as auspicious as though it were the dawning of the first day.

We may here speak of the general appearance of the city. Every pains had been taken to put the metropolis into gala dress and to present to the eye the most inspiring spectacle. Never was a city more completely clad in gay apparel. Every street on both sides, as far as the eye could reach, was ornamented with flags and streamers, mottoes, and emblems of jubilee. In this respect Broadway and Fifth Avenue were the most elaborately and beautifully adorned. It is doubtful whether in the history of mankind a finer display has been made in the streets of any city. The decorations extended to every variety of public and private edifices. Scarcely a house on Manhattan Island but had its share in the display. Indeed, if one had been lifted in a balloon above old Castle Garden, sweeping northward with his glass, he would have seen flags on flags from the Battery to Spuyten Duyvil. Along both sides of the North River and East River, and in the islands of the bay, the universal emblems were flung to the breeze. And the purest of sunshine glorified the scene with a blaze of morning light.

Arrangements had been made for President Harrison, Vice-President Morton, the members of the Cabinet, and other prominent men connected with the Government, to go to the city from Washington. A magnificent train was prepared for the accommodation of the company, and in the early morning of the 29th of April, the distinguished party arrived at Elizabeth, New Jersey, and were presently conducted across the harbor in a gaily decked steamer to the landing on the New York side. The bay was covered with vessels, the ships of foreign nations vying with those of the United States in flinging their flags and streamers to the breeze.

The part assigned to President Harrison in the commemorative exercises was the part of Washington. On the arrival of the Chief Magistrate, he was tendered public receptions at several places in the city; and in the evening he attended a great ball in the Metropolitan Opera-house, which had been prepared in imitation of the Washingtonian ball, given on the occasion of the first inauguration, at which the Father of his Country led the first cotillon.

On the morning of the 30th of April the people of New York, and the hundreds of thousands of strangers gathered there, poured into the streets to witness the great military parade, which was the feature of the day. Meanwhile, in the lower part of the city, the exercises which had been planned in imitation and commemoration of Washington's accession to the Presidency were under way. Wall Street and Broad Street were packed with people. A great platform had been erected in front of the Treasury Building, now occupying the site of old Federal Hall, and marked by the presence of Ward's colossal statue of Washington. It was here that the oratorical and literary exercises took place. These consisted of a Centennial Oration by Hon. Chauncey M. Depew; also of an address by President Harrison, of a poem written by John Greenleaf Whittier, and of such religious services as were appropriate to the occasion.

The accessories were all in keeping with the occasion. President Harrison sat in a chair which had been Washington's. The table also was Washington's, and the Bible

which was laid thereon was that on which the Father of his Country had taken the solemn oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. The Whittier poem was read by Mr. C. W. Bowen, secretary of the Citizens' Committee. The oration of Mr. Depew was of a high order, eulogistic of the present—the voice of a patriot who believes in the past and trusts the future. The address by the President was also able and patriotic. The exercises were closed with a benediction

bearing the President, the Vice-President, the members of the Cabinet, and other distinguished representatives of the Government, swept up to the head of the column, and led the way to the great reviewing stand, which had been prepared on the west side of Madison Square, looking down into Fifth Avenue. Here the President and his companions took their places to review the column as it passed, and for six hours the Chief Magistrate stood up to recognize, in his official capacity, the passing squad-

rons of the greatest parade ever known in a time of peace west of the Atlantic.

It were difficult to describe the great procession. It was admirably managed—wholly military. The different divisions were arranged in files from eighteen to twenty-two men abreast. In many places the marching was in close rank, so that the knees of those in the rear rank fitted almost geometrically into those of the men in front. The passage was at the rate of more than nine thousand per hour. The best estimates place the number in line at over fifty-two thousand. Major-Gen-



OLD FEDERAL HALL.

eral John M. Schofield, of the archdiocese of New York.


In the meantime, the military parade—greatest of all such displays in the United States, with the single exception of the review of the soldiers at Washington at the close of the Civil War—was in preparation for the march. The principal streets in the lower part of the city had been assigned for the formation of the various divisions of the parade. A number of magnificent carriages

were drawn up in line from Wall Street into Broadway; up Broadway to Waverly Place; through Waverly Place into Fifth Avenue; along that magnificent thoroughfare to Fourteenth Street; thence around Union Square to Fifth Avenue; and thence northward to Central Park.

Through all this distance, and on both sides of the street, was a solid wall of human beings, rising to the rear by every kind of con-

trivance which ingenuity could invent, so as to gain a view of the procession. The mass on the sidewalks was from twenty to fifty persons deep. In every advantageous position scaffolding, with ascending seats, had been erected for the accommodation of the multitudes, and not a seat was left unoccupied. At the street-crossings every variety of vehicle had been drawn up, and the privilege of standing on boxes, or sitting in carts, wagons, or hacks, was sold at high figures to the eager people who pressed into the crowd. Windows, and every other available point of view—house-tops, balconies, stoops, verandas—were crowded to their utmost capacity. In favorite localities, fabulous prices were charged for the privilege of looking from a window upon the passing cavalcade. The latter was, as we have said, preceded by the Presidential company. General Schofield, senior Major-General of the

thousand regulars—infantry and cavalry—drawn from the army; then came the cadets from West Point, whose marching, and uniform,



SUB-TREASURY BUILDING, WALL STREET

American army, as chief marshal, rode at the head of the column. After him, and leading the van of the procession proper, were over two and bearing) were of such excellence as to excite a chorus of cheers from end to end of the long march. Next followed the artillery and

batteries of the regular army. Many of the guns, and much of the armor, was resplendent for its brilliancy. After these came the marines and naval cadets, a vast column of apprentices, whose march, by its peculiar rolling movement, denoted that the column had been recently gathered from the decks of ships.

Thus closed the first division of the procession—that is, those who were taken from the Army and Navy of the United States. Then followed the militiamen—the National Guards of the different States. At the head was a column of three hundred and seventy men from Delaware; for Delaware had been *first* of the Old Thirteen States to adopt the Constitution, and was thus given a place of honor on the Centennial Anniversary. The Governor of each State represented in the parade rode at the head of the division from his own Commonwealth. Most of the Governors were in civil attire. General Beaver, of Pennsylvania; General Fitzhugh Lee, of Virginia; and General John B. Gordon, of Georgia, were conspicuous at the head of their divisions. It was noticed that those who were present from the Southern States were received with unstinted applause. Governor Beaver rode at the head of the Pennsylvania troops, numbering fully eight thousand men. Then came Governor Green, with the soldiers of New Jersey, three thousand seven hundred strong; then Georgia, with General Gordon and his staff. The Foot Guards, from Connecticut, preceded by the Governor, numbered six hundred. Governor Ames, of Massachusetts, headed the column of one thousand five hundred from the Old Bay State—a noble division, containing the Ancient and Honorable Artillery of Boston, all uniformed after the most antique pattern. The men of Maryland were five hundred strong. Then came New Hampshire; then Vermont, with a division of seven hundred. Governor Richardson, of North Carolina, followed with a body of five hundred men. This division was fortunate in bearing an old flag belonging to North Carolina in the pre-Revolutionary epoch. After this came the great division of New York. Twelve thousand men, arranged in four brigades of eighteen regiments, one battalion, and five batteries, were the contribution of the Empire State to the great display. At the

head of the line rode Governor David B. Hill. In this column the Seventh Regiment, made up of prominent men of New York City, and numbering over one thousand, was, perhaps, the most conspicuous single body in the whole procession. The Twenty-second Regiment vied with its rival; and it might be difficult to decide whether the palm for marching and other evidences of elegant training should be awarded to the West Point Cadets, the Seventh Regiment of New York, the Twenty-second Regiment of the same State, the squadron from the Michigan Military Academy, or the Twenty-third Regiment, of Brooklyn.

Behind this magnificent display of the military came the veterans of the Civil War, the men of the Grand Army of the Republic, headed by their Commander-in-Chief, General William Warner. These were arranged column after column to an aggregate of twelve thousand, according to the locality from which they were gathered, the rear being closed with a magnificent body of old soldiers, numbering nearly four thousand, from Brooklyn and Kings County, New York. It was already nightfall when this extreme left of the column passed the reviewing stand, and the parade for the day was at an end.

The evening of the 30th was occupied with one of the most elaborate and sumptuous banquets ever spread in the United States. For this purpose the Metropolitan Opera-house, in Broadway, had been procured and decorated. It was claimed by those experienced in such matters that the floral ornamentation of the hall was far superior in costliness and beauty to anything of like kind ever before displayed in the country. The boxes of the theater were adorned with the National colors and with the shields and coats-of-arms of the various States of the Union. Over the proscenium arch was a portrait of Washington, arranged in a cluster of evergreens and flowers. The auditorium was brilliantly illuminated, and the scene of splendor on every hand might well dazzle the eye and surprise the imagination of the beholder. The banqueters, embracing many of the chief men of the Nation, were seated at a series of tables, the first and principal one being occupied by the President of the United States, the Governor of New York, the Vice-President, the Lieuten-

ant-Governor, Chief-Justice Fuller, Judge Andrews, General Schofield, Admiral Porter, Senator Evarts, Senator Hiscock, Ex-President Hayes, Ex-President Cleveland, Bishop Potter, Speaker Cole of the New York Assembly, Secretary Proctor, Hon. S. S. Cox, General William T. Sherman, Clarence W. Bowen, and Elbridge T. Gerry, the last two representing the Citizens' Committee. At this table Mayor Grant presided, and read the toasts of the evening.

The feast began at nine o'clock in the evening. At the close, a series of brief addresses were delivered by the Governor of New York, Ex-President Cleveland, Ex-President Hayes, General Sherman, Senator Evarts, President Eliot of Harvard, James Russell Lowell, Senator Daniel, and others. The closing address was by the President of the United States. Nearly all the speeches were faultless in their subject-matter, eloquent in delivery, and worthy to be regarded as classics of the occasion.

The programme prepared by the Citizens' Committee embraced a general holiday of three days' duration, during which business was suspended throughout the city. On the 29th and 30th of April and on the 1st day of May the restriction was faithfully regarded. One might traverse Broadway and find but few business establishments open to the public. This was true particularly of the two principal days of the festival.

It now remains to notice the great civic parade of the 1st of May, with which the commemorative exercises were concluded. The design was that this should represent the industries, the progress, and in general the civic life of the Metropolis of the Nation and of the country at large, as distinguished from the military display of the preceding day. It was found from the experience of the 30th that the line of march was too lengthy, and the second day's course was made somewhat shorter. It is not intended in this connection to enter into any elaborate account of the civic procession of the third day. It was second only in importance to the great military parade which had preceded it. The procession was composed, in large part, of those various civic orders and brotherhoods with which modern society so much abounds. In these

the foreign nationalities, which have obtained so large a footing in New York City, were largely prevalent. The German societies were out in full force. Companies representing almost every nation of the Old World were in the line, carrying gay banners, keeping step to the music of magnificent bands, and proudly lifting their mottoes and emblems in the May-day morning.

The second general feature of this procession was the historical part. The primitive life of Manhattan Island, the adventures of the early explorers and discoverers along the American coast, the striking incidents in the early annals of the Old Thirteen States, were allegorized, and mounted in visible form on chariots, and drawn through the streets. All the old heroes of American History, from Columbus to Peter Stuyvesant, were seen again in mortal form, received obeisance, and heard the shouts of the multitudes. From ten o'clock in the forenoon till half-past three in the afternoon the procession was under way, the principal line of march being down Fifth Avenue and through the principal squares of the city. With the coming of evening the pyrotechnic display of the preceding night was renewed in many parts of the metropolis, though it could hardly be said that the fire-works were equal in brilliancy, beauty, and impressiveness to the magnificent day pageants of the streets.

One of the striking features of the celebration was the ease and rapidity with which the vast multitudes were breathed into and breathed out of the city. In the principal hotels fully one hundred and fifty thousand strangers were registered as guests. More than twice this number were distributed in the smaller lodging-houses and private dwellings of New York and Brooklyn. Yet the careful observer abroad in the streets saw neither the coming nor the going. With the appearance of the days of the celebration the throngs were present; on the following days they were gone. The great railways centering in the metropolis had done their work noiselessly, speedily, effectively. It may well be recorded as one of the marvels of modern times that only two persons are said to have lost their lives in this tremendous assemblage, extending through several days, and that at least one of these died suddenly

from heart disease, while the manner of the death of the other was unknown. Such is the triumph which the mastery of the human mind over the forces of the material world has easily achieved in our age, under the guidance of that beneficent science by which the world is at once enlightened and protected from danger.

The close of the year 1888 and the beginning of 1889 were marked by a peculiar episode in the history of the country. An unexpected and even dangerous complication arose between the United States and Germany relative to the Samoan Islands. This comparatively unimportant group of the South Pacific lies in a south-westerly direction, at a distance of about five thousand miles from San Francisco, and nearly two thousand miles eastward from Australia. The long-standing policy of the Government, established under the Administration of Washington and ever since maintained, to have no entanglements with foreign nations, seemed in this instance to be strangely at variance with the facts.

During 1888 the civil affairs of the Samoan Islands were thrown into extreme confusion by what was really the progressive disposition of the people, but what appeared in the garb of an insurrection against the established authorities. The Government of the islands is a monarchy. The country is ruled by native princes, and is independent of foreign powers. The capital, Apia, lies on a bay of the same name on the northern coast of the principal island. It was here that the insurrection gained greatest headway.

The revolutionary movement was headed by an audacious chieftain called Tamasese. The king of the island was Malietoa, and his chief supporter, Mataafa. At the time, the German Empire was represented in Samoa by its Consul-General, Herr Weber, and the United States was represented by Hon. Harold M. Sewall. A German armed force virtually deposed Malietoa, and set up Tamasese on the throne. On the other hand, the representative of the United States, following the policy of his Government, stood by the established authority, supporting the native sovereign and Mataafa. The American and German authorities in the island were thus brought into conflict, and serious difficulties occurred between the ships of the two nations in the harbor.

When the news of this state of affairs reached Germany, in April, 1889, several additional men-of-war were sent out to the island to uphold the German cause. Mataafa and the Germans were thus brought to war. Meanwhile the American Government took up the cause of its Consul, and of King Malietoa, as against the insurrection. A section of the American navy was despatched to the distant island, and the ships of war of two of the greatest nations of Christendom were thus set face to face in a harbor of the South Pacific Ocean.

In this condition of affairs, on the 22d of March, 1889, one of the most violent hurricanes ever known in the islands blew up from the north, and the American and German war-vessels were driven upon the great reef which constitutes the only breakwater outside of the harbor of Apia. Here they were wrecked. The American war-ships *Nipsic*, *Trenton*, and *Fauldus* were dashed into ruins. The German vessels, *Aller*, *Olga*, and *Eber*, were also lost. The English vessel, *Calliope*, which was caught in the storm, was the only war-ship which escaped, by steaming out to sea. Serious loss of life accompanied the disaster: four American officers and forty-six men, nine German officers and eighty-seven men, sank to rise no more.

Meanwhile, England had become interested in the dispute, and had taken a stand with the United States as against the decision of Germany. The matter became of so great importance that President Harrison, who had, in the meantime, acceded to office as Chief Magistrate, appointed, with the advice of the Senate, an Embassy Extraordinary, to go to Berlin and meet Prince Bismarck in a conference, with a view to a peaceful solution of the difficulty. The Ambassadors appointed for this purpose were J. A. Kasson, of Iowa; William W. Phelps, of New Jersey; and G. H. Bates, of Delaware. The Commissioners set out on the 13th of April, and, on their arrival at the capital of the German Empire, opened negotiations with the Chancellor Bismarck and his son. The attitude and demand of the American Government was that the independence of Samoa, under its native sovereign, should be acknowledged, and guaranteed, by the great nations concerned in the controversy. The conference closed in May, 1889, with the res-

toration of King Malietoa, and the recognition of his sovereignty over the island.

The closing week of May, 1889, was made forever memorable in the history of the United States by the destruction of Johnstown, Pennsylvania. The calamity was caused by the bursting of a reservoir and the pouring out of a deluge in the valley below. A large artificial lake had been constructed in the ravine of the South Fork River, a tributary of the Conemaugh. It was a fishing lake, the property of a company of wealthy sportsmen, and was about five miles in length, varying in depth from fifty to one hundred feet. The country below the lake was thickly peopled. The city of Johnstown lay at the junction of the South Fork with the Conemaugh. In the last days of May unusually heavy rains fell in all that region, swelling every stream to a torrent. The South Fork Lake became full to overflowing. The dam had been imperfectly constructed. On the afternoon of May 31st the dam of the reservoir burst wide open in the center, and a solid wall of water from twenty to fifty feet in height rushed down the valley with terrific violence.

The destruction which ensued was as great as the modern world has witnessed. In the path of the deluge every thing was swept away. Johnstown was totally wrecked, and was thrown in an indescribable heap of horror against the aqueduct of the Pennsylvania railway, below the town. Here the ruins caught fire, and the shrieks of hundreds of victims were drowned in the holocaust. About three thousand people perished in the flood or were burned to death in the ruins. The heart of the Nation responded quickly to the sufferings of the survivors, and millions of dollars in money and supplies were poured out to relieve the despair of those who survived the calamity.

The year 1889 witnessed the assembling at Washington City of an International Congress. The body was composed of delegates from the Central and South American States, from Mexico, and the United States of America. Popularly the assembly was known as the "Pan-American Congress." The event was the culmination of a policy adopted by the United States some years previously. General Grant, during his Presidency, and in the subsequent period of his life, had endeavored to

promote more intimate relations with the Spanish-American peoples. James G. Blaine, Secretary of State under Garfield, entertained a similar ambition. That statesman was accused of a purpose to create in the United States a policy similar to Disraeli's high-jingoism in Great Britain. The United States were to become the arbiter of the Western nations. To this end the Central American and South American States must be brought, first into intimacy with our Republic, and afterwards be made to follow her lead in warding off all Europeanism.

The death of Garfield prevented the institution of some such policy as that here vaguely defined. Nevertheless, in 1884, an Act was passed by Congress, authorizing the President to appoint a commission "to ascertain and report upon the best modes of securing more intimate international commercial relations between the United States and the several countries of Central and South America." Commissioners were sent out to the countries referred to, and the movement for the Congress was started. Not until May of 1888, however, was the Act passed providing for the Congress. The Spanish American nations responded to the overtures, and took the necessary steps to meet the United States in the conference. The objects contemplated were, first, to promote measures pertaining to the peace and prosperity of the peoples concerned; to establish customs-unions among them; to improve the means of communication between the ports of the States represented, and to advance the commercial interests and political harmony of the nations of the New World.

The Spanish-American and Portuguese-American States, to the number of nine, appointed their delegates, and the latter arrived in the United States in the autumn of 1889. President Harrison on his part named ten members of the Congress as follows: John F. Hanson, of Georgia; Morris M. E-tee, of California; Henry G. Davis, of West Virginia; Andrew Carnegie, of Pennsylvania; T. Jefferson Coolidge, of Massachusetts; Clement Studebaker, of Indiana; Charles R. Flint, of New York; William H. Frost, of South Carolina; Cornelius N. Bliss, of New York; and John B. Henderson, of Missouri. Mexico sent two representatives, namely: Matias

Romero and Enrique A. Mexía. Brazil, still an Empire, also sent two delegates: J. G. do Amaral Valente and Salvador de Mendonça. The representative of Honduras was Jeronimo Zelaya Fernando Cruz, the delegate of Guatemala, and Jacinto Castellanos of San Salvador. Costa Rica sent as her representative Manuel Aragon. Horatio Guzman, Minister of Nicaragua, represented his Government in the Congress. The Argentine Republic had two delegates: Roque Saenz Peña and Manuel Quintana. Chili sent two delegates: Emilio C. Varas and José Alfonso. The representatives of the United States of Colombia were Jose M. Hurtado, Carlos Martínez Silva, and Climaco Calderón. The delegates of Venezuela were Nicanor Bolet Peraza, José Andrade, and Francisco Antonio Silva; that of Peru was F. C. C. Zegarra; that of Ecuador, José Maria Placido Caamaño; that of Uruguay, Alberto Nin; that of Bolivia, Juan F. Velarde; that of Hayti, Arthur Laforestrie; and that of Paraguay, Jose S. Decoud.

The representatives met in Washington City in October. Committees were formed to report to the body suitable action on the subjects which might properly come before it for discussion. From the first the proceedings took a peculiarly practical direction. The great questions of commerce were at the bottom of the reports, the debates, and the actions which followed. Nor can it be doubted that the movement, as a whole, conducted in the highest degree to the friendship, prosperity, and mutual interests of the nations concerned.

At the same time, an International Maritime Conference, for which provisions had been made in the legislation of several nations, convened at Washington. In this case

the States of Europe were concerned in common with those of the New World. All the maritime nations were invited by the act of Congress to send representatives to the National Capital in the following year, to consider the possibility of establishing uniform rules and regulations for the government of vessels at sea, and for the adoption of a common system of marine signals. Twenty-six nations accepted the call of the American Government, and appointed delegates to the Congress. They, too, as well as the representatives of the Pan-American Conference, held their sittings in November and December of 1889. The same practical ability and good sense, as related to the subjects under consideration, were shown by the members of the Maritime Conference as by those of the sister body, and the results reached were equally encouraging and equally gratifying, not only to the Government of the United States, but to all the countries whose interests were involved in the discussions.

The history of the United States has been traced in the present Book from the Treaties of Ghent and Vienna, in 1815, to the dawn of yesterday. The Republic has passed through stormy times, but has at last entered her second century of Nationality in safety and peace. The clouds that were recently so black above her have sunk behind the horizon. The equality of all men before the law has been written with the iron pen of war in the Constitution of the Nation. The Union of the States has been consecrated anew by the blood of patriots and the tears of the lowly. The temple of freedom, reared by the Fathers, still stands in undiminished glory. **THE PAST HAS TAUGHT ITS LESSON, THE PRESENT HAS ITS DUTY, AND THE FUTURE ITS HOPE.**



MAP XXIII.

ENGLAND & WALES

English Miles




Towns of over 100,000 thus **LONDON &c.**
from 50,000 to 100,000 unshaded
from 10,000 to 50,000
below 10,000

Canals

Railways shown thus

Canals



N O R T H

S E A

I R I S H


S E A

DUBLIN

to Liverpool via Mersey

to Belfast via Mersey

to Glasgow



Map of the Bristol Channel

Longitude West 3 of Greenwich

Longitude East 1

0

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

115

116

117

118

119

120

121

122

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157

158

159

160

161

162

163

164

165

166

167

168

169

170

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

193

194

195

196

197

198

199

200

201

202

203

204

205

206

207

208

209

210

211

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

244

245

246

247

248

249

250

251

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259

260

261

262

263

264

265

266

267

268

269

270

271

272

273

274

275

276

277

278

279

280

281

282

283

284

2



Book Twenty-Second.

GREAT BRITAIN.

CHAPTER CXXVII.—LAST TWO HANOVERIANS.



THE smoke of the Battle of Waterloo rolled back to the borders of Belgium, and then to the confines of Europe. A field of desolation was revealed without a parallel in modern history. The wrecks lay heaped on every coast. It was at once apparent that a bloody transformation had been effected among the Western nations. Nor might the prescience of statesman or philosopher discover in the existing condition the true results of the Revolutionary conflict.

One of the first facts discoverable in the then condition of Western Europe was that GREAT BRITAIN had been least of all shaken from her political moorings. It was discerned, as the roar of battle receded to the horizon, that England had, even through the epoch of turmoil and violence, held on her tedious and labored course, like a heavy ship, toiling with the breakers, battered with the storms, but, nevertheless, essentially sound in her structure. It could but be acknowledged, moreover, that Great Britain only had emerged from the conflict of twenty years' duration with military

honor and civil precedence. It was by the indomitable courage of the English soldiers, as much as by the half-accidental coming of Blücher, that the Imperial eagle of France had been struck to the dust on the plateau of Mont St. Jean. Through his whole career, the Corsican had found no other foe which he so much dreaded as England. With that all-prevailing discernment wherewith he surveyed the field of Europe and made it the chess-board for his mighty game, he recognized that the player who sat in the fogs of the British Islands was his real antagonist. He well knew that the free institutions of England, as well as the native vigor of the English race, had conspired to develop in the Saxon Isles a civil and military power of which even his Imperial France might well stand in awe. During the whole period of the Republic, the Consulate, and the Empire, the Government of Great Britain maintained an attitude of sullen and unyielding hostility, first to the republican tendencies of the French Nation, but more particularly to Napoleon himself. On many occasions the conduct of England towards France was of a kind not to be justified in honorable diplomacy. Sometimes, indeed,

the English ministry crossed the border-line of perfidy in its proceedings with Bonaparte. But in such instances the English people, considering the character and principles of the foe with whom they had to deal, found little difficulty in framing a justification for the course pursued by their rulers.

In other respects the policy of Great Britain was more honorable, more commendable. As a rule, she stood stoutly to her time-honored principle of non-interference in the affairs of other States. Nor did she, after Waterloo, notwithstanding her anger and heat of blood, at any time assent to the project of the dismemberment and partition of France. And what is of much more importance, she declined, though strongly urged to such a course, to become a party to that unholy Holy Alliance, whereby her chief partners in the last great struggle with Napoleon now proposed to direct the destinies of Europe. It may be profitable to the reader in this connection to elucidate in brief the genesis and character of the so-called Holy Alliance.

Madame the Baroness Krüdener was a Russian princess, born in Riga, an adventuress in her palmy days, and a mystic when her palmy days were over. From the age of thirteen she traveled through the principal cities of Europe. Her wealth was great, her accomplishments many. At length princes and kings became her playfellows, and, in some sense, her toys. After 1803 she resided mostly in Paris. Afterwards she returned to Riga, and devoted herself to religious mysticism. Again at Paris, in 1814, we find her in her salon, receiving the visits of monarchs. She became a prophetess—the Cassandra of the modern Bium. She foretold the vicissitudes of the last year of the Napoleonic *tyrannie*. Alexander of Russia met her at Heilbrunn a month before Waterloo, and became infatuated with her and her doctrines. Henceforth, for several years, she moved the Czar according to the impulse of her reverie and purpose. Strange that this woman should have contributed so novel a chapter to the history of modern Europe as that recorded in the pages of the Holy Alliance!

It was on the 26th of September, 1815, that the league so-called was made. The parties to the compact were Alexander I., of


Russia; Emperor Francis, of Austria; and Frederick William III., of Prussia. To the Alliance, however, nearly all the other Powers, except Rome, England, and France, soon acceded. It is said that the terms of the compact were arranged for the most part by Alexander, acting under the immediate inspiration of Madame Krüdener. The Czar was then in Paris, and was in almost constant companionship with the prophetess. The Alliance aspired to be no less than a new basis for the political order and conduct, not only of Europe, but of the world. The compact assumed to be the application, and we might say the codification and real presence, of the principles of Christianity considered as a means and method of political action. Henceforth, civil government was to be a distinctly religious affair, Christian in all its sanction and proceedings. The States of Europe were to conduct their affairs on the basis of Christian amity and fellowship; and we, the hereditary princes of Christendom, are to be the patriarchs and fathers of the people. It might be difficult to know to what extent the royal figure-heads who completed and signed the Alliance were self-deceived in respect to the nature and inevitable tendencies of their agreement. But the whole philosophical meaning and purport of the compact might well be summed up in the one dreadful word—*despotism*.

The three monarchs signed the Alliance in September of 1815. But the contents of the agreement were not known to Europe until the 2d of February, 1816, when the paper was published in full in the Frankfort *Journal*. One of the special features of the instrument was that by which all members of the Bonaparte family were to be forever excluded, not only from the throne of France, but from all the sovereignties of Europe. The monarchs were very sincere in their project, as we shall hereafter see, in their conduct towards the republican and revolutionary movements of 1820-24. The Republicans of Naples and Piedmont, of Spain, and of France herself, shall feel, in full force, the results of the scheme contrived by Krüdener and Alexander. Not until the latter has been called to his account—not until fifteen years have passed away and a new revolution in France shall have driven the Elder Branch of the House of Bourbon into

perpetual exile—shall the effects of the Holy Alliance sink into the earth and disappear.

To the everlasting credit of Great Britain be it said, that she had no part or lot in the compact. She stood out against all blandishments. No inducements could be offered, no motive suggested, to seduce her from her immemorial policy of non-interference in the affairs of foreign States. George Canning, at that time British Minister of Foreign Affairs, sought with all his might and influence to counteract the effects of the hypocritical compact by which it was sought to combine the

mental theories which he inherited and assiduously cultivated to the close of his reign. Owing to his recurring paroxysms of insanity, that reign may be said to have ended with the establishment of the Regency in 1811. George Augustus Frederick, Prince of Wales, became Regent in consequence of his father's malady, and by the act of Parliament. It is a noticeable fact in the history of England that the Heir-Apparent to the throne nearly always, during his minority, and up to the time of his accession, adopts the political principles and espouses the cause of the Opposition. The



WINDSOR CASTLE

powers of Europe in a universal family despotism.

No adequate idea can be acquired of the political and civil history of Great Britain in the period immediately succeeding the Napoleonic wars without taking into consideration the character of the reigning dynasty. The first two princes of the line of Hanover Brunswick had been foreigners—Germans, speaking the German tongue, understanding but little of the genius and tendency of English institutions. With the accession of George III., however, a new era opened up, a new policy on the part of the young and popular sovereign. It is not the place in which to review the reign of George III., to note the govern-

leaders of the party, so-called, have always adopted the policy of seducing the Prince, if possible, from the political principles of the reigning king. This was true especially of the Prince Regent, who, in his younger years, fell under the dominion of the Whigs. He sought the society of his father's opponents in Parliament, and was initiated by Fox and Sheridan, not only into the principles and practices of the Whig sanctum, but also into the social excesses and vices of which those leaders were the easy chiefs.

It was under this Regency that the international crisis of 1815 was reached and broken on the plain of Waterloo. However great the glory that came to England by that event, it

could hardly be said that the military splendors of the time focused near the throne. The madness of the nominal king was heightened

Castle. We may here pause for a moment to notice the character and disposition of his successor, George IV.



by his blindness, and on the 29th of January, 1820, he passed away, being then in the eighty-second year of his age, and the sixtieth of his reign. His body was laid away with funeral pomp in the royal vaults at Windsor

George Augustus Frederick, Prince of Wales, who now acceded to the throne, with the title of George IV., was the first of the nine sons of George III. From his birth he had been noted for his comeliness of person. He had

an ease of carriage and a grace of manner which gained for him at an early age the sobriquet of "the Gentleman George;" but long before he reached his majority it was known, not only to England, but to all Europe, that the veneering of accomplishments which increased the Heir Apparent was only a transparent gloss through which all manner of vices and excesses played hide-and-gooseek within. The story of the Prince's life can not be repeated on the pages of respectable literature. He plunged at will into the whirl of all vicious excitement. He did not stop short of the grossest profligacy; and to this he added the habit of falsehood to an extent that made his name proverbial. Even his plighted faith could not be trusted. The political agitations in the midst of which he was nurtured, and which might have well provoked the highest powers of his mind, had to him no attractions. Schooled in everything that Fox and Sheridan had taught him in his youth, he flung himself at full length into the pool of vice, and rejoiced in it as though it were a sea-bath in summer. At last he fell in love with Mrs. Fitzherbert, who had been twice a widow at the age of twenty-five. Him she led on until she drew him into a private marriage, which became the *scandalum maximum* of the age. The nation was in a turmoil over the event. Fox, misled by the Prince as to the facts in the case, went openly to the House of Commons and denounced the story as a malicious falsehood. The Prince's salary was raised from fifty thousand pounds to sixty thousand, and Parliament gave him a hundred and sixty-one thousand pounds to discharge his debts; induced thereto by the falsehood which Fox had given to the House of Commons.

But the story of the Prince's personal life need not be pursued. On coming to the throne in 1820, it was expected that a Whig ministry would be at once called to the conduct of affairs. But the king dealt doubly with those who had been his friends, and sought, by means of a coalition, to make easy sailing through a sea of political apathy. He had already adopted the same policy during the Regency. He disliked George Canning, to whose energy of character much of the success of the British Government during the Revolutionary epoch must be attributed. Nor can it

be doubted that the king's unfriendliness and the indisposition of Canning to take part in the Parliamentary proceedings against Queen Caroline, induced the statesman's temporary withdrawal from the Ministry.

During the greater part of the reign of George IV. the Government was conducted under the ministerial leadership of Earl Liverpool. The latter had acceded to office after the assassination of Perceval, in 1812; and he remained at the head of the Cabinet until 1827, when his declining health compelled him to retire. It was, however, to the energy, we might say the unscrupulous vigor, of the Marquis of Londonderry, better known as Lord Castlereagh, that the success of the home management of Great Britain must be attributed at this epoch. The latter statesman had become leader of the House of Commons as early as 1812. He became the guiding spirit of the foreign policy of the Government during the last years of the Napoleonic era, and for fully a decade remained in the ascendant. He it was who represented the king at the second Treaty of Paris, and signed the compact of peace in 1815. He was, perhaps, the only one of the great political leaders of his time who remained in the favor of the Prince Regent, as he had been always in favor with George III. He was the personal adviser of the new king, and traveled abroad with him into Hanover, in October of 1821, meeting there, in international discussion, the Prince Metternich. This, however, was the end of his career. Castlereagh's intellect gave way under the pressure of overwork and a highly nervous organization, and on the 12th of August, 1822, he committed suicide with his penknife.

The general character of the history of England, in the period from 1815 to 1825, can not be understood without the survey of the whole of Europe. After the treaty of Vienna, Great Britain shared somewhat in the exhaustion, not to say the apathy, which supervened in all parts of the Continent. The passions—political, social, military, governmental—which had flamed and roared around the squares of Wellington, subsided into an almost absolute quiet in the five ensuing years. Despotie governments were, for the time, easily restored, and a flock of legitimate princes,

rushing back into the vacuum about the thrones of their ancestors, found, for a brief season, as comfortable seats as any kings had occupied since the Middle Ages.

But the halcyon epoch of Bourbonism was of short duration. No more than half a decade elapsed after the battle of Waterloo until the flames of revolution, caught from the great conflagration in France, began to shoot up in little jets in almost every country of Western Europe. This revival of the revolutionary spirit, however, did not seriously appear in England. Her insular position, and the spirit of her people and institutions, were alike unfavorable to the political insurrections which, at this epoch, broke out in nearly all the Latin States.

But Great Britain could by no means avoid constant connection with the affairs of the Continent. The first foreign entanglement of the British Government after the treaty of Vienna, sprang from the necessity under which the Government found itself to resist and resent the work of the Holy Alliance in the Spanish Peninsula. Of all the restored sovereigns, none settled back into his seat more comfortably than did Ferdinand VII., of Spain. The methods of government which were re-instituted belonged, in that country, to the sixteenth century rather than to the nineteenth. The opposition of the liberal party was unavailing to check the abuses and extravagance of the reign. Finally, in 1819, the Spanish king, in order to replenish his wasted exchequer, sold Florida to the United States. Presently a revolt broke out at Cadiz. The insurrection spread; the peasants of the provinces rose in arms, and, in 1822, the popular movement resulted in the election of the patriot Riego as President of the Cortes.

Such was the condition of affairs when the cause of Ferdinand was espoused by the Holy Alliance. France, Austria, Russia, and Prussia took the astounding course of formal armed intervention in the affairs of Spain. Nothing could be more cheering to the political optimist than to see Great Britain in this emergency turning squarely about, and in the very face of her recent allies protesting by the resolute mouth of Canning against the Spanish intervention. Though her protest was unavailing for the time, it nevertheless served the pur-

pose of a warning against such work in the future, and pointed with a menacing index to the downfall of the Alliance.

This complication of England relative to Spain had not been unraveled until the kingdom became profoundly interested in the affairs of Greece. Here again the leaning of the British Nation, not radical, but ever inclining to the side of political liberty, was strikingly manifested. It is not the place to recount the fortunes of the Greek Revolution which broke out in 1821, and again in 1824. It is sufficient to note that the attitude of Great Britain was consistent with her record. In no country did the society of the Philhellenes find so congenial a seat as in England. The Government confronted Turkey; and Mr. Canning, no less than Lord Byron and other British patriots, stood stoutly for the independence of the Greeks. While the monarchs of the Continent feared the rising of the Greeks as another eruption of that fearful democracy which had jostled so many from their thrones, Great Britain deliberately promoted the cause of Grecian liberty. This policy was persistently adhered to until the summer of 1827, when the situation of affairs in the East led to the appointment of ambassadors by Great Britain, France, and Russia, to consider the questions at issue. A conference was held in London in the beginning of July, and on the 6th of that month a compact was signed, in accordance with which the nations concerned would proceed to terminate the Turco-Grecian War. A joint expedition was fitted out, consisting of English, French, and Russian vessels, and sent into the Eastern Mediterranean.

The object in view was to compel the Sultan to grant an armistice pending the determination of the conditions of peace. The allied armament reached the Bay of Navarino on the 20th of October. The Sultan promptly and emphatically declined the mediation of the Powers, and the issue came at once to the arbitrament of battle. Meanwhile, Ibrahim Pasha received large reinforcements from Egypt, and was ordered to put down the Greek insurrection at every hazard.

The captains of the allied fleets, however, had received orders not to permit the further destruction of the Greek insurgents. The com-

manders of the squadron therefore bore down upon the Turkish Admiral, who had taken his position at the bottom of the Bay of Navarino, where a battle was opened by a discharge from the Turkish guns. The conflict became general and continued furiously for four hours, when the work was done. The squadron of the Ottomans was blown to fragments.

In that year he became Home Secretary of England, in which relation he was called upon, first of all, to administer coercive measures for the discontent of Ireland. In that country already, and in the House of Commons, a strong sentiment was developing for Catholic emancipation; and, for the time, Peel was constrained by his office, and perhaps by his con-



BATTLE OF NAVARINO.

scarcely anything remained but the *debris* of ships floating on the agitated sea. Thus by a single stroke the Greek crisis was ended, and the way prepared for a permanent settlement of affairs in the East.

We may here pause for a moment to speak of, at least, one of the great measures of Sir Robert Peel. That statesman entered the enfeebled ministry of Lord Liverpool in 1822.

to lead the opposition to this movement. On this question he was defeated in the House of Commons in 1825, and sought to retire from the Ministry; but his services could not well be spared. He soon found a work more in accord with his faculties and spirit, in reforming and humanizing the criminal code of Great Britain. The history of this reform constitutes of itself a chapter in

the evolution of English civilization—a chapter which would reach back for its material to the times of the Pagan ascendancy in the British Islands, and would draw to itself from the Middle Ages, and subsequently, a great part of English history. The reader of the present age is aware, in the light of a dim apprehension, that the bottom principles of English law, especially on its criminal side, were deduced from the customs of barbarism; but he can hardly be aware of the extent to which all the elements of that barbarism continued vital in the code of Great Britain down to the close of the first quarter of the nineteenth century.

The cruel savagery expressed in that code can hardly be described in language. It would require an artist's brush, and the blood-dripping canvases of a great gallery, to reveal the cruel scheme of the criminal law under which the English race groaned from age to age, and from which the inveterate conservatism of that people forbade them to be delivered. As late as a time within the memory of men yet living, the offenses still punishable by death under the statute law of England were innumerable. If, in the last years of the Napoleonic era, the death penalties due, under the jurisprudence of the kingdom, had been inflicted as the law demanded, the highways of the kingdom would have been well-nigh a continuous gibbet, and a large percentage of the people hangmen by profession. Out of the very necessity of things, the judges had been driven to the continuous use of respite, in order to avoid the death penalties which they were obliged to pronounce from day to day. At every assizes, large numbers of criminals, whose lives had been demanded by the law for petty offenses, many of which have now ceased to be criminal at all, were respited by the judges because of the sheer impracticability of continuous executions. And yet, under this shocking condition of affairs—such was the profound hypocrisy of the age—the law-making and law-administering powers of Great Britain stood stubbornly against every effort at reform, hugging the barbaric abuses which they had received from a pagan ancestry, as though those abuses were the very palladium of English liberty.

At the epoch of which we speak, the lives

of almost all criminals brought to the bar of justice lay at the mercy of the court. As late as 1807 the theft of a pocket-handkerchief from the person was still a capital offense. If a soldier or a mariner, so unfortunate as not to have a pass from the magistrate or the commanding officer, durst beg for bread enough to keep him alive until he might reach his post, his life was demanded by the law. Nor might any elaboration of details adequately represent the revolting cruelties of the system of jurisprudence which was still maintained and practiced to the close of the reign of George III.

It was in the first years of the present century that that great legal reformer, Sir Samuel Romilly, appeared in Parliament, and undertook the work of reforming the English criminal code. To him, perhaps more than to any other Englishman, must be ascribed the conception of the great task of reestablishing the criminal jurisprudence of Great Britain on a new basis of tolerable humanity. The reader will readily recall the fact that in France the reform of the criminal code had been gloriously accomplished in the last decade of the preceding century amidst the flame and roar of revolution. He must also remember that it was from Mirabeau, that titan of destruction and reform, that Sir Samuel Romilly derived the larger part of those humane principles of which he became the advocate and expounder in the House of Commons. What, therefore, must have been his chagrin when, after having managed to secure the repeal of the statute of 8 Elizabeth, chap. 4, whereby petty theft was made a capital offense, he was obliged year after year to see his bills for the abolition of other equally sanguinary statutes thrown out of the House of Lords, rejected with disdain by the statesmen and publicists of his time, and himself viewed as-kanee as the enemy of society!

The work of Sir Samuel Romilly was taken up and carried into the intellectual world by the distinguished scholar and jurist, Sir James Mackintosh. Him the versatile Macaulay has chosen to call "the father of English jurisprudence." Mackintosh, however, was a scholar and thinker rather than a parliamentarian; and however great and salutary his work may have been in reforming the *mind* of Great

Britain, his influence on the criminal code was but feeble and indirect. Such was the status of affairs when the ascendancy of Sir Robert Peel became an acknowledged fact in the British Parliament.

The temper and temperament of Sir Robert were well adapted to the work which he now received from the hands of Remilly and Mackintosh, and which he was destined to carry forward triumphantly. That work was completed, or at least begun, in five principal Acts which Peel introduced into Parliament, and which he defended on the 9th of March, 1826, in one of the most able and effective speeches of the century. The formulation of the new principles of jurisprudence was the work of Peel's hand and brain; but the principles of the reform he had received from his predecessors. His great strength and capacity as a legislator lay in his ability—his power almost unrivaled—of gathering the essentials of other men's creations, and of giving thereto the form and force of statute law.

We may not suppose that the reform of the English code, to which we have here given considerable space, was by any means complete and final under the work of the statesmen and publicists above referred to. It is indeed out of the question that anything should be complete and final in the legislation and jurisprudence of England. A race of people who out of the nature of their own feelings derive little—almost nothing—from abstract reason, and everything from experience and tentative movements in this direction and in that, must needs march in the rear of a people like the French, who are nothing if not rational. But at the same time, the English people, though their progress is slow and tortuous, march *securely*, and rarely lose by relapse and retrogression what they have once gained under the law of experience.

We here come to one of those ever-recurring ministerial crises in which the civil history of England so much abounds. The year 1827 marked the limit on Lord Liverpool's ascendancy. The Premier fell sick, and through his illness, rather than by inefficiency, his Ministry was broken up. In this emergency George Canning was sent for by the king, and placed at the head of the Government. But Sir

Robert Peel, the Duke of Wellington, and other leading Tories, refused to support the new Premier, and Canning was obliged to solicit the support of the Whigs. Peel had already become the rival of Canning, and to this, rather than to any divergence in the policy of the two statesmen, their separation must be attributed. Canning, however, did not long live to hold the dubious ascendancy which he had reached. In August, 1827, he died; and in the following January a new Ministry was constituted under the leadership of the Duke of Wellington.

Another death, occurring at nearly the same time with that of Canning, had an important influence on the course of the reigning dynasty. Frederick, Duke of York and Albany, second son of George III., and heir to the crown after the reigning king, died, and his title and right were transferred to the Duke of Clarence, who was destined soon to accede to the throne as William IV. It was one of those circumstances above the will and purpose of man, by which the European dynasties have been so frequently deflected into unforeseen channels, producing many times anomalous results and complications in the royal families.

The Duke of Wellington was induced to accept the office of Premier by the solicitations of the king. At the time of his accession to office, the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts was already pending in the House of Commons. The measure was violently opposed by the Tories; but Wellington, to the great disappointment of many of his political followers, advised the House of Lords not to offer further resistance to a measure which must ultimately prevail, and the act was accordingly carried. It was soon found, however, that even this concession could not secure the retention of the Liberal elements in the Cabinet. A quarrel broke out between the duke and Huskisson, and the Liberals withdrew from the Ministry. It was believed that the cause of Catholic emancipation would now be permanently checked; but the election of O'Connell, in 1828, proved conclusively, even to Wellington and Peel, that that cause must inevitably prevail. It was seen that further resistance to the removal of the cruel disabilities to which the Catholics had long been sub-

jected, would lead to turmoil and violence, if not to civil war, in the kingdom.

But, before beginning an account of the measures by which Catholic emancipation was finally effected, we may here turn briefly from the consideration of affairs in the home Government of Great Britain to speak of the foreign relations of the kingdom. To this dec-

ade, namely, the third of the century, belongs the history of the extension of British territory and domination in the East by the conquest of Burmah. It might have been foreseen that, in the nature of things, the establishment, and the extension, of the British power in India, and the well-known war-like and aggressive disposition of the Bur-

mese, would, sooner or later, bring the two nations into conflict. It was on the north-eastern frontier of Bengal that the opposing powers at length came together in hostility. The Burmese were, at that time, making war on Assam, and it was in resistance of this movement that the British, in East India, opposed a barrier of force.



GEORGE CANNING.

ade, namely, the third of the century, belongs the history of the extension of British territory and domination in the East by the conquest of Burmah. It might have been foreseen that, in the nature of things, the establishment, and the extension, of the British power in India, and the well-known war-like and aggressive disposition of the Bur-

After some desultory fighting, war was declared, in February of 1824. An expedition was sent out from India, under command of Commodore Grant and Sir Archibald Campbell. In May of 1824 the armament entered the Irawadi River, and came before the Burmese city of Rangoon. War now broke out in earnest, the British gradually penetrating

into the interior, the Burmese, with their half-barbarous methods of warfare, falling back before the invasion. Bandoola, General of the Burmese army, collected a force of sixty thousand men, and, in the latter part of 1824, fought several battles with the British army, about five thousand strong, in which the latter, though so greatly inferior in numbers, were nearly always victorious. On the 2d of April, in the following year, the city of Dondew was taken by Sir Archibald, and here Bandoola was killed. Later, in the same month, Prome was captured by the British, and, on the 17th of September, an armistice was concluded for a month.

Later in the year, an army of sixty thousand men advanced against the British from Ava, the capital. But the latter held out under repeated attacks, in none of which were the Burmese more than partially successful. A decisive battle was fought on the 1st of December, and negotiations for peace were immediately opened. It was soon found, however, that the Burmese were insincere, and hostilities broke out more violently than ever. In January of 1826, Sir Archibald Campbell advanced on Ava, the Burmese capital. On the 9th of February, a decisive battle was fought near the ancient city of Pagan-Myo, in which the British were completely victorious. The defeated enemy now came quickly to terms, though many acts of violence and hostility still told of the unsettled condition of affairs in the country. The Treaty of Yandabo put an end to the war, and became the basis of the large accession of territory known as British Burmah. The Burmese sovereign was obliged to give up Aracan, together with the provinces of Mergui, Tavoy, and Yea; to yield all of his claims to the kingdom of Assam and the contiguous States, and to pay a large indemnity for the expenses of the war. The strength, vigor, and resistless impact of the British power borne on the vehicle of Sir Archibald's small army against an ancient and populous kingdom, more than ten thousand miles distant from the seat of the English Government, was but another illustration of the vitality and enterprise of that warlike race which has fastened the crooked flukes of its anchors under the chalky walls of the British Islands.

Returning to the home affairs of the kingdom, we may properly present in this connection some fuller account of the agitation which now arose relative to the penal disabilities under which the Roman Catholics of England and Ireland had been placed by the Act of Union. Now it was that the great agitator and reformer, Daniel O'Connell, appeared on the scene, and began, with vehement invective and unanswerable argument, to demand the removal of the penalties against his Catholic countrymen. He instituted a society called the Catholic Association, small at first, but growing slowly to larger proportions, and spreading to all parts of the United Kingdom. In 1828 he was elected for Clare to the House of Commons, an event which foretold the success of the cause which he advocated. A measure embodying his principles of reform was introduced and carried through the House of Commons against the most strenuous opposition; but the bill was rejected in the House of Lords. The excitement rose to such a pitch as to endanger the peace of the country; and in Ireland the fires of civil war smouldered, ready to burst into flame. In 1828 the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, which had been in force since the time of Charles II., was, as we have said, carried through Parliament, in a bill introduced for that purpose by Lord John Russell.

It was believed by the Tories that so great a concession as was implied in this measure would satisfy the Catholics and bring quiet to the Kingdom. But the event proved otherwise. With the triumphant election of O'Connell to Parliament, the agitation broke out anew. It was claimed that the reformatory measures thus far promoted had been intended to favor only the Protestant Dissenters of Great Britain, and that nothing short of the removal of the legal disabilities of the Catholics would suffice. It was clearly in defiance of the statute forbidding the admission of Romanists to Parliament that O'Connell was elected to that body. The crisis was reached when the time came for the Irish agitator to take his seat in the House of Commons. The Ministry, backed by the Protestant clubs which had been formed in most parts of the Kingdom, determined to exclude O'Connell from his place. When this project was known,

party animosity was fanned to a white heat. The public became so convulsed that an appeal to arms seemed inevitable, unless the Government should yield. It was in the face of this alarming condition of affairs that the Ministry, at the opening of the Parliamentary session of 1829, was obliged to retreat. It was perceived by the Tory leaders that it would be better for the Government to bring forward a bill of their own motion to relieve the Catholics of their disabilities than to be driven to such a course by the impending revolution.

In accordance with this prudential scheme, a bill was at once prepared, which had the effect of arousing all the deep-seated prejudices of the Kingdom. The Tory Ministers were denounced as traitors, not only to their party, but to the Constitution of Great Britain. Many of the extreme partisans refused to follow their leaders further in the direction of reform. The Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel became the objects of bitter dislike to the Ultra-Tories, and the latter statesman was actually defeated for reelection by the University of Oxford. Nevertheless, on the 13th of April, 1829, the RELIEF BILL was passed, and for the first time in one hundred and fifty years the Roman Catholic subjects of Great Britain were made equal before the law with the other people of the Kingdom. Henceforth the discrimination against them extended no further than to their exclusion from the offices of Regent, Viceroy of Ireland, and Lord Chancellor of the Kingdom.¹

George IV., who had personally resisted to the last the recent measures of reform, was correspondingly humiliated at his own and the defeat of his Tory Ministry. His health was already greatly enfeebled. He presently retired from the public gaze, and sought seclusion in the shades of Windsor Castle. The worn-out debauchee took no further interest in public affairs, and the public responded by tak-

¹ By a strange coincidence the venerable Cathedral of York, the pride of the Church of England, was almost destroyed by fire at the very time when the triumphant Catholics were hailing the passage of the Relief Bill through Parliament. It seemed that the violence done to the Mother Church by Henry VIII. and the Reformers of the Sixteenth Century, was about to be avenged by the concurrent ravages of party strife and the devouring elements.

ing as little interest in the affairs of the king. The latter was taken seriously ill early in the year, and died on the 26th of June, 1830. The Duke of Wellington, who was not wanting in power of personal analysis, and was no flatterer of men, living or dead, summed up the qualities of the deceased monarch as follows: "He was the most extraordinary compound of talent, wit, boollonery, obstinacy, and good-feeling—in short, a medley of the most opposite qualities, with a great preponderance of good—that I ever saw in any character in my life." Of his reign, however, though short and little distinguished for glory, it may be said that hardly any other decade in the history of England has been more marked for the many practical reforms which it witnessed, for the advance of all liberal sentiments in society and State, and for the diffusion abroad of more humanizing tendencies, than was the otherwise feeble and unsteady reign of George IV.

The late king left no legitimate children to inherit his title and crown.¹ His brother, the Duke of York and Albany, was long since dead. The next elder of his brothers was William Henry, Duke of Clarence, who now acceded to the throne, with the title of WILLIAM IV. He had been a sailor in his boyhood, serving with distinction under Admirals Digby, Rod-

¹ As for Queen Caroline, she also had gone to the land where shameless persecution could no longer assail her. She had, after the infamous trial to which she had been subjected in the House of Lords, been permitted to resume her title of Queen, but was forbidden to enter Westminster Hall on the day of her husband's coronation. It was the death-stab in the woman's bosom; she pined for nineteen days, and yielded her shattered life to the elements. Even this was not the end of the dark fatality that overhung her career. Her daughter, the Princess Charlotte Augusta, was wedded, in 1816, to Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, afterwards king of the Belgians, but on the 6th of November in the following year she died in the agonies of child-birth—an event that wrung from the stern soul of Byron one of his sublimest stanzas:

Peasants bring forth in safety! Can it be,
O thou that wert so happy, so adored!
Those who weep not for kings shall weep for thee,
And Freedom's heart grown hoary, cease to howl.
Her only grief for ONE; for she had poured
Her omens for thee, and o'er thy head
Beheld her Iris! Thou, too, lonely lord
And desolate consort—vainly weest thou wed!
The husband of a year, the father of the dead!

ney, and Nelson. But during the reign of his brother he had lived the life of a private gentleman at Bushy Park. Unfortunately, the life of William had not been such as to justify any hopes that might be entertained of reforming and redeeming the general character which was now borne throughout Europe by the princes of Hanover-Brunswick. Some idea of the moral and political principles by which the new king was likely to be guided may be had from a scrutiny of his conduct while a member of the House of Lords. While sitting in that body, he had defended the recklessness, the extravagance, and debauchery of his brother, the Prince Regent. He had spoken in favor of the Bill of Divorcement, by which that alleged gentleman proposed to put away forever from her royal seat and inheritance the unfortunate Queen Caroline. He had denounced the proposed emancipation of the slaves, as against the laws of justice and the interests of humanity. In his private life his relations were hardly more well-timed and respectable than those of his brother, the Regent. He had become enamored with a certain Mrs. Jordan, an actress by profession, with whom he lived for nearly twenty years, the union being broken off at last for merely political reasons. In 1818 he had taken in marriage Adelaide of Saxe-Meiningen, who, in course of time, obtained a great influence over her easy-going husband. But no family sprang from the Prince's legitimate marriage, and he was

destined to be left at the end of his reign, as his brother George IV. had been, without an heir capable of inheriting the crown.

William IV. came to the throne at a time when the agitation for reform in all the legislative and administrative methods of the King-



CATHEDRAL OF YORK

dom was rife. It seemed at this epoch that the energies of the nation, long consuming themselves in war, had turned suddenly against the rough barriers and impediments to civil liberty, which the Middle Ages had entailed on modern England. No sooner had the Catholic question been settled by the conces-

sion of the rights which had been withheld from that large body of British subjects since the times of the Restoration, than another question of still more vital importance was presented to the English people. This was the question of a reform of the British Parliament, particularly of that part of the system which related to the basis of representation in the

Parliament would, in its details and philosophy, involve the greater part of the history of the English-speaking race. Originally, the House of Lords had been selected from the Witenagemot of the Saxon kings. The Witenagemot was, at first, an assemblage of the great men—literally, the wise men—whom the sovereign



WILLIAM IV

House of Commons. In times past this basis had been determined rather by landed estates than by population; but the whole growth of the civil polity of England had been in the direction of an enlargement of popular rights—a drifting away from those feudal ideas upon which representation had so long been founded.

The history of the evolution of the British

was wont to call into council. It was an assemblage of the *Witan*, or Wise Men, of the Kingdom. It consisted of temporal lords, of earls, of dukes, of barons, of archbishops, and bishops, and abbots, brought together, and constituting a body of magnates, from whom the king was wont to seek advice and support in times of trouble. The House of Commons had arisen from a very different source, and had been of slower development. Its origin is to be sought in the Anglo-Saxon *moots*, or meetings, consisting, at first, of such voluntary assemblages of freemen as might be essential to the welfare of the tribe. The first of the moots was the *town-moot*, which included the assembled freemen and cultivators of the folk-lands, gathered together to regulate the civil affairs of their township, their village, or parish. Next came the *burgh-moot*, being an assemblage of the principal men of the burgh, for the purpose of administering municipal affairs. The *hundred-moot* had a still more important place in the English system. It comprised the reeves and chief freemen gathered from the several townships and burghs within the limits of the so-called Hundred. Above this assembly was the *shire-moot*. It

was a body gathered from the shire or county, having an ealderman for its president, and exercising jurisdiction over the several hundreds comprised within the shire. The body was composed of a reeve and four freemen from every hundred. Its members can hardly be said to have been elected, at least not by such methods as would constitute a modern elec-

tion. But they were sent to the various moots by the common voice, and by methods which had in them the germ of a true election.

In many emergencies it became desirable for the mediæval kings of England to call not only the Great Council or House of Lords, but also the Commons—that is, representatives from the various moots above described—to assist and support the sovereign in his wars, and to give him counsel in the general affairs of his government. The student of history will readily recall the fact that the Commons of the Western European kingdoms were, in the times of which we speak, an extremely modest folk, very little disposed to interfere in the affairs of state, timid in all political matters, slow to convene even at the sovereign's call, and meek in his presence. In England, however, on account of the peculiar structure of society, the Commons grew into greater prominence than in any other country. A burgess or middle class sprang up, in whose hands much wealth was at length accumulated. They it was who henceforth must, in large measure, furnish the revenues of the Kingdom. As a consequence, the English Commons were more frequently called by the king to assist him with their presence and their means. For several centuries there was an approximation between the two Houses of Parliament. But at length the growth of the Commons alarmed both the king and the lords, and in the reign of Edward III. the two Houses were formally separated. The organization of each became more definite, and each henceforth pursued its independent lines of development.

The reader may perceive, in the situation here prepared, the elements of that great conflict by which, at the middle of the seventeenth century, the monarchy and aristocracy of England were for a while subverted. In the Second Revolution, of 1688, the House of Commons was again triumphant. It became the most powerful and regular legislative body in all Christendom. But the point of peculiar interest to the student of history is that the old barbaric constitution of the Commons had been, through all stages of the evolution, preserved as the fundamental basis of the House. Such was the astonishing conservatism of the English race that the abuses which had

flowed down in the stream of popular government were preserved along with the uses and advantages of the organization. Aye, more; the abuses of the system were huzzed and embraced with as much fervor as were the true principles of progress, enlightenment, and freedom which constituted the vital part of the Parliamentary system of government.

At length, however, the gradual growth and diffusion of political enlightenment made it impossible for the abusive part of the system longer to survive. This crisis was reached in the beginning of the fourth decade of the present century. The reformatory spirit was already abroad in the Kingdom. The effort to repeal the more obnoxious of the disabilities which had long been imposed on the Catholics made manifest the abuses which were intermingled and blended with the very structure of the House of Commons; and no sooner had the repeal been passed, than the reforming party turned upon the House itself, with the determination to exorcise the evils under which that great body was laboring as the governing force of England.

The very foundation had to be broken up. It was perceived that the vice was deep-seated, reaching down to the very basis on which the House of Commons rested. The various boroughs of the Kingdom, from which the representatives sitting in the House were drawn by election, had been mapped out long ago, and, though the population had fluctuated from side to side; though great communities had been planted where none existed before; though other great communities had, in the mutations of industry, under the landed system of Great Britain, and in answer to the calls of commerce, disappeared from the places where they did exist, the old basis of representation still prevailed; so that the House of Commons no longer represented the England of the present, but the England of a mythical past. Large cities had sprung up where hitherto there was no dweller. Such were Liverpool, Manchester, and Leeds, which, though inhabited by teeming thousands, were absolutely unrepresented in Parliament. The ancient boroughs knew no such cities, and conservative England had thus far respected her ancient boroughs—must respect them still! Many old districts had become well-nigh depopulated; but conservative

England still regarded her old districts—must regard them still! Such, for instance, was the rotten borough of Graton. Such was the borough of Old Sarum, which no longer contained a single house, and yet it continued to be represented by two members of the House of Commons. Such boroughs were the so-called "pocket" boroughs; for they might well be carried in the pocket! Liverpool had no representative; Old Sarum had two representatives. At length the sturdy artisans of the great manufacturing towns determined no longer to endure the abominable mockery of representative government in which they, the bone and sinew of England, had no part or lot. Popular leaders at once took up the clamor. The recent success of the political revolt in behalf of the Roman Catholics furnished the example—gave encouragement to the movement. A popular belief was diffused abroad that the movement could but be crowned with success. But against it all, the reactionary party, the conservative, obstructing element in British politics, that ancient Toryism which had through so large a period of British history controlled, or antagonized, the destinies of the kingdom, set themselves with the firmness and obstinacy of the immovable rocks in the Hill of Taric.

It happened at this particular juncture that the affairs of Continental Europe tended much to strengthen and intensify the popular movement in England. In the very year of the accession of William IV. to the English throne, the roused-up people of France disposed of their king by a most summary process. At the same time a rebellion occurred in Belgium, which led to the severance of that important power from the dominion of Holland, and the establishment of an independent kingdom under the rule of Leopold, of Saxe-Coburg, who received the crown, in July of 1831, with the title of Leopold I., King of the Belgians. In these movements of the Liberals of the Continent, the people's party of England was quick to discover the omens of success. On the other hand, the English Tories found in the destruction of the continental systems, with which they sympathized, every reason for distrusting popular government and adhering to the past. To the Liberals of Great Britain Louis Philippe, of France, was

a pleasing character to contemplate; to the Tories he was a menace, a specter.

Thus it was that the great project of reforming the basis of representation in the British House of Commons became the all-absorbing question in the first years of William IV. The measure met with the greatest opposition in the body to which it was directed. A ministerial crisis was precipitated by the foolish declaration of the Duke of Wellington against the proposition for Parliamentary reform. He was suddenly deprived of the confidence of the country, and a coalition of the Whig party with those who had followed the political fortunes of Canning was formed. The Wellington Ministry was dissolved, and in November of 1830 the king summoned Earl Grey to form a new Cabinet, pledged to carry out the reformatory policy. It is believed that the earl himself had but little sympathy with the popular cause; but he was willing, on assuming the leadership of the Government, to promote at least certain features of the proposed Parliamentary revolution.

The REFORM BILL, so-called by preëminence over all other Parliamentary measures having like purposes as their end, was accordingly prepared, and, on the 1st of March, 1831, was laid, by Lord John Russell, before the House of Commons. Then it was that "storming fury rose," such as, perhaps, was never heard before in that turbulent arena where so many of the battles of English liberty have been fought and won. The bill passed to its second reading, and through its second reading, by a majority of one vote. It was seen by the advocates of the measure that it was destined to failure, and Parliament was dissolved with an appeal to the country.

The English Nation was now shaken to its center. A new Parliament was returned much more favorable to the bill than was the preceding. The second reading of the act was now carried by a majority of one hundred and thirty-six. The third reading was pressed, and the act went triumphantly through the House of Commons. Earl Grey carried the bill to the Lords, where it was rejected by a majority of forty-one. Here, then, the issue was made up. The landed aristocracy of Great Britain planted itself squarely in the way of reform, and the question was whether

the ancient prejudices of the kingdom, represented in the House of Lords, would yield to the popular, and now overwhelming, pressure in the House of Commons, or whether, on the contrary, the popular party, bearing the banner of reform, and backed by the decisive results of the recent Parliamentary election, would be hurled back, routed, overthrown.

It can not be doubted that the last months of 1830-31 witnessed in England a crisis more serious and alarming than anything which had been known since the Revolution of 1688. The radical reformers and the Ultra-Tories were ready to decide the issue by civil war. Between the extremists, however, rose the Grey Ministry, carrying with it the great moderate party of Englishmen, who, though determined on reform, still sought to reach the result by methods short of revolution. In the emergency two courses, and only two, were open to the Government. There was between the two Houses of Parliament what, in more recent phraseology, would be denominated a political "deadlock." This might be broken either, first, by a declaration from the House of Commons that the assent of the lords was *not necessary* for the passage of the bill; or, secondly, by creating under royal prerogative a sufficient number of new peers to bear down the adverse Tory majority in the Upper House. Each of these methods is objectionable in the last degree. To declare the assent of the House of Lords unnecessary was revolutionary. To create the new peers would be to drown the House of Lords and destroy its distinctive character. With much reluctance it was determined by the Ministry, on the 1st of January, 1832, to demand of the king the creation of the new peers. Under this menace the Tory Lords receded somewhat, and the bill was allowed to pass its second reading. But when it came to the third reading, the passage of the measure could not be forced, and the Grey Ministry resigned.

Wellington was now asked to form a new Cabinet, and undertake the Government. But the task was hopeless. After a single week of such political turmoil as has rarely been witnessed in Great Britain, the king was obliged to send again for Earl Grey, and recommit to him the destinies of the State. That Minister and Lord Brougham went to the

king in person, demanded of him the power to create the new peers necessary for the passage of the Reform Bill through the House of Lords, and compelled the king to put his assent *in writing*, as follows: "The king grants permission to Earl Grey and to his Chancellor, Lord Brougham, to create such a number of peers as will be sufficient to insure the passing of the Reform Bill, first calling up peers' eldest sons.—WILLIAM R., Windsor, May 17, 1832."

The event showed that the extremity which was thus provided for was not demanded. The Tory lords saw at last the expediency of yielding a little to save much. Accordingly,



LORD JOHN RUSSELL.

when the Reform Bill came to its final passage before the Lords a sufficient number of the peers, headed by the Duke of Wellington, *voluntarily absented themselves* from the House to permit of the passage of the Act by a majority of eighty-four. Thus on the 7th of June, 1832, the Bill for the Reformation of the British Parliament became the law of the Kingdom, after a struggle, which, at several of its phases, had brought the country to the very verge of revolution. The peril had been emphasized in many instances by actual violence. Time and again popular indignation had broken forth against those leaders of the Tory party who were impeding the progress of the Reform.

In London the palace of the Duke of Wellington was assailed by a furious mob, with whom not even the memories of Waterloo could prevail any longer. Nottingham was burned to the ground, and a large part of Bristol destroyed by insurgents beyond the control of the authorities. But as it became evident that the reformatory movement would succeed, as the Tories shrank before their opponents, a better temper prevailed, and the ship of State at length outsailed the storm and anchored in clear water.

Perhaps no other measure ever adopted by the British Parliament was more salutary in its effects than was the Reform Bill of 1832. It was a new era from which many other reformatory projects were to date their origin and possibility. By the Reform Bill, the so-called pocket and rotten boroughs were disfranchised. No longer might some landed nabob carry in his pocket several Parliamentary votes, behind which there was no constituency. Other decayed boroughs, while they did not actually lose their representation in the House of Commons, had that representation greatly reduced. The votes thus gained from the disfranchised boroughs, were redistributed to the counties and manufacturing towns to which an adequate representation had hitherto been denied. The whole disfranchisement extended to fifty-six boroughs and about thirty small towns. The general effect was that of equalization, by which the populous counties and the cities were given their just equipoise in the House of Commons.¹ Certain property qualifications on the suffrage were allowed to stand. Indeed, in the light of the liberal principles which now prevail in England and the United States with respect to the rights and prerogatives of citizenship, we can but be surprised that the very moderate principles incorporated in the Reform Bill of 1832 should ever have been regarded as radical or extreme. The right of voting in the English boroughs was still restricted to the tenants of houses worth ten pounds a year. Properties under this valuation, or rather the holders of the same, lay as before, under complete disfranchisement. In the counties, tenants paying a

rental of fifty pounds per annum were entitled to suffrage, while freeholders having an income from their own lands of forty shillings, or landed property worth ten pounds a year, were permitted to vote under the provisions of the bill. Such were the general features of the reform by which the Parliamentary representation in the House of Commons was determined for the ensuing thirty-six years.

We now come to consider the legislation of the so-called Reformed Parliament, which began its existence in 1833. The liberalizing tendencies which had been produced and disseminated during the period of agitation, now speedily bore their fruits. No sooner had the House of Commons again assembled than a bill was brought forward for the abolition of slavery in all the colonies and possessions of Great Britain. In this case, the agitator was William Wilberforce, Hull, one of the enthusiasts of humanity, at that time a member of the Commons for the county of York. During the greater part of his life he had been engaged in projects looking to the abolition, first, of the slave-trade, and then of slavery itself. As early as the ascendancy of William Pitt, Wilberforce, in conjunction with that statesman, sought to secure the abolition of the slave-trade in the British dominions. No great step, however, was taken in this direction until 1807. Pitt, in the meanwhile, died, and Wilberforce struggled on against the selfishness of men and the prejudice of ages. He was already in the last act of his life when the Reformed Parliament, under the inspiration and leadership of Brougham, Buxton, Clarkson, and many other philanthropists, who had heard the cry of the oppressed, took up his unfinished task, and, as his life went down in the shadows, the *Moor Telcel Uphursin* of slavery was seen in burning letters over against the wall. Even then the slaveholders of the Kingdom rallied all their powers to defeat the measure; but the gale of public opinion blew hard against them, and they and their cause went down together. A month after the death of Wilberforce, when, from the mountain-top uplifted high, he had caught across the river one certain glance of the radiant landscape, the EMANCIPATION BILL was passed, and human slavery met its quietus throughout the British dominions. It could not be said, how-

¹ Ireland gained, under the new apportionment, five additional members in the House.

ever, that the slaveholders suffered greatly from the loss of their alleged "property." The plan of abolition was so gradual in its application, and the steps taken so ample to remunerate those who were supposed to have suffered financially by the destruction of servitude, that none might well complain. Those who had held slaves were allowed therefor an aggregate compensation of twenty millions of pounds. The emancipation, moreover, was postponed to such dates as were supposed to be convenient for the masters. Slave children under six years of age were to become free in the summer of 1834; slaves of the field, in seven years; and domestic servants, in five years from the passage of the act. It was estimated that the slaves of the Kingdom, for whom a compensation was given to the owners, numbered, at the time of the passage of the Emancipation Bill, about eight hundred thousand.

Daniel O'Connell now reappeared on the stage of British politics, and became one of the leading figures of the scene. The ascendancy which he had acquired during the agitation for the repeal of the penal disabilities of the Catholics, now carried him to the front of another movement, still more important and radical in its character. England for three centuries had been a Protestant State. The Reformation had entered into combination with the whole frame of civil society. In no other State of modern Europe had the religious institutions of the country been blended more completely with the political structure than in the major island of the Kingdom. Ireland, on the other hand, was a Catholic country. Into the Western Island the Reformers of the sixteenth century had never been able to penetrate. The Celtic race proved itself most loyal and devoted to the Mother Church. Hardly might it be said that Spain or Portugal, or Italy herself, had remained more profoundly infected with the Holy Faith, as dispensed from the chair of St. Peter, than had Ireland.

This divergence and antagonism in the religious system of the people of the two islands constituted in the fourth decade of the present century, as it had done for generations, and as it does to the present day, the insuperable bar to political and social sympathy between the

English and Irish races. At the reformatory epoch, of which we are here presenting a sketch to the reader, the leaders of the Catholic, we might say, the Irish, party in the United Kingdom, were elated by their success in securing the passage of the Repeal Bill. They had shared in the more recent excitements attendant upon the reformation of the British Parliament. They were for many reasons emboldened to strike out for a more radical reform, and in Daniel O'Connell they found the impersonation of the cause.

The two most offensive symbols of the subordination of the Irish people to the British Government were the Established Church, and the System of Tithing by which it was supported. The Episcopalian Establishment was as fixed in Ireland as in England. It sat brooding over a people who were utterly alienated from it. The Irish were Catholics, but they must support the Church of England. That Church existed among them for its own good. In many parts of the country the Establishment was represented merely by the buildings, the clergymen, and the parish. Parishioners there were none. To support such an institution, foreign in every particular to the genius and sympathies of the people—to support it by taxes and rentals laid heavily and perpetually upon the Irish Catholic peasantry—was an iniquity so palpable as to be monstrous in the estimation of posterity.

Against this whole system of foreign ecclesiastical domination, O'Connell now raised his voice. He demanded the disestablishment of the Church in Ireland. He demanded that the tithing system, by which that Church was supported, should be abolished; that the dioceses should be broken up, and the bishops and priests of the Church of England left to such free support as they might still obtain; that the Establishment, in a word, should henceforth be made to rest on its own basis, just as the Mother Church rested, in the island.

At this time a state of affairs had supervened in Ireland on the religious side of society very similar to that which existed in England before the passage of the Reform Bill. O'Connell's measure was in the nature of an ecclesiastical reform, by which inequalities of taxation and similar abuses were to be removed. But the propositions of the

reformer were met with violent opposition in Parliament and throughout the country. The wrath of the prelates of the Church of England, and those who were associated with them in interest—backed, as they were, by the Tory party, and all the prejudices born of conservatism—rose to the pitch of violence. The agitation was fanned to a flame. The Ministry of Earl Grey tottered under the as-

deavored to assert itself and maintain the ascendancy of the ancient order by the passage of a COERCION BILL, the object of which was to suppress the Irish movement by force of arms. But the measure, as might well have been foreseen, only aggravated the evil which it was designed to mitigate.

In the midst of the confusion the Ministry of Grey went to pieces on the rocks. The

Earl resigned, and was succeeded in office by William Lamb, better known as Lord Melbourne. But he also was unable to weather the storm. After a brief and unsteady effort to hold the helm, he was obliged, though supported by the king, to give place to a new Conservative Ministry, under the leadership of Sir Robert Peel. This movement, however, was as unstable as its predecessor. The appeal to the country which was now made resulted in the overthrow of Peel and the reappointment of Melbourne as Premier, in 1835. In the meantime, however, Parliament had attempted to cast a tub to the Irish whale by adopting a measure of partial reform. An act was passed by



DANIEL O'CONNELL

saults of its adversaries. Meanwhile, the first fruits of the agitation, as always happens in such cases, were bitter to the taste. The Irish peasantry, outraged for generations by the intolerable exactions of the English Establishment, broke into revolt. In many places the country was terrorized by the excesses of the insurrections. Crime and bloodshed were in the path of those who now avenged themselves for the wrongs which had been inflicted upon them. At the first, the British Ministry en-

which ten of the bishoprics in Ireland were abolished, and the revenues of the Church rearranged on a basis approximating to justice.

This was the epoch of the ascendancy of Daniel O'Connell in the House of Commons. As a debater he had become pre-eminent. This, too, in his old age; for he was beyond fifty when he entered Parliament. The analysis of his character and purposes has been difficult, even when the same have been

illuminated by the light of subsequent events. It seems to have been his policy to demand much, and to accept for his countrymen whatever he could get. His oratory was rude and boisterous; his invective a thing to be dreaded, even by the greatest and most callous Parliamentarians of his time. As a field-speaker, it is doubtful whether any man of the century has been his superior. He swayed the multitudes of his excitable countrymen at his will, and was given by his admirers the hardly too extravagant epithet of the "Uncrowned King."

It is to the era which we are here considering that we may properly assign the beginnings of another measure of reform in the administration of Great Britain. Parliament was now, for the first time, called upon to wrestle with the great question of pauperism. The existing Poor Laws of the country were such that the number of those claiming public charity of the kingdom increased from year to year. The disease was seen to be aggravated by the very means which had been adopted to allay its ravages. The amount annually appropriated for the support of paupers had run up to the enormous sum of seven millions of pounds, and still the cries for gratuitous support increased and multiplied. It was under the Administration of Lord Melbourne that the reform of the Poor Laws was undertaken by Parliament. The measures adopted were successful only to a limited degree; but they had the merit of leading in the right direction. The new statute forbade the further payment of benefits to able-bodied paupers in their own homes, and required all those who demanded an entire or partial support at the hands of the public, to enter the work-houses, and earn by labor what they sought, and had previously received, as a gratuity.

In the year 1835 still another impetus was given to the ear of reform, by the passage through Parliament of the MUNICIPAL ACT. This measure was especially designed to ameliorate the condition of towns and cities. The act was a sort of sequel to the Reform Bill of 1832. It was provided that the taxpayers of municipal corporations and boroughs might elect a body of town councillors, and that the latter might choose one of their own number as chief magistrate of the corporation.

The principle of local self-government was thus, with great advantage, introduced and applied among the municipal populations of Great Britain.

Sharp after this came the passage, in 1836, of what was known as the TITHES COMMUTATION ACT, by which it was provided that a fixed rent, to be determined by the average price of corn for the seven preceding years, should be substituted for the irregular tithes, which had hitherto been collected in the parishes. Some of the English dioceses were, at the same time, reformed, and, in other bills, it was enacted that marriages might thereafter be solemnized in the churches of Dissenters.

In the early part of the reign of William IV. much ill-feeling was created in Great Britain and Holland by the conduct of the former country towards the latter. The difficulty was entailed as one of the consequences of the Belgic Revolution of 1830-32.

King William I., of Holland, naturally looked to England for sympathy in his contest with the revolted Belgians. What, therefore, were his chagrin and resentment to find the whole influence of the British Government thrown on the side of the insurrectionists, and to see the crown of the kingdom of Belgium conferred on Leopold, son-in-law of the late king of England. To the student of history, however, this course of the British Government will not appear astonishing or unnatural. From time immemorial it has been the ill-disguised policy of England, in the maintenance of her own ascendancy, to give her sympathies to the revolutionary party in foreign States; this to the extent of encouraging the rupture of rival kingdoms up to the point when the revolution itself becomes a menace to British interests. It was in pursuance of this political habit that in 1835 the encouragement of the British Government was openly given to Isabella of Spain, at that time engaged in a civil war with her uncle, Don Carlos. A division of the English army, under command of General Evans, was sent into the Spanish Peninsula, and took active part in upholding the child-queen of the kingdom.

On the whole, the Ministry of Lord Melbourne was inefficient, and the times of its ascendancy uneventful. The Premier himself

owed his high place in the Government to negative rather than positive qualities. He has been pronounced by political critics to have been deficient in insight and in energy; and his political influence must be referred, not to his own strength, but to conditions independent of his will, and to the concurrence of fortunate circumstances. It was the happiness of Melbourne, however, to form the connecting link between the reign of William IV. and the king-sovereign who succeeded him.

As for the king, his life was now rapidly waning. In the last years of his reign he exercised only the slightest influence on the course of events. William began to show signs of debility in May of 1837. It was

found that he labored from a fatal affection of the heart. Declining for several weeks, he came to his death on the 20th of June, in that year. He died, as his brother before him had died, with no legitimate children; and the large family of alleged illegitimate heirs were, of course, excluded from the throne. It belonged to the Melbourne Ministry to steer the ship of State from the narrow and stormy seas of an unpopular reign into the ocean—almost shoreless—of the Victorian epoch; an ocean wide and free—not, indeed, without its seasons of storm and tempest, but for the most part fanned with gentle breezes from infinite regions, and crowned with the radiance of sunlight.


CHAPTER CXXVIII.—EPOCH OF CHARTISM.



HE reader of history must be constantly surprised with the vicissitudes through which the Royal Houses of Europe have been fated to pass. Time and again we have the recurring phenomenon of a princely family in full bloom suddenly struck with blight and barrenness. Who could have foreseen that the House of Tudor, represented in the vigorous and passionate Henry VIII., could have so suddenly and strangely descended into extinction and oblivion? Who could have anticipated the equally sudden descent of the House of Stuart into the female line? And who can contemplate without wonder the determination of nature that not one of the seventeen children of Queen Anne should reach maturity? Why should Henry, six times wedded to fertile queens, be unable to perpetuate the name of Tudor? Why should Anne be mocked as if she were a fruitful tree, doomed to bear forever, but dropping its unripe and blasted apples to the earth? So also we view with astonishment the sudden decadence of the family of George III. Nine sons are born to him, and two of them in turn wear his crown, and yet at the death of

William IV., in June of 1837, not a single male child of the legitimate blood of the English Guells, not a single true cion of that House of Hanover-Brunswick, which had been transplanted from Germany to England, remained to inherit the crown. Edward, Duke of Kent, fourth son of George III., had been laid with his fathers since 1825. To his surviving family, however, by the established laws of English descent, the monarchy must now go for a sovereign. And that sovereign was found in the person of the Duke of Kent's daughter, the Princess ALEXANDRINA VICTORIA, and to her the crown descended without the shadow of dispute.

The Princess at this time was seventeen years and one month of age. She had been the heir-presumptive during the reign of her uncle William IV. Her education, in the meantime, was intrusted to the Duchess of Northumberland, by whom the Princess was removed from the degrading influences of the court, and carefully trained for the duties alike of queenhood and womanhood. Her development had been carefully guarded, and she had grown up a virtuous, intelligent, and prudent girl, fitted by every kind of discipline for the exalted rank and trying duties of her station. Nothing in history presents a stronger



contrast than is afforded by the sentiments, the instincts, and purposes of the maidenly bosom of Victoria on the day of her accession, and the passions floating in that purlien of filth

and abomination, which swelled and broke in a surf of indescribable offensiveness around the English throne during the last two reigns.

The circumstances of the inauguration of

the young Queen were such as to awaken the enthusiastic admiration of her subjects. Her youth and inexperience, and her fortunate ignorance of the world, it had been supposed, would leave her a helpless novice in the royal seat. But she at once showed herself to be ready for the occasion. On the day of her accession she bowed to the lords in waiting, read her own speech aloud in the clear,

ness under trial. The war-battered Wellington said gruffly that he could not have wished a better performance from his own daughter. On coming to power, the new Queen rejected the name *Alexandrina*, which had been given her out of compliment to the Emperor of Russia, and signed herself simply *VICTORIA R.*, the name by which both herself and her epoch,



QUEEN VICTORIA

musical tones of girlhood, showed neither fear nor embarrassment, blushed crimson red when her two aged uncles knelt to kiss her hand, and won the hearts of all. Peel declared himself amazed at her manner and behavior, at her deep sense of the situation, at her firm-

ness under trial. The war-battered Wellington said gruffly that he could not have wished a better performance from his own daughter. On coming to power, the new Queen rejected the name *Alexandrina*, which had been given her out of compliment to the Emperor of Russia, and signed herself simply *VICTORIA R.*, the name by which both herself and her epoch,

one of the most important in English history, will ever be remembered. The maiden ruler who was thus called to the throne of England was the thirty-fifth in order of succession from William the Conqueror, and the fifth Queen Regnant of the United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland. The contingency which had been provided for on the accession of George I. had thus at last arrived. Under the constitution of the Dukedom of Hanover-Brunswick, the princes of that line must be male; for the Salic Law, prevalent immemorably in Germany as well as France, excluded women from the throne. Accordingly, when George I. was called by Parliament to the sovereignty of Great Britain, it was provided that so long as a male heir remained to wear the crown, Hanover and England should be governed by a common king; but in case the English crown should fall into the female line, then Hanover should revert to some other branch of the family in which the male line was still preserved. The event had come. The daughter of the Duke of Kent had inherited the English throne. Hanover was accordingly severed from its political relations with Great Britain, and on the accession of Victoria became an independent power. Duke Ernest, of Cumberland, was chosen king.

The new sovereign of England came into power under the auspices of the Tories. Lord Melbourne was still Prime Minister. The Queen herself sympathized in her youth, as she has always done, with the Tory party, and the Ministry of that party remained in power as it had been in the closing years of George IV. A new Parliament was created by an appeal to the country, and the result showed that the Tory, or, as it now began to be called, the *Conservative*, party had a slight gain in the elections. If we should glance into the English Parliament at this time, we would discover in that body an array of political talent, not to say genius, which could hardly be surpassed in the palmiest days of British history. The foremost man of all was, doubtless, Lord Henry Brougham, at that time fifty-eight years of age. Perhaps no abler or stronger character has appeared in the arena of statesmanship within the present century. He was a great orator, as that term is used, to describe not only the temporary influence of the speaker over those whom he addresses, but also to signify a solidity of subject-matter and cogency of reasoning, such as may well influence the thought of readers in another age and country. Brougham had risen to the Chancellorship in

1830. In 1835 he was left out of the Whig Ministry, and, during the remainder of his career, pursued an independent course on all questions of the day, wielding, in his old age, a free-lance, which he hurled with the power of a giant. After him, the second place among the Parliamentarians of the time has been assigned to Lord John Lyndhurst, who, as a debater, has had few superiors in the British House of Lords. Lyndhurst was the son of John Singleton Copley, an American painter of the Colonial times, and was born in Boston, in the year 1772. He was a Tory by politics, a statesman by profession. Without the aggressive force of Brougham, without his ruggedness of character and stormy disposition, he nevertheless rose easily to a high plane of influence in British affairs, and maintained it through a long and eventful life. In the House of Commons of this time might be seen sitting, for the city of London, George Grote, the historian of Greece. There, also, was Edward Lytton Bulwer, destined to the peerage. In the same body appeared, for the first time, the eccentric and foppish Benjamin Disraeli, for whom destiny had reserved the task of making his august Queen Empress of India. William E. Gladstone had then seen five years' service in the House. Lord John Russell had just begun his career as leader of his party. There were Palmerston, and Peel, and Stanley, O'Connell and Sheil, shouting to the charge for the emancipation of Ireland. It has been remarked that of the great names who were destined, in the next forty years, to be blazoned on the escutcheon of British Parliamentary history, only four—Roebuck, Cobden, Bright, and Macaulay—were wanting in the Parliament which assembled when Victoria took the scepter.

The Government of the Queen inherited from its predecessor all of the reformatory tendencies of the age. Those tendencies had not yet satisfied themselves by taking organic forms in the English Constitution. But for a brief season the reformatory movements were checked by the diversion of the attention of the Government to the affairs of Lower Canada. In that country an insurrection broke out in 1838, and the Government found itself under the necessity of suspending the colonial constitution, in virtue of which Canada had her

civil existence. In order to secure a better administration in the Province, John George Lambton, Lord Durham, was selected as a new Governor, and to him was assigned the difficult task of quelling the insurrection, pacifying the people, and reorganizing the Government. On repairing to America and assuming his duties in Canada, he was so unfortunate as to adopt measures beyond the limits of his instructions, and perhaps beyond the limits of present application to the then conditions in Canada. The ordinances which he prepared for the government of the Province were subsequently taken as the basis of Canadian nationality, but they were disapproved by the House of Lords; whereupon the Governor was so deeply offended that, without waiting to be recalled, he abandoned his post and returned to England.

Nor did the event fail to justify, in some measure, what had seemed to be the rashness and impractical temper of Lord Durham. Powerful friends at home approved and defended his course. His report on the condition of affairs in Canada was one of the ablest papers of the times, and Parliament was soon obliged to adopt the very policy which the discarded Governor had attempted to maintain in his brief and extraordinary administration.

The period of history upon which we are now entering was marked in the history of all countries by the great extension of scientific knowledge. It was the epoch, rather, in which scientific knowledge began to be extensively applied in all industrial and commercial enterprises. It was, in short, the dawn of the new era of contrivance and invention. The augmentation of the productiveness of human labor in almost all departments of industry became perceptible from the fourth decade of the century, and the volume of applied force was destined to increase and widen through the whole Victorian Age. It were difficult, indeed, as it is always difficult, to point out with exactitude the beginnings, the true origins, of the great discoveries and inventions which have so vastly multiplied in our times. Perhaps we should cite the last quarter of the eighteenth century as the general date of the scientific discoveries which began to be utilized fifty years afterwards. The discovery of oxygen-gas by Priestley, in 1774, might almost be

said to be the first stage in the natural sciences. What, indeed, had mankind actually known about the true constitution of nature up to the time of Priestley and Franklin? The scientific men of this and the subsequent age, however, were explorers and discoverers rather than inventors. It is with the application of discovery, the adaptation, or, if we may so say, the incorporation of the principles by which phenomena are governed into physical contrivance, that we are here to consider and illustrate.

One of the greatest of the achievements to which we refer was the extension of STEAM NAVIGATION—particularly the navigation of the Atlantic Ocean by steamships—and the establishment by this means of regular lines of communication between Europe and America. The Atlantic Ocean was first traversed experimentally by a small steamer called the *Savannah*, in 1816. The vessel was constructed at New York, was successfully steered to Liverpool under the propulsion of steam, and constituted the brief experimental wonder of the times. The next voyages accomplished by the same agent were made a few years later between Holland and the Dutch West Indian colonies. It was, however, in the early part of the year 1838 that the practical feature of ocean steam navigation was demonstrated on a large scale. In that year the British-built steamships *Sirius* and *Great Western* made their trial voyages across the Atlantic. The first trip of the *Great Western* was made from Bristol to New York in fifteen days. The *Sirius* steamed out from Cork and reached the American metropolis in seventeen days on her trial trip. It was the demonstration of a great problem, the favorable solution of which was destined to exercise a vast influence, not only on the commercial affairs of nations, but on the nations themselves by the extension of intercourse and the stimulation of internationality. This was particularly true of that feature of the improvement which related to the transmission of the oceanic mails. Nor will the patriot reader on this side of the Atlantic fail to recall with pride the fact that the Mother Country, essentially maritime as she is, at the bottom of her greatness, was constrained to draw upon the genius of the American Republic for the first suggestions and demonstrations

of the practicability of propelling vessels by steam-enginery.

The same pride may well be inspired by the story of the indebtedness of the Mother Country to her daughter in the matter of applying the electrical current as a means of communication. In England, the first to make such application of electricity was Sir Charles Wheatstone, at that time professor of experimental philosophy in King's College, London. It was in June of 1836 that Wheatstone produced what may be called the rudimentary telegraph. In that year he took out a patent "for improvements in giving signals and sounding alarms in distant places by means of electric currents, transmitted through metallic circuit." Similar discoveries had already been made by our own Professor Morse, but it does not appear that Wheatstone was indebted for his contrivance to the American inventor. Both philosophers were working out, independently, the solution of the same problem. With Wheatstone was associated Mr. Cooke, an Englishman of scientific attainments and business experience, whose practical abilities were joined with those of the philosopher in his patent for the first electrical apparatus of the telegraphic kind in England.

It should be observed, however, that the work of Wheatstone was limited to the sounding of signals at a distance, and did not reach to the conveyance of information by means of language. The latter achievement was the work of Morse, as has already been delineated in another chapter. In the matter of the railroad, however, the first actual production belonged to England. There it was that Stephenson led the way into the new continent of commerce and travel. The London and Birmingham Railway was not, however, opened in its whole length until 1838, fully sixteen years after the successful opening of the first line, eight miles in length, to the Hetton colliery. An act for the transmission of the English mails by railway was passed through Parliament in 1838, and thenceforth the development and extension of the system was rapid and constant until it became universal.

We come at this same period in English history, to one of those remarkable features in civilization dependent in part on physical contrivance and in part on civil administration.

We refer to the establishment of what, in English parlance, is called THE PENNY POST. The methods of transmitting the mails by irregular and local agencies, such as had been in vogue since the Middle Ages, continued in operation in Great Britain to within the memory of men still living. The idea of a general postal system, operating at cheap rates under direction and control of the Government, did not enter the mind of any British statesman until after the accession of Victoria. Even then the project had to be carried to Parliament, and persistently advocated by a man wiser in his generation than any member of that body, before the feasibility of the scheme was acknowledged and adopted. The experiences of Sir Rowland Hill—for to him all mankind are perpetually indebted for the conception of a cheap and universal postal system—were almost identical in his dealings with the British Parliament and advocacy of his proposed measure before that body with those of Professor Morse before the American Congress. The scene in either instance of these two pioneers before the two great representative law-making bodies of the English-speaking Nations may well remind one of the attitude of Columbus, surrounded with a group of bigoted monks and ignorant school-men, and trying to reveal to their bat-winged imaginations the glories of a New World!

It was in the year 1839 that the Chancellor of the Exchequer laid before Parliament a proposition in which it was declared expedient to reduce the postage on letters to one uniform rate of one penny charged upon every letter of a given weight. The measure also proposed the abolition of the franking privilege hitherto possessed by members of Parliament, and the restriction of franking to such official documents as must be transmitted by the officers of Government. The striking feature of the proposition was that it reversed the existing theory in regard to the transmission of matter by mail. Hitherto the receipts from the post-office department had many times fallen short of the expenditure. The prevalent systems of mail-carrying were so imperfect and irregular, that many of the leading business houses in Great Britain had chosen to employ private parties to carry their mail from city to city. By this means, and

by many others, the aggregate receipts of the post-office department were reduced to a figure as meagre as the system itself was contemptible. Whenever from any such causes a deficiency had arisen, it had been the custom of the department to *advance the rates* of postage, believing that thereby the aggregate receipts would be increased. It remained for Rowland Hill to demonstrate the fallacy of this position and demonstrate the truth of the reverse. In 1837 he published a pamphlet entitled *Post-office Reform; its Importance and Practicability*. It was one of those rare productions which, by their invincible logic and cogent array of facts, make a conquest of the human mind. Hill's work fought its way even into Parliament. The post-office authorities decried the project. The Postmaster-General denounced it in the House of Lords as a visionary scheme. When Parliament took the matter up, and, in spite of itself, began to admit the truthfulness of Hill's demonstrations, the officials of the department assented to try the project, but hedged against the consequences. Sydney Smith satirized the enterprise with his usual bitterness. Nevertheless, the ministry gave way under the impact of the truth. The great commercial cities caught a glimpse of the benefits of the new system, and poured their petitions in its favor into the House of Commons. A bill was brought in embodying the scheme of Rowland Hill, and on the 10th of January, 1840, the act for the establishment of postage at the uniform rate of one penny per letter of not more than half an ounce in weight, was adopted against the strenuous opposition of a large party in both Houses of Parliament. And it may well surprise posterity to know that among the names of those most bitterly antagonistic to the act were those of the Duke of Wellington and Sir Robert Peel. The country and the world immediately responded to the new system by pouring an increased volume of revenue into the post-office department of every nation where cheap postage, after the manner devised by Sir Rowland Hill, has been adopted as a method of administration.

We here approach one of the most remarkable episodes in the political history of England. It was in the year 1838 that the extraordinary social and industrial upheaval known by the

general name of CHARTISM occurred. It is doubtful whether any other agitation of like kind, more general, more profound, more heated, had shaken the fabric of British society than was the sudden and unexpected insurrection of the masses in favor of what was known as "the People's Charter." This name was given to a brief summary of political principles said to have been drawn up by Daniel O'Connell, in the year above named, and handed by him to the Secretary of the Workingmen's Association, with the remark: "There's your charter; agitate for it, and never be content with anything less." It is proper, first of all, to state concisely what were the principles of political action summarized in the People's Charter.

The document in question contained six brief formal propositions, which were as follows:

1. We demand Universal Suffrage—by which was meant rather Manhood Suffrage than what is now known as universal suffrage, meaning the ballot in the hands of both sexes. This, the Chartists did not demand.

2. We demand an Annual Parliament—by which was meant the election of a new House of Commons each year by the people.

3. We demand the right to Vote by Ballot—by which was meant the right of the people to employ a *secret* ballot at the elections instead of the method *visa voce*.

4. We demand the Abolition of the Property Qualification now requisite as a condition of eligibility to Membership in the House of Commons.

5. We demand that the Members of Parliament shall be paid a salary for their services.

6. We demand the Division of the Country into Equal Electoral Districts—by which was meant an equality of *population*, as against mere territorial extent.

Such, in brief, was the code of political doctrines under which the Chartist reformers of 1838 went forth to agitate the country.

To the reader of to-day it must appear a matter of astonishment that the representatives of the working classes of Great Britain should have been called upon, at a time within the memory of men still living, to defend and advocate political principles so self-evident and common-sense as those declared in the Charter;

and his wonder must be raised to amazement when he is told that the whole governing power of Great Britain, the King, the Ministry, the House of Lords, the House of Commons, the Tories as a party, the Whigs as a party, and—all party divisions aside—the great Middle Class of Englishmen—set themselves in horrified antagonism to the Charter and its advocates, as though the former were the most incendiary document in the world, and the latter a rabble of radicals gathered from the purlieus of the French Revolution. How can such an incredible fact in the present-century history of Great Britain be explained and interpreted?

In the first place, the great Reform Bill of 1832 had proved a signal failure. This is said with respect to the workingmen of Great Britain—to the masses of the people. That bill had been agitated in the first place by the well-to-do Middle Class of Englishmen. The battle for the standard in the Parliamentary war of 1828-32 was between the Middle Class and the Aristocracy. The former fought for an extension of their rights; the latter for the maintenance of their exclusive privileges. But in that contest neither the representatives of the Middle Class nor the representatives of the Aristocracy had had the slightest care for the interests of the working masses—for the rights of the real people of England. Nevertheless, the real people had been profoundly agitated by the Middle Class orators and statesmen, and had been led to believe that the Reform Bill was intended to remove the evils under which the workingmen of Great Britain toiled on in the obscure drama of poverty from birth to death.

The real people of England were thus enlisted in favor of the reform measures of 1832, and followed the banners of Earl Grey, Sir Robert Peel, and Lord John Russell. But what was the chagrin, mortification, disappointment, and, presently, the rage of the workingmen when, after the passage of the Reform Bill, they began to perceive that, so far as themselves were concerned, the measure had been a delusion and a snare. They saw, after five years of bitterness, that though great benefits had been derived from the bill by the Middle Class, no benefit whatever had reached themselves. They beheld, moreover, the Whig

party withdraw from them and stand aloof, as though it would affiliate with that very Aristocracy from whose hands the Reform Bill had been so hardly wrung. Henceforth in the ears of the toiling masses the word *Reform*, used in connection with the Parliamentary measures of 1832, sounded as a mockery, and the mention of it began to awaken on the features of all workingmen, from the hard-handed artisans of London to the soot-smutted miners of Wales, a sardonic grin, presently stiffening into a frown of un-speakable hatred. Such was the principal antecedent of the agitation which arose under the Charter.

Other causes cooperated with the principal cause. The amendment to the Poor Laws, while correct in principle and ultimately vindicated in practice, for the present worked hardship and engendered dissatisfaction. Beyond all this, the working people of England were, at this time, ignorant to the last degree. They knew only in a certain vague way that they were oppressed, that they were suffering. They knew enough to perceive that the products of their toil went to enrich the landed gentry, or to fill the coffers of great merchants and manufacturers. Superstition had not yet loosened its hold upon the popular imagination. Ignorant leaders came forth like apparitions, first, to deceive, and then disappoint, the masses. One of these, by the name of Thom, a bankrupt brewer and half-madman, appeared in Canterbury, proposing to lead the people. He called himself Sir William Courtenay, of Powderham Castle, Knight of Malta, King of Jerusalem. Multitudes followed him about, until presently, near the gates of Canterbury, he and some of his principal followers, at the head of a large body of rioters, were shot dead in a conflict with the militia. But the fanatics who followed his banner believed that their leader would come forth by resurrection, and at length conduct them to social happiness and plenty. The industrial districts of England were rife with such delusions, and the existence of the insurrectionary tendency among the working-classes was used by the Middle-Class Whigs as an excuse for inclining to the side of conservatism, and for locking with strong chains the wheels of the car of reform.

But there were not wanting in England certain brave spirits warmed with the enthusiasm

of humanity, fearing not the menace of political ostracism, dreading not even the dungeon and the gibbet, who took up the People's Charter, so-called, and went forth among the masses to defend and advocate its doctrines. Among these, several names were conspicuous. First of all may be mentioned Feargus O'Connor, who was, perhaps, the most popular and vehement of all the Chartist leaders. Thomas Cooper, a poet of no mean capacity, a philanthropist in word and deed, buoyed up the cause of Chartism with tongue and pen. In the eighth decade of the present century the lecture-goers of the United States were called, time and again, to hear the silvery tones of the voice of an aged Englishman. He was a veritable Saxon. His full beard and mustache were long and white. He was short and thick in figure, of florid complexion; and those fierce blue eyes, which he had taken by heredity from his Teutonic ancestors in the Hollowlands along the Baltic, by turns blazed with the fierceness of his earnest convictions, or beamed with the benignity of his generous spirit. Great were the themes which he presented on the American platform. Eloquence was the old man as he delineated some of the leading vicissitudes of English history, or portrayed the thrilling crises of Continental society. Without note or memorandum, he spoke for hours without a pause, and his hearers sat enraptured. On his last round before the free people of the West, the old man's right thumb was covered with the black stall which concealed the incipient felon destined to cause his death. He is gone. It was Henry Vincent, the Chartist orator, who, in 1828, suffered imprisonment in Wales for advocating the People's Charter.

Chartism became popular throughout England. The chief seats of the agitation were in the manufacturing and commercial cities. In all such situations the Chartists became numerous and powerful. The leaders, as a class, were men of the highest respectability and most earnest purpose. In some instances, mere factionists and adventurers, having everything to gain and nothing to lose, threw in their fortunes with the cause, and generally brought disgrace upon it. But for the rest, the movement was directed by an intelligent enthusiasm for which it would be

difficult to find a parallel as the prime motive of any other political agitation. It can not be denied—and it was a fact, indeed, gloried in by the Chartist reformers themselves—that the multitudes who followed in the wake were men of low degree, drawn from the mines and factories, the dirty streets of cities, and the humble shops of country villages. This mass, however, constituted a large part of the English *people*, and their struggle for emancipation was among the noblest of the popular excitements of the century.


The methods, moreover, adopted by the Chartist leaders to secure their ends were in the highest degree commendable. The orators went from city to city, from village to village, speaking to the throngs that gathered to share a common enthusiasm and to hear discussed the principles of the People's Charter. Torch-light processions, popular dinners, and multitudinous gatherings became the order of the day, and the movement presently gathered such head that the Government, not without reason, grew apprehensive of a political upheaval in the kingdom. As a rule, all the English artisans and the producing classes, properly so-called, espoused the Chartist cause. The Ministry and Parliament became alarmed, and strenuous measures were adopted to prevent the further spread of the excitement, and to trammel up the consequences of the work already done.

The Chartist meetings began to be broken up, and the leaders to be prosecuted. One of the severest crises was that attendant upon the effort to release Henry Vincent from prison at Newport. For this purpose a vast force of workmen was crudely organized, under the leadership of a Newport trader by the name of Frost. He was assisted by several others, and his forces were arranged in three columns, to converge on Newport at a certain hour of the night; but the movements of the rude insurgents were so irregular that only the column headed by Frost arrived at the scene of action at the appointed time. This division was confronted by the city authorities, and a collision occurred, in which the workmen were dispersed. Frost and the other leaders were taken, tried, convicted, and condemned to death. The sentence was not carried into execution, but was commuted into banishment

for life. Three of the leaders were sent to the penal colonies; but in course of time the animosity of the Government was cooled, and those of the condemned Chartists who had not died in the interim regained their freedom.

It was long to follow the destinies of the agitation during the next ten years. The movement ebbed and flowed. Those of the Chartist leaders who had espoused the cause through an unselfish enthusiasm, inspired by sympathy for the woes of the English masses, held stoutly on. Persecutions and prosecu-

Jamaica. It grew out of the abolition of slavery in that country, and of a struggle between the old masters and the freedmen, not unlike the chaos which ensued in the Southern States in the decade succeeding the American Civil War. On the whole, the Imperial Government of Jamaica, that is, the Governor, the Council, and the other royal officers, favored the maintenance of the rights of the enfranchised classes in the island. But the Assembly, representing the old dominant master-class of the people, planted themselves



VIEW OF JAMAICA.

tions did not appall them; imprisonment, and even death, did not suffice to still their voices. We shall hereafter see that as late as 1848 the Chartists, as a party, were as numerous and powerful, as capable of shaking the country with their tread, as they had been in the spring-tide of the agitation.

The Ministry of Melbourne now tottered to its fall. The circumstance which was destined to give the *coup de grace* to that rather long-lived and little sensational Cabinet related to the administration of affairs in the island of

against the freedmen, and a clash thus arose in the heart of the Government.

The question was one which greatly puzzled the Ministry; but the Gordian knot was cut at length by an act suspending or abrogating the Jamaican Constitution. This measure was violently opposed by Sir Robert Peel and the Conservatives on the one side, and by the Radicals on the other. The latter now constituted a considerable body in Parliament. They had, in the times of the Reform agitation, followed the Whig banner with enthusiasm; but,

like the Chartists, of which they were really the representatives, they had eaten the worm-wood and drank the gall of bitterness and disappointment on account of the small outcome of the Reform movement to popular liberty. The combined attack of the two wings was more than the Melbourne Ministry could stand. The Premier resigned his place, and suggested to the Queen that she call Sir Robert Peel to the head of the Government.

Between the larger paragraphs of English greatness are interlarded many paragraphs of English littleness. We here come to one of those extraordinary episodes in the Parliamentary history of Great Britain which may well excite a smile on the lips of posterity. The young Queen of the United Kingdom had her royal household after the manner of her ancestry. Among the personages composing the household, two of the most important were the Ladies of the Bed-chamber. This delicate office of personal and intimate attendance on the Queen had been given to the wife of Lord Normanby and the sister of Lord Morpeth, afterwards Lord Carlisle. These two noblemen had both been holding high offices under the Whigs. The first had been Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and the second, Irish Secretary in the same Administration. But these officers had, of course, gone down with the Whig Ministry of Melbourne. The question was whether the wife of the one and the sister of the other, Ladies of the Bed-chamber to the Queen, should or should not go out of place with the Ministry. When Sir Robert Peel went to the Queen to accept from her the office of Premier, he thought he discovered a specter, two specters indeed, in Her Majesty's bed-chamber. He conceived that the retention of two eminent Whig ladies in closest attendance upon their royal mistress would break the efficiency of the new Conservative Ministry about to be formed. He, therefore, rather abruptly and without due tact, demanded that the Queen's ladies-in-waiting should share the fate of the fallen Ministry.

The young Queen was shocked at the proposition. She had become greatly attached to the ladies who were now regarded as a menace to Sir Robert and his Conservatives. She accordingly consulted with Lord John Russell, and, on his advice, replied to Sir Robert that

she could not consent to a course which she conceived to be contrary to usage, and which was so greatly repugnant to her feelings. Sir Robert thereupon refused to accept the Government, and made a high-sounding oration in Parliament in defense of his position. A Ministerial crisis was thus produced, and the Queen was obliged to recall Lord Melbourne to the head of the Government. The excitement growing out of this "Question of the Bed-chamber," as it was called, spread through the country, and a considerable interval elapsed before Parliament swung back into its customary mood.

The return of Lord Melbourne to the head of the Government was only for a brief season. On resuming office he was still confronted with the Jamaica Bill. That measure had to be modified and remodified under the dictation of the Opposition, until its leading features were tinkered away. Even these beatings about could not save the already discredited Whig party from rout and overthrow. The Ministry staggered on for a brief season, and was driven finally from power to make way, in September of 1841, for the accession of Sir Robert Peel and the Conservatives.

The attention of the British public could but be called, at an early date, to the question of the succession. Here, indeed, was a Maiden Queen on the throne of England. As for the rest, the English Guelphs were well-nigh extinguished. The great family of George III. had come to this: a modest, quiet, and not uncommonly young woman on the English throne. Nor was the Queen herself unmindful of the situation. Girlish fancy, as well as Imperial duty, had suggested to her the desirability—the necessity—of marriage. To her credit he it said, that she was totally devoid of that unwomanly pride which flamed in the bosom of Elizabeth Tudor, making her prefer the singleness and selfishness of royal power to the charms of wifehood and motherhood. At the opening of Parliament, in 1840, Victoria appeared in person, and declared her intention to be married to her cousin, Prince Albert of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha. The young Majesty said in her speech, that she trusted that the step which she was about to take would be conducive to the interests of her people as well as to her own domestic happiness. It was

known that the royal marriage thus announced was, both on the Queen's part and the part of the Prince, an affair of the heart, rather than an affair of royal and political convenience.

The event fully justified public expectation. Prince Albert was eminently worthy of the trying station to which he was called. His situation was peculiar in the last degree. From one point of view, it seemed that the law of nature was reversed and made of no effect by the Constitution of Great Britain. The Prince was the husband of the Queen, but the law of affection came in to rectify and amend the hardship to which the husband was subjected; and there can be no doubt that while the Queen henceforth held the scepter over his head, he to the end of life held an equally imperial scepter over her heart.

It may well be asked, especially in a Republic like ours, what part or lot Prince Albert, in such a situation, had, or could have, with respect to the public affairs of the kingdom. Was he simply a cipher by the side of that significant unit, the Queen? or might he be reckoned among the political and civil forces of the reign? In the first place, the Prince was by nature and discipline a gentleman and scholar. The domestic pursuits charmed him from his boyhood. In his intellectual preferences he chose art and education as the two subjects most congenial to his taste, and to these elevating branches of culture he devoted himself with assiduity. He became the patron of many of the noblest enterprises of the Victorian era; and although never what might be called a popular prince among the people to whom he was set in such strange relation, he nevertheless exercised on the men and manners of his time a most wholesome influence, the effects of which have not yet passed away. Nor may we overlook his equally salutary, though indirect, influence on the Queen, and through the Queen on the Ministry, the Parliament, the whole Administration of Great Britain. In this respect he was a moderating and conservative force, checking, as far as he might, the evil consequences of party legislation and the rage of politics. He was in all respects a cautious, prudent man, little disposed to interfere, except with affectionate advice, in the affairs of the

august personage by his side. His patronage of art and learning endeared him in a high degree to the intellectual classes of England. Painters and poets sought his company, and scientific men, laboring in the dark mines of truth from which new laws of the world are drawn forth and elucidated for the benefit of mankind, turned ever to Prince Albert as to a wise counselor and steadfast friend.

Some of the incidents of the Prince's career, after his union with the Queen, may well be narrated. At the outset he was subjected to a humiliation in Parliament, by the



PRINCE ALBERT.

reduction of the proposed annuity of fifty thousand pounds to thirty thousand pounds—this the work of the Tory Opposition. His good sense, however, led him to make no sign, and presently afterwards he received the great compliment of being declared Regent in case of the Queen's death with issue. In this case the Opposition joined with the Ministry, and the act was passed by unanimous vote. It can not be doubted that the measure contributed not a little to the dignified estimate which was henceforth placed on the Prince by the English people. Ever afterwards he constituted a kind of outside Privy Council to the

Queen and extant Ministry; nor would it be easy to point out, in the twenty-one years of his life subsequent to the royal marriage, a single instance in which his influence was exercised to the hurt of the British Nation.

Meanwhile, the Prince set his mind on the accomplishment of many improvements and reforms in the existing order. In the early years of his ascendancy he undertook, among other things, to effect the abolition of dueling in the army. The Prince's project contemplated the establishment of a system of Courts of Honor, before which the difficulties constantly arising between officers and among soldiers, might be arbitrated without appeal to the barbarous code duello. In this work he secured the cooperation of the Duke of Wellington, and, although the measure of establishing courts failed of adoption, the attitude of the Prince, and of those statesmen who espoused his views, prevailed over the brutal usages of the past to the extent of their extinction. Dueling, as a practice among public men and soldiers, disappeared from English society, if not as a direct result of the enlightened agitation started by Prince Albert, at least coincidently with the effort which he made in that direction.

Following the course of events, we come now to consider the history of the so-called OPIUM WAR between England and China. The circumstances leading to this unfortunate and disgraceful catastrophe had their root partly in the industrial and political constitution of the Chinese Empire, partly in the commercial transactions of the British East India Company; but, more properly, in the wanton avarice and conscienceless policy of the Home Government of Great Britain. The matter at issue related to the introduction and sale of opium by British traders in the ports of China. Such importation had begun under the auspices of the East India Company, and was carried on by that gigantic corporation until 1834, when the charter and exclusive rights of the company expired. Meanwhile, the opium-trade had become important. Many districts in India produce the poppy in exuberant abundance. The drug drawn therefrom was carried by the ships of the Company to the Chinese ports, and sold to native merchants, under whose encouragement the opium-smok-

ing habit spread rapidly among the people. The Imperial Government took the alarm, and adopted the policy of excluding the opium-ships from all the harbors of China.

The measures looking to this end were reasonable in the highest degree. The right of the Chinese authorities to protect the people of the Empire from the disastrous effects of the opium-habit could not be gainsaid with the slightest show of reason. The trade in opium had, meanwhile, passed from the monopoly of the British East India Company to the general merchant-marine of the kingdom. At this time the ports which were open to English commerce and English intercourse in general were Canton and Macao. In these ports of entry the British Government had planted superintendents, whose conduct, instead of being directed with judicial fairness and in accordance with the principles of international law, was wholly biased by the interests of the illicit trade of their countrymen.

Nor did the Home Government in this emergency take the first step towards the maintenance of right and honor in its dealing with the Chinese authorities. Even when Captain Elliott, chief superintendent in the port of Canton, made one appeal after another to the Ministry for instructions covering the discharge of his duties, he received no reply. Matters were allowed to drift in their own pernicious course. The British traders became bolder and bolder, discharging enormous cargoes of the deadly drug under the very eyes of the Chinese officers. After a while the Government sent out a dispatch to Captain Elliott, telling him virtually that those who traded in opium against the edict of the Emperor would have to take the consequences; that the British authorities would not interfere to protect those merchants who were engaged in the illicit trade, but that they must bear such losses as their own persistency and the execution of the Chinese laws might entail. This was equivalent to saying that the British traders in the East might provoke a war with China, with the implied inference that, *after the war was begun*, Great Britain would defend her interests without looking into the justice or injustice of the conflict. It was clear that as soon as hostilities should be precipitated, excesses would be committed by the Chinese, unac-

quainted as they were with the usages of European warfare, and that the Home Government of England would be obliged to take up the cause of its traders and other subjects on the coast of China.

The war came on. The Imperial officers in the Chinese ports demanded that the introduction of opium should absolutely cease, and that the cargoes now in store should be given up for destruction. At length, in 1839, Captain Elliott was constrained to comply with this demand. It was agreed that all the opium then in the hands of Englishmen should be surrendered to the native officers, and he also exacted a pledge—of no validity—from the merchants that they would cease to traffic in the drug. Accordingly, on the 3d of April, in the year just named, 20,383 chests of opium were given up to the mandarins, and, under direction of the Imperial Commissioner Lin, were destroyed. It was this event—though the same had been brought about in virtual conformity with the instructions which Captain Elliott had received—that precipitated hostilities. A declaration of war was made by the English Government in 1840, and the East Indian fleet was sent to the Chinese coast. Native armies were thrown into the field; but in the conflict which ensued they were like sheep for the slaughter. There could be but one result. What could the diminutive, undisciplined, half-armed men of the Orient, though fired with the valor of Spartans, do before the shining bayonets and vomiting cannon of Great Britain?

As a matter of course, the English were constantly victorious. In the first year the British fleet captured the town of Chusan, and in 1841 the Bogue Forts were easily taken. It is narrated that when one of the Chinese towns was captured, the Tartar general, in the hour of defeat, shut himself up in his house, and ordered his servants to burn him to death. It was the custom of the routed Chinese to drive their wives and children into wells and ponds, and then cut their own throats in the very frenzy of their hopeless rage. When the British squadron sailed up the river Peiho against the Chinese capital, some futile efforts were made at negotiations, but the movement came to naught. The important city of Ningpo, distant somewhat from

the sea, was taken, and then Amoy—far to the south, fell into the hands of the British.

Not, however, until an army was planted in front of Nankin, did the Imperial Government realize the hopelessness of further resistance. Negotiations were again opened, which soon resulted in a treaty—a treaty as one-sided in its provisions as the war had been in its results. The island of Hong Kong was ceded to Great Britain. It was agreed that British consuls should be established in the five great ports of Canton—Amoy, Foochow, Ningpo, and Shanghai—and that those places should be thrown open to British traders. Finally, an indemnity of four and a half million pounds sterling was wrung from the Chinese Government as the price of the war, and to this was added another large sum to pay for the opium which had been destroyed at the outbreak of hostilities. The treaty was as humiliating to the Chinese as the war itself had been an outrage to their nationality. If there be a single instance in the recent history of mankind more highly illustrative of the possible meanness, avarice, and arrogance of the strong—an example of the willful persecution and unmerited punishment of an unoffending people by one less numerous, but more mighty than themselves—it is that of the Opium War of Great Britain with China.

We are now come to the epoch in British history when the Melbourne Ministry, the ascendancy of which had reached well back into the last reign, tottered and fell. The Whig Government, represented by this Ministry, had been for some time in a moribund condition. If we glance into Parliament at the close of 1840, we shall see a Government respected by no party, not even by itself; yet the Whigs clung to power. Time and again the Ministry was beaten on important votes in the House of Commons; but Lord Melbourne still clung to his office. It was a time of temporizing and political expedients, most of which were adopted merely for the purpose of holding the party in power. In the many months of the decadence of the Ministry, however, several measures were either originated or promoted, the value of which after times have been quick to perceive and augment.

First among the popular movements belonging to this time may be mentioned the

establishment of a SYSTEM OF PUBLIC EDUCATION in Great Britain. In this important enterprise we see again illustrated the ever-recurring fact that in the British system of state and society, everything is the result of growth. It might be impossible to point out a single striking feature in the great nationality of the England of the present day which has not proceeded from some germinal beginning in the past, been promoted in the planting and development by the courage and foresight of a few progressive Englishmen, opposed and assailed by the majority, pushed up and out against such opposition by the inherent vitality of the measure, and brought finally to efflorescence and fruiting by that simple law of social evolution against the operation of which neither men nor nations can prevail. So it was in the case of the project for the establishment of a system of public education.

It was in the year 1834 that the first grant of public money was made by Parliament for the education of the children of the people. It was the meagre sum of twenty thousand pounds a year. Even this pittance, given forth from that treasury which had poured out immemorably its multiplied millions and billions for the prosecution of wars, was virtually a contribution to the Church of England rather than to the common people. There had been organized in connection with the Established Church what was called the National School Society. There also existed another body, called the Foreign School Association, which actually went so far in the direction of radicalism as to admit to its benefits children of all Christian denominations. While the efforts of the National School Society were directed wholly to the educational work of the Church of England, the sister organization went so far as to promote the education of the children even of Dissenters.

It was into the hands of these two societies that the annual Parliamentary appropriation of twenty thousand pounds was directed; and by these two societies the money was expended up to the year 1839. To this time no effort whatever had been made in Great Britain to extend, under the patronage of the Government, the advantages of education to the masses of the people. Up to this time a scheme looking to a system of common secular educa-

tion reaching to the poor would have been regarded with horror by the most progressive statesmen of the country. In 1839, however, a bill was introduced by Lord John Russell, increasing the annual appropriation to thirty thousand pounds, and at the same time providing that the distribution of the funds should be transferred to a Committee of the Privy Council. Hitherto the money had been annually distributed precisely where it was not needed, and withheld from the very places which were crying to Heaven for such assistance. Under the new scheme of disbursement the method was reversed, and the benefits of the measure extended to those poor and crowded localities which were thronged with the children of the people. It was actually conceded that the aid of the law might be extended to schools in which the Roman Catholic version of the Bible was read! The measure was at once vehemently assailed by the Opposition. It was declared that to extend the aid of the Government to schools not under the control and direction of the Church of England was an outrage on the Constitution of Great Britain, a menace to religion and morality, a measure for the propagation of heresy and incendiarism in both Church and State.

Great was the clamor over Lord John Russell's Bill. The measure at length prevailed, and the foundations were thus laid for the great system of popular education since established and developed in Great Britain. But we can not pass from the subject without noting with amazement, and for the instruction of all who are interested in studying the evolution of enlightenment among the nations, and especially the slow progress of the coming dawn in the brains of the great, that the Russell Bill was opposed in Parliament with both the voices and the votes of Sir Robert Peel, Lord Stanley, William E. Gladstone, and Benjamin Disraeli. Nor may we pass without mentioning the other fact, that the measure contemplating the establishment of secular schools in the United Kingdom was supported by Daniel O'Connell and Smith O'Brien—a fact giving as good cause for pride among the Irish people as may ever be given to the present on account of anything done in the past.

Some honor may therefore be claimed for the Melbourne Ministry as having had under its

patronage and direction the first formal measure for the secular education of the English people. Meanwhile, an incident in the history of the Parliamentary government of this epoch may well be cited as illustrative of the tendencies of civil procedure. It was the law of Parliament that the reports of its committees should be published for the information of the body and the people. A certain prison report, made near the beginning of 1840, contained a paragraph denouncing a book published by a certain Stockdale, as a work at once disgusting and obscene. For this publication the author of the book brought suit for libel against the Parliamentary printers, and obtained judgment against them. But the House of Commons refused to acknowledge the validity of a judgment against its officers or agents for doing what the House had directed them to do. An issue was thus made between the Queen's Bench on the one side, and the Commons on the other. The sheriffs, ordered to carry out the judgment of the Court, were arrested by authority of the House, and for some time it looked as though the High Court of England and the House of Commons would end the matter by arresting and imprisoning each other! At length, however, Parliament gained the day, and an act was passed exempting, for the future, the officers of the House from such interference and prosecution as they had recently suffered. The incident is cited here to illustrate the general law that under the governmental and civil systems, established by the English-speaking race, conflicts and disputes between the Legislative and the Judiciary nearly always conclude with a victory of the former over the latter.

Still another historical incident may serve to show the spirit and manner of the times. If we look in on London in the year 1840, we shall find no public institution more worthy of commendation, more honorable to the genius of the English people, than the British Museum. The institution was, by the law of its government, open to the public, but on Sundays it was closed. In July of the year just referred to, Joseph Hume, an enlightened and progressive member of the House of Commons, hoping on the principle of counter-attraction to draw large numbers of people of the poorer class away from the purlicues of

vice and degradation, and to raise them somewhat to a higher and purer plane of thought by the contemplation of the grand and beautiful, introduced a bill that the British Museum and the National Gallery of Art should be opened at certain hours on Sunday. Mr Hume carefully provided that the opening should be *after* the conclusion of divine service in the churches and, more particularly, "at such hours as *taverns, beer-shops, and gin-shops are legally opened.*" The proposition was met with invective and the appeal to the *odium theologium*. Mr. Hume was denounced as a covert enemy of the Sabbath day, a foe to the Church, and a dangerous man to society, because he had introduced a bill which might serve to draw some thousands of people on Sunday afternoons from the sacred association of the gin-shops to the degrading influences of the British Museum!

Passing from these minor incidents in the civil history of the Kingdom, we come to consider a very important and serious aspect of foreign affairs. It was at this time that Great Britain was drawn by her interest, and under the policy which she had prescribed for herself, to a stern and warlike interference in the affairs of the East. The scene was Egypt and Syria. In the former country the ruler, at this epoch, under the general suzerainty of the Turkish Sultan, was the famous Pasha Mehemet Ali. He was a warrior, a statesman, a man of genius, despising the Sultan, his master, and having a general contempt for the methods of government employed by the Sublime Porte. It is quite likely that Mehemet Ali was ambitious of establishing an independent sovereignty. Quite like him in character and abilities was his adopted son, Ibrahim Pasha, General of the Egyptian army. To him Mehemet Ali looked for the conduct of his wars.

The Porte, at this time, had fallen into that chronic decline which, though seemingly destined never to destroy, has, since the beginning of the century, fatally afflicted the Ottoman Empire. The outlying provinces and dependencies of Turkey were subject to the prey of whoever might go forth to ravage. To Mehemet Ali, Syria was the inviting field. He carried thither his victorious arms, and made a conquest of the country. The Sultan

was constrained for a while to let his powerful vassal have his way, but at length, in 1839, declared war against him. A decisive battle was fought, and Ibrahim Pasha gained a great victory over the Turks. The Sultan died, Capitan Pasha, Admiral of the Ottoman fleet, deserted to the Egyptians, and the event of

and territorial integrity of the Turkish Empire. It is not the place in which to explain the origin and true nature of this theory, which has been so prominent in the diplomacy of the States of Western Europe during the greater part of the present century. It is germane, however, to the question immediately




MEHEMET ALI PASHA.

Egyptian independence, with the consequent loss to Turkey of all the countries around the eastern and south-eastern borders of the Mediterranean, knocked at the door.

It will be remembered that the well-known policy of the Western Powers, particularly of England, was, at the time of which we speak, and since has been, to maintain the political

before us to note the fact that, of all the Western Kingdoms, Great Britain was most devotedly and consistently attached to the principle of maintaining the unity and independence of the Ottoman Power. On the other hand, France was least devoted to the same principle. Prussia and Austria were devoted to it in a general way. Russia was

devoted to it, not devoted to it, or devoted to it of Catherine II., the Russian power has been in a measure, as suited the interest and passion slowly but surely, like one of the avalanches



PALL MALL. 40. ST. JAMES'S PLACE.

of the hour. The reader of general history will readily recall the fact that, since the days of Peter I., more particularly since the days of the Alps, sliding down from the north-east upon the lowlands of the Ottoman. It will also be remembered that the necessity, or

seeming necessity, of resisting this pressure had been the mainspring of the policy adopted by the Western Powers to uphold the integrity and autonomy of Turkey.

The threatened establishment of an independent Egypt under the sovereignty of Mehemet Ali seemed to contravene the general purpose of Western Europe, and England resolved to interfere. An English fleet was accordingly despatched to the Mediterranean, and uniting with the Turkish squadron, proceeded to the bombardment of Acre. An English army in Egypt, allied with Turkish and Egyptian forces, attacked the strongholds of Mehemet, and drove him thence with great losses. Ibrahim Pasha, though he had shown himself more than a match for the native armies of the Orient could not resist the impact of British bayonets and British cannon. Mehemet Ali was obliged to give up the hopeless contest, and to content himself with a restricted government in Egypt. All of his Asiatic conquests were wrested from him and restored to the Porte. Ambassadors representing the parties to the controversy came together in London, and in July of 1840 the terms of settlement were arranged and signed by the Western Powers.

They were signed by all but France. In that country Louis Philippe was now king, and Adolphe Thiers was his Minister of State. It was the belief of Thiers that the whole business in Egypt had been fomented and managed by Great Britain in her own interest. The belief was not without foundation. Thiers was enraged at beholding the covert elevation of the British standard in the East. He conceived that France had been disparaged in the whole course of the Egyptian complication, and that the disparagement was the careful work of Great Britain. He declared his purpose of going to war sooner than submit to the humiliation of his country. The king, however, and the government as a whole, refused to follow the bellicose Prime Minister, and he was at length obliged to resign his office. M. Guizot succeeded to the leadership of the French Cabinet, and in July of 1841 the Treaty of London was signed by the representative of France. Thus, for the decade which we are here considering, was the Eastern question disposed of under the auspices of England.

During all these events, the Whig Ministry of Melbourne stumbled on in paralytic fashion to the inevitable downfall. The straw which at last broke the camel's back was a proposition introduced by Lord Russell, then in the Ministry, with regard to regulating the trade in corn.¹ His proposition was to establish a duty at a fixed rate of eight shillings the quarter on wheat, with proportional rates for the other cereals, rye, barley, oats, etc. His proposition was a concession to the principle of free trade, which was just then beginning to claim, as it never had claimed before, the attention of the British public. Being so, the proposition of Russell was in the nature of an explosive with a lighted fuse in the mid-ear of the Ministry. Melbourne, and the rest who were vehement protectionists, must either follow for the free-trade modification of the corn laws, or else combat the proposition of Russell and give up their offices. Such was the condition of affairs when at last Sir Robert Peel, in June of 1841, brought forward the proposal in the House of Commons of a direct vote of want of confidence in the Ministry. The resolution was adopted by a majority of one. Parliament was dissolved. The Tories came back in the early autumn with a great accretion of strength. Melbourne and his colleagues resigned, and a new Conservative Ministry was organized under the Premiership of Sir Robert Peel.

The auspices of the new Tory, or, as it was now called, Conservative Government, may be said to have been favorable at home, unfavorable abroad. It was in the early days of Sir Robert's Administration that the news began to be borne to London of the direful disasters which had overtaken the British authorities, civil and military, in Cabul. The city so-called is the capital of the State of the same name, in the northern part of Afghanistan. If we look into this far region, in the year 1837, we shall find on the throne of Cabul a native prince by the name of Dost Mohammed. He was, in a certain sense, a usurper; that is, he had led a popular revolution against Shah Soojah Moolk, the old so-called legitimate sovereign of Cabul, and had expelled both him and his house.

¹The reader will understand that *corn*, in the English phraseology, is the generic name for the several varieties of cereal grains, and not particularly of the grain so called in America.

Dost Mohammed established himself in the kingdom, and set his brothers and sons at the head of the petty subject States—this with the enthusiastic approval of the popular revolutionary party.

The reader might well ask by what possible construction of international politics this course and condition of affairs in Cabul could be of the slightest interest to Great Britain. Why should England concern herself in the least about the destinies resulting from a revolution in a petty kingdom in Northern Afghanistan? A full answer to these questions would require the exposition of many international policies and a mass of details which might well fill a volume. It is sufficient for our purpose to summarize the leading features of the complication; to express, if we may, in a few paragraphs, the essence of this far-off Asiatic imbroglio. First of all we must consider the British East Indian Empire. This vast Power, at the time of which we speak, was already stretching out its long and sinewy arms from Calcutta over the Indian populations, numbering in the aggregate much more than a hundred millions. Some of the provinces of India were actually subject to the authority of Great Britain; others had alliances of friendship and dependence with her; and still others, while maintaining a show of independence, were overawed by her presence and scepter.

One of the countries thus dependent by alliance with the East Indian Government of Great Britain, was the Punjab. This great province, embracing the Upper Indus Valley, lay next to the borders of Afghanistan. The Ameer of the Punjab was a friend and dependent of the East Indian Government. It was to him, for friendship and protection, that the overthrown Shah Soojah, of Cabul, with the members of his family and a few of the princes who had adhered to his cause, fled after the revolution effected in Cabul by Dost Mohammed. Such was the situation, viewed from the English side of the landscape.

Consider, in the next place, the colossal power of Russia. There she lies, with extended dominions, like a great shadow, yea, like a great substance, over all the north-western parts of Asia. Her policy of territorial aggrandizement was well known and well

dreaded at the time of which we speak. Friendly were her relations with the Shah of Persia. The Czar patronized the Shah, treated him like a small kinsman, used him like a friendly puppet, protected him, encouraged him, finally put him out as a feeder in the direction of Afghanistan. In other words, it was on the line of Cabul that the conflicting interests, or rather ambitions, of Great Britain and Russia met in the East, as they had already met in the West, on the line of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles. The figure is sufficiently ridiculous; but at this time Russia was the monkey of Asia; Persia was the cat; Cabul was the cat's-paw, and India was the oven, in which were roasting the English chestnuts. To complete the fiction, a lion was lying by the door of the oven!

All this was by hypothesis. Overt acts as yet there had been none. But the situation was such, in the estimation of both Great Britain and Russia, as to make it desirable to have the alliance of Dost Mohammed. At this time there was resident at that monarch's court a certain Alexander Burnes, kinsman, though the name be differently spelled, of the poet Burns, of great memory. The Englishman had gone from India into Afghanistan and Cabul. There he found Dost Mohammed favorable to an alliance with England. But he also found the emissaries of Russia at the court, busy with their schemes and temptations. Dost Mohammed desired, as the sequel has shown, to go with England. But, through some perversity and blindness, the British East Indian Government had determined to undertake the restoration of Shah Soojah, the obsolete king of Cabul, to the throne of his ancestors. This, of course, compelled Dost Mohammed to fall over towards the side of Persia and Russia. At this juncture the Governor-General of India, in pursuance of his folly, sent out an army by way of the Punjab to conduct Shah Moolk back to his dominions. The policy of Lord Auckland, the Governor-General, in this particular, had the full concurrence and support of the Home Government of Great Britain. The British force was under command of Sir W. Macnaghten, whose second in command was General Elphinstone. It appears that there was on the part of the leaders of the expedition the

terior object of obtaining for themselves diplomatical positions at the Court of Shah Soojah, whom they were carrying along with them, like an East Indian idol, to be set up again in his palace at Cabul. Lofty ambition



DOST MOHAMMED KHAN.

on the part of Sir W. Maenaghten to be enjoy extraordinary at such a court, in such a place, under such conditions!

In the meantime, hostilities had begun by an attack of the Persians on the city of Herat, popularly designated as the "key of India." The place is situated on the lines of communication between the plateau of Asia and the valley of the Indus. It lies five hundred and fifty miles eastward of Cabul. In 1837, Herat was besieged by a Persian army of about thirty-five thousand men. The native prince, in defending his city, was assisted by Colonel Eldred Pottinger, Commandant of the British garrison in Herat. It was to his abilities and courage, rather than to the valor of the native troops, that the Persian force was held at bay and finally beaten off.

By the beginning of October, 1838, Sir W. Maenaghten had collected his forces west of the Indus, and thence set out on his ill-starred expedition for the restoration of Shah Soojah to the throne of Cabul. The movement to the interior was valiantly resisted by Dost Mohammed and his sons. The half-wild Afghan soldiery, though unable to stand in battle before the disciplined army of Great Britain, nevertheless fought as for their altars

and native land. It was manifest from the first that so far from any uprising of the people in favor of Shah Soojah, Dost Mohammed held the complete and universal allegiance of his subjects. They rallied to his standard, and threw themselves in the advance and on the flanks of the British army. They planted themselves in the town of Ghuznee, where they resisted the whole force of their enemy, suffering a siege until what time the British, by heaping bags of gunpowder against one of the gates and blowing open the wall with an explosion, rushed through the breach and took the town. The Afghans retreated, and the way was opened to Jelalabad, which was defended by the celebrated Akbar Khan, one of the sons of Dost Mohammed.

This city was also taken after much hard fighting. The invaders then came to Cabul, from which Dost Mohammed escaped into the open country. Maenaghten's idol, Shah Soojah, was reinstated in his ancient palace; but it was evident from the first that he would have to be maintained in place by the British army. Dost Mohammed rallied his forces and returned to the contest. On the 2d of November, 1840, he fought with the British army a decisive battle, in which only the En-



AKBAR KHAN.


glish artillery prevented the Afghans from winning a clear victory in the field. They were, however, defeated, and on the evening of the same day, Dost Mohammed, of his own accord, rode to the British head-quarters, an-

nounced himself as King of Cabul, and surrendered as a prisoner of war.

The downfall of Mohammed, however, by no means ended the contest. The British army lay in its cantonments at Cabul for a full year, upholding a dubious peace. On the anniversary of Dost Mohammed's battle, namely, November 2, 1841, a popular insurrection broke out in Cabul, which, for violence and horror of details, was almost unparalleled. When Alexander Burnes undertook to appease the rage of the insurgents, he and his brother and

with the knives of the Afghans. The hacked and distigured body of the murdered Englishman was exhibited as a trophy in the bazars of Cabul. Shah Soojah soon afterwards met a similar fate.

The command of the British army was devolved on General Elphinstone, and to him Akbar and his chiefs now dictated whatever terms they would. It appears that in this dreadful emergency the spirit of the British officers and men gave way. They fell into a condition of semi-despair, from which they never



SIR ROBERT AND LADY SALE.


their company were attacked and cut to pieces. Then the flames of revolt broke out on every hand. Akbar Khan became at once the bad and the good angel of the insurrection. He led it, and, at the same time, restrained the savage instincts of his followers to a sort of half-civilized warfare, which was still too horrible to be depicted in language. Sir W. Maenaghten and several of his officers were at length invited to a conference with Akbar and his chiefs. An altercation ensued, and Maenaghten and his companions were butchered

recovered. General Elphinstone even went so far as to appeal to the consideration of Akbar Khan and the Afghan troops! Nor does it appear that Akbar himself was unwilling to show the courtesies of victory to the vanquished. But the chieftains and the half-savage Afghan soldiery could not be restrained. A treaty was made, the terms of which were dictated by Akbar and accepted by Elphinstone. The British army should at once, and without delay, withdraw from Afghanistan to Jelalabad, take up the garrison at the latter

place, leave the country forever, give up hostages for the fulfillment of the compact, receive a conduct on the retreat, cross the Indus out of sight, go

It was now the dead of winter, 1841-42. The army, about sixteen thousand strong, including the allied natives, and bearing along the wives of the living officers and the widow of the murdered Macnaghten, as well as their children and other helpless creatures who had come out with the expedition from India, left Cabul to make its way through the dreadful pass called the Koord Cabul, a horrible mountain gorge five miles in extent, traversed by a

their purpose, or else to put the English still further in his power, demanded that the wives and children should now be given up as the price of liberation for the army. Lady Macnaghten, Lady Sale, whose husband, Sir Robert, was at that time commandant at Jelalabad; Mrs. Stuart, Mrs. Trevor, with her seven children, and some others were accordingly surrendered, in the heart of the Asiatic desolations, to the compassionate keeping of Akbar and his retainers! The remnant of the army was then permitted to pass; but it was the passage of death. The force melted away. Finally it dwindled to a handful. The column



ARRIVAL OF DR. BRYDON AT JELALABAD.

roaring torrent now frozen into a glacier, and covered with impassable accumulations of snow. It were long to tell the story of that awful march. It may well be within the limits of truth to aver that, for horror and despair, no other such retreat is known in the history of the world! The fugitives toiled on through the snows, freezing, starving, dropping dead of despair, thinned at the rear and on both flanks by the cruel bullets of treacherous foes, and finally coming against an impassible barricade which the Ghilzies had thrown up across the pass. Akbar Khan, either trying to buy off his own chieftains from


was still on the road to Jelalabad, where General Sale was holding out against the enemy; but Akbar Khan had compelled Elphinstone, as commander in chief, to agree that Sale should evacuate Jelalabad, join the fugitives, and fly from the country. But there were soon no fugitives to join. Arriving within a few miles of Jelalabad only six men out of the sixteen thousand were alive. Five of these were struck down before the fortress was reached. Doctor Brydon was the solitary fugitive who at last tottered up half-dead against the gate of Jelalabad to recite the story of the most appalling disaster, the most

shameful overthrow, the most cruel destruction, which had ever overtaken a British army.

The sequel is soon told. Akbar Khan had had his revenge. Even the raging fury of his chieftains must have been satisfied. The tide of disaster was stayed at Jelalabad. General Sale refused to recognize the validity of the terms which had been extorted from Elphinstone. He defended the city, and the Afghans were driven back. General Pollock, who had been defending the Khyber Pass, came to the rescue. General Nott, commandant of the British forces at Candahar, set out for the front to restore the fortunes of the British cause. General Sale, having driven back the enemy, was enabled to march out of Jelalabad. Everything foretold a speedy recovery.

But there was nothing to recover. The body of Shah Soojah, stripped of its barbaric jewels, and hacked and gashed with sabers, had long since been thrown into a ditch at Cabul. Shah Soojah was no longer a factor in international politics. Meanwhile, Lord Auckland's term as Governor-General of India expired, and Lord Ellenborough was sent out by the Home Government to supersede him. Of course, it was easy to reconquer Afghanistan. In September of 1842, General Pollock's army reentered Cabul. A few signal acts of vengeance were inflicted on the Afghans. Their great bazar, in which they had exhibited the mutilated body of Sir W. Maenaghten,

was razed to the ground. An expedition, under command of General Sale, was sent out, in the hope of recovering the English women and children who had been given up to the enemy. After many vicissitudes, the hostages were found in the Fortress of Bamean, in the far wild region of the Indian Caucasus, and



THE KHYBER PASS.

all of them who remained alive were restored to their friends and kindred. It was indeed the chief glory of the campaign that General Sale was able to rescue his wife and her wretched companions from captivity. As for the rest, the consequences, or at least the benefits, of the war were naught. Dost Mohammed came up out of his exile in India, and was

restored to the throne of Cabul, to become the ally of Great Britain! Nor were the general international relations of the principal Powers, whose jealousy had led to the conflict, in any wise materially altered by its issue. An army of sixteen thousand men had sunk in despair and death, amid the horrors of the Koord Cabul, with no appreciable advantage arising from the awful sacrifice.

We may now return to consider the progress of events in the Home Government of Great Britain. Just as the last echoes of the disasters of Cabul were heard in England, a new agitation broke out, of which the consequences have not yet wholly disappeared. Daniel O'Connell arose, and stood again on the stage of British politics; and his figure, his attitude, his speech, were more alarming to English conservatism than ever before. It is doubtful whether any other personage has ever appeared in the arena of Parliament in whom were concentrated so many of the elements of the storm as in O'Connell. He was a man of majestic presence; an orator by nature; the Celt of the Celts; stern and yet humorous; bitter in his antagonisms; firm in his friendships; loving Ireland with passionate devotion; a Catholic, but not a Papist; a friend of freedom and humanity; an agitator by nature; a reformer by practice. He was already sixty-eight years of age. He had not entered Parliament until he was fifty-four. But when he did come, it was the apparition of a new force, the rising up of a new figure on the stage, to whom the greatest Parliamentarians did either obedience of admiration or menace of antipathy and hatred.

The connection of Daniel O'Connell with the Reform Bill of 1832, and particularly with the act repealing the disabilities of the Catholics, has been noted already. He became in that work and subsequently the coadjutor of the Reformers in the House of Commons. He supported the Ministry of Lord Melbourne, and in many emergencies gave material aid to the Whig party. He, like other liberal statesmen of his time, had hoped and expected great things from the reform measures of 1828-32; but, like the rest, he had been sorely disappointed. He, too, had quickly perceived that the reform had not yet struck down to the real people of England.

Moreover, he was quick to discern that the support which he had given to the Whig Ministry had not been reciprocated by the party. He saw that the Whigs were afraid of him; that their party was disparaged in the estimation of the British public by his support; that whereas Lord Melbourne and his following were willing to avail themselves of the aid of O'Connell in emergencies, they were equally willing to know him not when the emergency was passed. It thus happened that in the interval between 1832 and 1842, O'Connell thought much and profoundly on the most radical of all questions affecting the political destinies of his country.

That question was simply this: Whether, on the whole, the political and civil union of Ireland with England was an advantage or a disadvantage to the former country, a blessing or a curse to the Irish people. Right or wrong, he came to the conclusion that the Union was a curse; that the woes of Ireland in the first third of the present century were largely traceable to the position of subordination into which she had been forced against her will; and that the only remedy, the only prospect of recovery for Ireland, was the repeal of the Union between that country and England. He took his stand accordingly. He went boldly into the House of Commons, and to the people of both islands, and declared his purpose to have the Act of Union annulled. He announced prophetically that the year 1843 should be known in history as the "Year of Repeal," and that agitation was the order of the day.

We may revert for a moment to the time and circumstances of the event by which the political destiny of Ireland had been merged with that of Great Britain. In the last stormy decade of the eighteenth century the people of that island had, as a rule, shown no undue loyalty to the British crown. The society of "United Irishmen," in sympathy and almost in league with France, had had an extensive influence in its work of agitating for Irish independence. At length the English Government bore down heavily on the Irish insurgents, and after the loss of about twenty thousand men, and the expenditure of more than thirty million pounds sterling, suppressed the revolt. Many of the Irish patriot leaders were con-

REUNION OF THE CAPTIVES OF CABUL.



demned and executed. By the year 1799 the insurrection was at an end, and a state of quiet in which there was a mixture of torpor and despair supervened in Ireland. Then came the Act of UNION, by which it was provided that the two islands should henceforth be merged in a common government under the title of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; that the existing English dynasty should continue in authority over both alike; that the United Kingdom be represented in a single Parliament; that Ireland be granted therein a representation in the House of Lords of twenty-eight temporal peers, and in the House of Commons of one hundred representatives; that the Irish Episcopal Church be merged with that of England; that manufactures and commerce should be on the same footing in the two islands; that the national expenditure be in proportion of *fifteen* for England to *two* for Ireland, for twenty years; and that the existing law courts should be maintained, with an appeal from the Irish Chancery to the House of Lords. This great Act for the future administration of the United Kingdom was passed in 1800, and went into effect on the first day of the present century.

Under the Act of Union, Ireland entered on her career of subordination to Great Britain. It was a career of alternate passion and apathy, of excitement and torpor, of sporadic insurrections and spasms of loyalty. It can not be doubted that the Act of Union was, in the first place, forced upon the people of the island against the wishes of four-fifths of the population. It is almost equally certain that at no time, even to the present day, could the measure have received the assent of a majority. At the time which we are here considering, the Union had been in force a little more than forty years. O'Connell came to the deliberate conclusion that it could be and should be repealed. Nor could it well be said that the means which he adopted to this end were inefficient, or that his method was one of political unwisdom. In fact, he had studied thoroughly the genius of English institutions, and no one knew better than he the character of the antagonists with which he had to deal. His plan was essentially that of the Chartists. It was agitation, open and

above board; discussion of the question before the people, an appeal to justice, and afterwards to that profound prejudice of race which had existed immemorably between his countrymen and the people of England.

The excitement which now arose surpassed any thing in the previous history of Great Britain, except only those fiery passions which swept the country during the two revolutions of the seventeenth century. O'Connell set up his battle-flag in the House of Commons and his rallying standard in Ireland. The contest evoked all the volcanic fires of his nature. The Irish rose by thousands and hundreds of thousands to his call. No orator of this, or perhaps of any, century has so swayed the multitudes of his countrymen. The tides ebbed and rolled like those of the sea. In England the opposition to O'Connell and his party was kindled to a white heat. Never were such denunciations heard in any other civilized country as were launched at the head of the great Irish agitator. To the alarmed upper-classes of English society, whether Whig or Tory, O'Connell became the *l'ête noise* of the epoch. They hurled at him every epithet which party malice could invent. They called him the "Big Beggarman," and traduced his character in all the figures and forms of speech. But to the excitable Irish he was the "Uncrowned King." He planned in Ireland a series of mass-meetings, which were successful to an extent never known in any other country. Thousands, tens of thousands, finally hundreds of thousands, poured from hut and hamlet and town to the places of the great assemblages. Ireland was not wanting in spots consecrated by patriotic memories. Tradition had hallowed many a place as the scene of great deeds, in the old heroic days when wild Irish chieftains had led their subdued clans in the struggle for freedom. O'Connell adroitly chose such places for the meetings of the people. One great throng was assembled at Kilkenny, where rose the old round tower of St. Canice's Cathedral. Another meeting was held in the orator's native county of Kerry, where, in the midst of his thrilling oration, he turned about, and appealed to "yonder blue mountain, where you and I were cradled." Again, at Mullaghmast, an innumerable multitude was gathered, whom the speaker fired by referring to a still more

burning memory. "Here," said he, "three hundred and ninety Irish chieftains perished;" and then went on to describe the betrayal of the old heroes of his countrymen by the hated Saxons, who had invited them to a banquet.

Ireland was now shaken to its center. The means for carrying forward the peaceable revolution began to be provided. A popular subscription, called the "rent," was taken up, which aggregated forty-eight thousand pounds. All the while the leader counseled his followers to maintain the peace, to indulge in no acts that might stain the history of the sacred cause. Under the magic of his influence, they obeyed him as children might obey a venerated father.

Meanwhile, the Government became alarmed. All Ireland was in peaceable insurrection. True, among the vast multitudes which had arisen at O'Connell's call, many were ready for violence, ready for the revolution by the sword and fire. But such audacious fraction of the whole was held in check by the dictatorship of the master. "Every man," said he in proclamation, "who is guilty of the slightest breach of the peace is an enemy of me and of Ireland." But the Government could no longer with safety to itself—so it was decided by the Ministry—refrain from interference with the revolutionary movement. Greatest of all O'Connell's meetings was that which he appointed to be held at Clontarf. Recently a monster gathering had been held on the Hill of Tara, where stood the stone used for the coronation of the ancient kings of Ireland. But at Clontarf, near Dublin, the scene of the great victory which the Irish had gained aforetime over the Danes, it was proposed to hold, on the 8th of October, 1843, a political meeting, which of itself should give reality and sanction to the revolution. It was proposed to bring together at this place a human sea, composed of five hundred thousand Irishmen, devoted to the cause of a peaceable severance from the dominion of Great Britain.

The preparations went on effectively. It could not be doubted that the meeting was destined to be the greatest assemblage ever held in the British Islands. Nor can there be doubt that O'Connell was fully able to sway the multitude to his will, and that his purpose was wholly peaceable. But the Lord Lieu-

tenant of Ireland saw the thing in a different light. With the sanction of the Home Government he accordingly took steps to prevent the assemblage. He issued a proclamation on the day before the meeting, declaring that it was calculated to excite well-grounded apprehension that those engaged in the movement had in view the alteration of the laws and Constitution of England by physical force. He therefore warned the people not to attend the proposed meeting; to stay at their homes; to disperse each to his own place. Military preparations were made to carry out the edict and prevent the assemblage. The Irish were already gathering in heavy masses from all directions. A dreadful collision with untold destruction of human life was at the door. In the emergency, O'Connell again showed his imperial ascendancy over the minds of his countrymen. He sent out a proclamation on the eve of the meeting declaring that the orders of the Lord Lieutenant must be obeyed; that the authorities must not be resisted by force; that the multitudes must return to their homes. The order of the leader was universally obeyed, and the meeting at Clontarf did not take place.

Great, however, was the chagrin of many of O'Connell's followers. The more radical had hoped that a conflict would be precipitated—much as our fathers had forced the hand of Great Britain on the slope of Bunker Hill. The great division of younger Irish patriots went sullenly to their homes, and O'Connell never regained his mastery over their minds. As for the victorious Government, it at once proceeded to make the most of its advantage. Prosecutions were instituted against O'Connell and his leading condutors. He and his son, John O'Connell, also Sir John Gray, and Sir Charles Duffy, with some others, were arrested and brought to trial on a charge of stirring up disaffection among the Irish people, and exciting them to insurrection against the Constitution and Government of the United Kingdom. O'Connell conducted his own defense, but not with the vigor which he had displayed in the open field. He and his associates were convicted. O'Connell himself was sentenced to imprisonment for a year, and to pay a fine of two thousand pounds. The rest were condemned to punishment less

severe. O'Connell immediately appealed to the House of Lords, and by that body the sentence of the court below was reversed. The convicted men were set at liberty, and the crisis was at an end.

It can not be doubted that the influence of O'Connell over his countrymen waned from the time of the Clontarf catastrophe. His natural forces were expended in this final

on his country, he departed for Italy. Arriving at Genoa, he could go no further. There, on the 15th of May, 1847, the most remarkable Irishman of the present century ended his tempestuous career.

In the meantime, the Administration of Peel had taken up and disposed of several important matters claiming the attention of the English people. It may be noted, however, in the light of the retrospect, that the legislation of the times was directed rather to social than to political questions. This fact is illustrated in the bill brought into Parliament by Lord Ashley for the alleviation of the conditions of life among the miners of Great Britain. It is probably true that until within the distinct memory of men still living, the life of the English miner was one of the most terribly degraded existences known in history. It is impossible to conceive of any condition of human hardship and depravity more appalling in itself, more horrible in its consequences, than that which was present in the collieries of England and Wales. This was especially true of the women and girls who were compelled to toil their lives away in dark, damp mines, where the sunlight never penetrated,



SIR ROBERT PEELE.

contest in favor of Irish independence. He remained in the House of Commons until 1846, making his last speech in that body on the 3d of April, in this year. It was noticed that the fires of his stormy oratory were already quenched. He became a subject of melancholia. Foreseeing the end of his life, he withdrew from the public gaze and set out for Rome, where he hoped to die. Just as the first gloom of the potato famine began to settle

where comfort never came. It was shown by a Parliamentary investigation of the state of affairs in the coal-mines, that women and girls were hitched instead of mules to the coal-carts, and obliged to draw them through the filth and grime of narrow passages, until not only all semblance of womanhood, but the very lineaments of humanity were obliterated. It was revealed, that under these conditions, a state of immorality existed in these subterra-

mean caverns so awful in its manifestations to be discussed even for the instruction of after times. Lord Ashley procured the passage of an Act by which the evils in question were abolished. In 1842 a bill was passed providing that, after a limited period, no woman or girl should thereafter be employed in the mines and collieries of England.

Two years afterwards, the Factories Act was passed, by which the daily hours of toil of children under thirteen years of age were reduced to six and a half, but the clause of the bill reducing the working hours of men to ten failed of adoption. It has been remarked by those who have studied carefully the debates attendant upon these measures, that a large proportion of English Parliamentarians, backed by perhaps a majority of the middle and upper classes of the people, deeply reprobated the fact and tendencies of Lord Ashley's bill. It was urged that to prevent women and girls from pursuing the horrid life to which they had been condemned hitherto in the mines was an abridgment of the natural rights of Englishmen to labor in what manner they chose—an attempt to annul the necessary laws which should govern the relations of the employed and the employés.

It was to this period that the first effort to establish Secular Universities in the United Kingdom must be referred. We have already seen how the project for the establishment of Common Schools was resisted; how the Church of England contested the measure by which her monopoly of the child-mind of the realm was to be broken up. The same kind of prejudice and bigotry displayed itself in full force when the project for the establishment of the Queen's University in Ireland, with three colleges subordinate thereto, was laid before Parliament. It was proposed that the new institution should be entirely undenominational in its character, its management, its teachings. For once the proposition had the effect of bringing into union the combined forces of Catholicism and the Established Church. The Catholics, constituting fully five-sixths of the Irish people, and the Episcopal Establishment, embracing the remainder, were equally vehement in resisting and resenting the proposal for the establishment of what both parties chose to denominate a "godless" institution.

At this time Wales was thrown into a violent excitement by an insurrection of the common people against the Toll Roads, on which the ever-increasing rates of toll became a burden no longer tolerable. The movement against the roads and the managers took one of the most grotesque and singular forms ever witnessed. Some one discovered a passage in the twenty-fourth chapter of the Book of Genesis, as follows:

"And they blessed *Rebekah*, and said unto her, Thou art our sister; let thy seed possess the *gate* of those which hate them." Of a certainty, this must mean that the *toll-gates* of Wales should be *possessed* by the seed of *Rebecca*. An association was accordingly formed, called the Daughters of Rebecca, whose business it should be to possess the gates. Since an effective corps of rioters could not well be organized out of women, it became necessary to extemporize the daughters by putting men into women's clothing. Such was the aspect of the riots. The assaults on the toll-roads were made by night. The insurrection rather gained the day, for although the rioting *Daughters* of Rebecca were presently suppressed, their doings had been sufficiently significant to induce the passage, by Parliament, of an act for the abolition of the exorbitant tolls.

Another struggle between human right and human authority was fought out at this time in a peculiar manner. The Italian patriot, Joseph Mazzini, was, at the date of which we speak, resident as an exile in London. He was engaged in political correspondence with the Sardinian and Austrian Governments for the promotion of the cause of the emancipation of Italy. Knowledge of such correspondence was brought to Sir James Graham, Home Secretary for the Government, and, by his command, Mazzini's mail was arrested, his letters opened, and his communication with foreign States thus cut off. The question was whether or not, under the Constitution, such right of pillaging private mails existed; and, though the conservative spirit rather favored the exercise of such a prerogative by the Government, it was accompanied with such a nudge in the ribs of Sir James Graham and the Ministry as signified, when rendered into English: This right exists; but let it never

be exercised again,—a peculiarly English solution of the question.

In 1843 an alarming difficulty, arising out of comparatively trifling circumstances, threatened the peace of Great Britain and France. Missionaries had made their way into the island of Tahiti, in the South Pacific, and had so far succeeded as to convert and educate the young Queen Pomare, sovereign of the island. The French also were busy in that far region, and by various means succeeded in inducing the native queen, notwithstanding her partiality for England, to put herself under the protection of France. This done, the French Admiral, cruising by the island, compelled Pomare to hoist the flag of his country above her own.

wrecked in a peculiar manner. The great industrial question, involving the policy of England as it respected her existing laws on the subject of protection to the home industries of England, was the reef on which Sir Robert's ship finally went to pieces. The issue here opened before the reader is one of the widest and most interesting in the history of civilized nations. We have already, in a previous chapter, discussed the question of Free Trade and Customs Duties for Protection to Home Industry in our own country. This was the question, which now arose with peculiar significance in the history of Great Britain. It can hardly fail of interest that we should, at the very beginning, take for a moment a higher



ISLE OF TAHITI.

The queen thereupon appealed to Victoria for protection, for a guarantee of her independence. The French Government disavowed the act of its admiral in Tahiti, but an unfriendly feeling was fomented in both France and England over the question, and the bad blood of the day came near finding vent by the sword. The difficulty was at length settled by the restoration of the rights of Queen Pomare, and the war spirit subsided. Nor will the American reader fail to note, for his interest and instruction, the Tahiti incident of 1843-4 as almost in exact analogy with the crisis through which our own country and Germany have recently passed, relative to the Samoan Islands.

The Ministry of Peel was destined to be

point of view, and note, with perfect impartiality, some of the bottom principles and conditions out of which this great industrial problem has arisen.

Consider, first, the British Islands with respect to the industrial conditions which have been impressed upon them by the hand of nature, and, in a secondary sense, by the progress of civilization. These islands are of small extent. In the distribution of minerals, no other country has surpassed them. In the distribution of agricultural lands, these countries are limited. They are insular, hemmed in by the sea, having no expansive background of broad territories. The country, moreover, is mountainous; broken in nearly all parts into irregularities of surface, forbidding to the

agricultural instincts of men. In other parts we have marsh-lands, great sluggish rivers, and originally over the whole landscape a heavy, almost impenetrable forest. It was natural in such a situation that mining, manufacturing, and commercial industries should spring up and flourish from the earliest days. Here were almost limitless supplies of block-tin, of iron, of copper, of coal, of all the concomitants of those industrial pursuits which relate to the extraction of minerals and their combination with labor in the higher forms of value.

In such a country the agricultural pursuits must inevitably lag in the rear of the other progressive industries. This natural fact, tending to the disparagement of agriculture in England, was aggravated by the peculiar organization of English society. The establishment of the feudal system, and the building up thereon, in after times, of the most powerful landed aristocracy in Europe have tended ever since the Middle Ages to concentrate the ownership of lands in Britain in the hands of a few; and this tendency has still further retarded the agricultural interests of the kingdom. Out of these facts it was found, long before the close of the seventeenth century, that the agricultural pursuits were so disparaged in England as to call for legislation in their behalf. In 1670 a Corn Law was passed, imposing a duty on the importation of the cereal grains. It was a measure intended to stimulate the production of those grains at home, rather than a device for revenue. Let the reader, moreover, observe with care that the Corn Law was from its inception a measure of the barons and lords, a project of the country squire to increase the receipts from their estates. The lands were sublet by the landlords to their tenants, the peasantry of England. With the increase in the price of grain thus artificially produced, the tenants would be able to bear a higher rate of rent. Thus the coffers of the land-owning class would be filled with an increased volume of revenue, drawn ultimately from the consumers of bread-stuffs. But the consumers of breadstuffs were mostly the manufacturers, the miners, the artisans, the shop-keepers, and the merchants. The country peasantry were indeed few in numbers, as compared with the multitudes who,

under the laws of nature and industry, had accumulated, and were still accumulating, in the manufacturing and mining districts.

Thus came in the Corn Law as an artificial agency to stimulate the production of grain in Great Britain. During the whole of the eighteenth century the policy adopted by the Act of 1670 continued in force. It became the immemorial usage of Great Britain to assess and collect large customs duties on all imported grains; so that at the beginning of the modern era the Protective system had become what might be called a part of the British Constitution.

Consider, on the other hand, the natural and artificial conditions present in the United States of America. It would be difficult to find in the same a single element of the problem which is not directly the reverse of the corresponding fact in Great Britain. Here there is a continent of rich agricultural lands. They are spread out from ocean to ocean, from the Lakes to the Gulf. It is estimated that the Mississippi Valley alone contains two billions of arable acres. On the whole, the distribution of minerals in our country is not proportionally abundant. The deposits, though rich enough, and even inexhaustible, are far apart. In some regions, coal and iron are present together. Copper lies on one coast; lead is far distant. Tin, there is none at all east of the Rockies.

It is not needed that we should review *in extenso* the industrial features which nature has impressed on our country. Suffice it to say, that in almost every particular they are the exact reverse of those of England. Here the agricultural interest forean all other forms of industry. The manufacturing and commercial interests have lagged behind. Agriculture has been at a natural advantage in the industrial development of the United States. Manufactures have been at a natural disadvantage. It thus has happened that the policy adopted by the American Government, and ratified by the people, of encouraging the weaker, namely, the manufacturing interest, has been the exact reversal of the policy of England. In this country, the suggestion and motive of the Protective System has always proceeded from the manufacturing and artisan classes. Here the protected article has been

the product of workmanship, rather than the product of nature; and its increased price has been drawn ultimately from the agricultural classes, who have constituted the body of consumers.

These paragraphs have been inserted in this connection for the purpose of elucidating for the American reader the whole question before us, but more particularly to account for the fact that the Protective System was for more than a hundred and fifty years naturally and inveterately pursued in Great Britain with respect to *agricultural products*, while in the United States it has been followed, not with equal persistency, but still persistently, with respect to the *manufacturing industries*. The brief study here presented may serve to show how it is that the sentiment of Free Trade originated in the very heart and soul of the English manufacturing towns; was fostered there; was promoted from those places as centers by a manufacturers' propaganda, and finally forced, as a permanent policy, on the British Parliament, against the fiercest opposition of the landlords and country squires of the Nation; while on this side of the sea, the sentiment of Free Trade has had its origin and propulsion from the producers of those great staples which are developed from the soil—has made its way, in so far as it has progressed at all, against the whole force of the manufacturing interest, and has been unable to the present day to gain an ascendancy in the American Congress because of the superior compactness and solidarity of the manufacturers of the country.

We now return from this digression to consider the destiny of the Corn Laws in England. In 1815 the old statute of 1670 was reenacted by Parliament. Under the new law the ports of England were absolutely closed against the importation of foreign grain; that is, such was the *effect* of the law. In some cases the price of wheat was raised to nearly five dollars a bushel. It is needless to say that the crowded people of the manufacturing towns cried out fiercely against such prices, and it was only by an amendment to the Corn Laws, by which a sliding scale, as it was called, was substituted for the Act of 1815, that the clamor of the starving populace was stilled for a season. It was in the nature of

this sliding scale to adjust the duty on grain to existing prices, so that when the prices rose to a certain level the duty on foreign importations should cease. The intent and aim of the policy were simply to preserve and maintain a high price on the English cereals, so that they might be produced notwithstanding the disadvantages under which such production had been placed by nature.

From 1815 to 1841, it may be said that both Whigs and Tories were equally devoted to the Corn Laws in both theory and practice. They were so in theory, because it was accepted as a truism not any more to be doubted than an axiom in mathematics, that the Protective System, as such, was a necessary part of the true nationality of England. It was accepted in practice, because it seemed at least superficially to accomplish a given result. Self-interest was thought to be subserved by such a law. We have seen how the Corn Laws proceeded from the agricultural, or rather the land-owning, side of the British public. If we glance at the constitution of Parliament, at the epoch which we are here considering, we shall be no longer surprised at the compactness and force of the Protective System as it related to agricultural products. Every member of the House of Lords was a large land-owner, and fully five-sixths of the members of the House of Commons were in the same category. Parliament was a land-owning institution. It was virtually based on land-ownership. At first sight, it will appear strange in the extreme that in a country marked out by nature for the most successful development of all manufacturing industries, the evolution of the governing body in civil society should have been wholly from the side of land. But the student of history will readily recall the Norman conquest, the distribution of the lands of the Island by William and his followers in sixty thousand fiefs, the establishment of the feudal system, the ever-growing disposition of the people during the Middle Ages, and subsequently, to attach importance to land-ownership, and will easily understand the anomaly of a land-owning Parliament in a manufacturing and commercial country.

The circumstances to which we have here referred will throw additional light on the struggle of 1832. That contest was simply

for the enfranchisement and representation of the manufacturing towns. It was for the disfranchisement of the decayed landed constituencies. Until that time, it might almost be said that the manufacturing interests of Great Britain were unrepresented in the governing body of the realm. If they were represented at all, it was because of their subordinated importance to the landed interests of the kingdom. What, therefore, must have been the indescribable prejudice and antagonism against which the propagandists of the Anti-corn-law League must battle in the attempted reversal of public opinion, and for the substitution of the principle of Free Trade instead of the Protective System, which had prevailed immemorially!

Nevertheless, that indefinite thing called public opinion did, between the years 1841-46, change over from the old system to the new, from the dogmas of Protection to the theory and practice of Free Trade. The revolution was accomplished, as nearly all such changes are in England, by agitation. The movement began, as we have said, from the manufacturing towns. It had its heart in Manchester. Leeds and Birmingham became coadjutors in the work. The agitator, the great inspiring spirit of the oncoming battle, was Richard Cobden. He had been brought up as a warehouseman in London. When about the age of thirty, he traveled much in foreign lands, observing carefully the industrial condition of all peoples. He then became a partner in a cotton-printing establishment near Manchester, and at length distinguished himself as a pamphleteer. It was but natural that he should become deeply impressed with the disparaged condition of the manufacturing industries of the country.

At length, in the year 1838, a commercial crisis occurred in the town of Bolton-le-Moors, in Lancashire, and nearly all the business interests of the place, and the surrounding region, went to wreck. Three-fifths of the manufacturing establishments were shut up on account of the disaster. More than five thousand workmen were thrown out of employment, left homeless, and without the means of securing a subsistence. In this appalling condition, the suffering masses were confronted in a startling manner with the effects of the Corn-law

System. They perceived that they must starve because of the exorbitant prices of breadstuffs, and that these exorbitant prices were the product, not of the relation of supply and demand, but of the law of Parliament. From this time forth the agitation broke out, and Cobden was the torch-bearer of the new light. Meetings to secure the abolition of the Corn Laws began to be held in the manufacturing cities, and able speakers instructed the people in the laws of political economy. Now it was that John Bright took his stand by the side



RICHARD COBDEN

of Cobden. In Parliament almost the sole apostle of Free Trade was Charles Villiers, a man of aristocratic lineage, but a sound convert to the doctrines of Free Trade. Daniel O'Connell himself, now near the sunset, threw some of the last energies of his life into the agitation for the abolition of the Protective System. Milner Gibson, a Tory in his antecedents, joined the league, and W. J. Fox, a Unitarian minister, popular and eloquent, added his influence to the cause.

At first, however, the effort of those who had organized the Anti-corn-law League and


established the Free Trade Hall in Manchester, seemed almost as hopeless as the struggle of a swimmer to ascend Niagara. The whole volume of national influence, of national practice and tradition, roared and rushed in the face of the agitators, and seemed to bear them down with an overwhelming pressure. But they were not destined to be swept away. Circumstances favored, as they have rarely favored, the cause of the reforming party. That most unanswerable of all arguments, human misery, came to the aid of the propaganda. Wretchedness, woe, want, starvation, despair, uttered their voices, and the cry at length reached the profoundest recesses of prejudice and conservatism. It reverberated through the Kingdom. The towns were shaken at first, and then the country-side began to heave and swell. It was not, as we have said, the voice of man, but the voice of hunger, of thirst, the clamor of women and children for bread. We have just seen how at Bolton-le-Moors the appeal of starvation was first made on account of a commercial crash. But it was at once seen that any other city, in which the manufacturing interest predominated, and where thereby dense masses of population had been drawn together, might suffer a like catastrophe at the mere wave of a wand. It was perceived that the whole manufacturing and artisan industries of Great Britain were saved from sliding into the horrible pit only by such temporary shores and props as might be at any moment broken and knocked away. Even Parliamentarians must see it and shudder. Even the great landowner, secure in his estates, with his multiplied tenantry, and his herds of Tees-water bullocks, must hear the cry in his fastness, and tremble at the possible consequences.

But to mere commercial disaster, and the serious consequences following in the wake, a far more dreadful circumstance was now to be added. The summer of 1845 in Ireland was unusually wet and cold. As the season wore on, it became certain that the potato-crop was about to prove a failure. It was noticed, on digging into the hills where the young bulbs were swelling to maturity, that a peculiar rot had attacked them, and that already, in mid-summer, a considerable part of the expected product had been destroyed. In a country of

such various resources as the United States, where the failure of some single product occurs with scarcely a notice except in the census, where the abundance of other things makes up for the deficit, and the well-sustained tide of life sweeps on without a check in its flow or diminution in its volume, it is almost impossible to conceive of the dismay and horror with which the people of Ireland, in this summer of 1845, must have regarded the impending failure of the potato. Before the season was yet well advanced, or the full extent of the disaster more than vaguely conjectured, the Relief Committee of the Mansion House in Dublin issued a paper in which it was declared that no reasonable conjecture could be formed with respect to the limit of the effect of the potato disease, and that the destruction of the entire crop seemed an imminent possibility.—Let us look for a moment at the condition of the Irish peasantry.

A great majority of the Irish were dependent absolutely, at this time, upon the potato for subsistence. This was particularly true of all the people in the southern and western parts of the island. In the North country some other articles—oatmeal in particular—were eaten; but apart from this, the potato was the be-all and the end-all of the Irish peasants' resources. It will surprise the American workman to know that, in 1845, not a few of the Irish peasants, but all of them, lived, not principally or in the main, but *wholly, exclusively*, on the potato. Such a thing as meat, or any other of the more concentrated forms of human food, was absolutely unknown in the Irishman's home. His meal was of the potato only. All of his meals were so. He had nothing else. His children grew to manhood and womanhood, and then to old age, without ever having once in their lives known the taste of meat-food. In such a condition, what shall we say of the terror which the gloomy, wet summer of 1845, and the spread, ever-increasing and widening, of the potato-rot must have inspired among the crowded populations of the ill-famed island?

The cry was soon heard across the channel. At first the country squires of England, satisfied in their abundance, were disposed to deny the story of the famine, to put it off as a scare, as a hobgoblin conjured up by the Opposition



THE IRISH FAMINE—SCENE AT THE GATE OF THE WORK-HOUSE.

and the Free Traders; but the specter would not down, and the shadow thereof soon fell across the obdurate and conservative conscience of Great Britain. Such was the condition of affairs that John Bright, speaking of the crisis afterwards, declared that Famine itself had joined the Free-Trade cause.

But why the cause of Free Trade? For the reason that the grains which all the world stood ready to pour into the harbors of starving Ireland were excluded therefrom by the Corn Laws of Great Britain. Even if not excluded, the price was so exorbitantly high as to be beyond the reach of the Irish peasantry. The Corn Law thus stood, like the tree of Tantalus, with its boughs hanging low and laden with abundance over the heads of the Irish people, but ever beyond their reach. Grain must take the place of the potato, or the Irish must starve. But grain can not be substituted as the food of the people so long as the present prices are maintained. The present prices are the result of the Corn Laws. Therefore, the Corn Laws must be abolished, and that speedily, for starvation is an exigency which, if not met at once, need not be met at all.

Such was the tremendous argument with which the Free Traders were reinforced in the autumn of 1845. Meanwhile, Cobden, Bright, and Villiers had gone on with the argument in the abstract, with the appeal to the judgment and understanding of the English people. Under their appeals, during the last five years, a large and influential following of Free Traders had been organized outside of the pales of party. Free Trade was their one great principle. To them the shibboleth of *Whig* or *They* was no longer anything. They did not care to pronounce it at all, but stood ready to join their forces with either party if thereby the abolition of the Protective System could be secured. The Whigs, who now constituted the Opposition, were naturally more inclined to the doctrine of Free Trade than were the Conservatives in power. But as a matter of fact, the foundation of both parties was undermined, and each awaited the catastrophe. Sir Robert Peel and his Ministry had come into power under the distinct pledge of supporting the existing system of industry. In particular, they had promised that the Corn Law should be

upheld. It had been noted, however, that Sir Robert, in his public utterances on the subject, was disposed to regard the Corn Laws as *exceptional*, and a suspicion crept over the country that at heart and in theory Sir Robert was more of a Free Trader than a Protectionist. Cobden and his followers looked upon the matter in this light, and calmly awaited the issue.

Such was the condition of affairs when famine knocked at the door, and the Government was obliged, *volens volens*, to take its stand and declare a policy for the immediate relief of the country. On the opening of Parliament, in January of 1846, Peel went boldly to the front and outlined the legislation which he should undertake. It consisted in brief of the gradual, and yet speedy, abolition of the Corn Laws, and with it virtually the whole system of Protection. Of course, the policy was only dimly suggested in the Premier's speech at the opening of the session; but the outline was sufficient, and the Conservative party had before it the alternative of being dragged at the wheels of the chariot of Free Trade, or of finding for itself a new leader in place of Sir Robert Peel.

The situation and the occasion have ever since been memorable in the Parliamentary history of Great Britain. The Conservative Ministry, with the exception of Lord Stanley, had all gone over with Sir Robert, agreeing to support him in carrying out the new policy of the Government. For the moment it seemed to the landed interests of Great Britain, and especially to the representatives of that interest in Parliament, though they still constituted an overwhelming majority of the whole, that the end of all things had come; that the league of the manufacturing towns with commercial disaster and domestic distress at home, and with the potato famine in Ireland, had won the day over the ancient order of society, and was about to stamp the residue under foot. Only one avenue of escape seemed open. If a new leader could be discovered to rally to the breach and reorganize the shattered Conservative ranks, all might yet be well.

The leader came like an apparition. On the night when Sir Robert Peel, having abandoned the cherished principles of the Conservative party, foretold in his speech the

adoption of the Free-Trade policy, and when the Conservatives, without a voice, still sat under the paralysis of the hour, a strange figure arose in the House of Commons, and began to thunder against Sir Robert Peel in a perfect storm of invective and bitter sarcasm. It was that fantastic Hebrew, Benjamin Disraeli, who, from being the butt of the House of Commons, now suddenly arose to the rank of leadership, from which the vicissitudes of fully thirty years could hardly suffice to shake him. The world knows the history of the man; how he had entered Parliament as a Radical; how he had made himself, by his quaint apparel and loud ways, a mixture of peacock and jackdaw; how he had been hooted down without finishing his maiden speech; how he had persevered against every species of prejudice, from the deep-seated prejudice of race to the gaddy prejudice of mere manners; how he had gained in spite of all; how he had drifted over to the Conservative benches; and finally how, on the memorable night above referred to, he had suddenly sprung open like an automatic knife, and cut his way to the very heart of the temporizing policy of the Prime Minister. From that hour unto the day of his death, Benjamin Disraeli never ceased to be the idol of the old conservative landed aristocracy of Great Britain. Henceforth he stood for the ancient system; for the monarchy as a general fact, and for the Queen as a particular instance; for the feudal land-tenure of the aristocracy; for privilege and prerogative; for the House of Lords; for the Established Church, and for every fact and principle in the British system of society and government whereby that system might better be maintained in its ancient solidarity and grandeur.

Notwithstanding the brilliancy of Disraeli's attack on Peel; notwithstanding the sudden rally of the Protectionist party, and its quick recovery of all that might yet be saved from the wreck, there was no hope that the tide could be stemmed, that the determination of the country to substitute Free Trade for the Protective system could be thwarted or turned from the purpose. Until this end should be accomplished, the Ministry of Peel must live. The new scheme of the Government was quickly perfected and laid before Parliament. It was not a declaration for immediate Free

Trade. The measure proposed by the Ministry still included the imposition of a duty of ten shillings a quarter on wheat, so long as its price should not exceed forty-eight shillings. Above that figure, the duty was to be reduced, until at fifty-three shillings a quarter, the tariff should stand at four shillings only: this arrangement for the time. At the end of three years the *system* of protection on grain was to be abandoned *in toto*. It was foreseen that, when once abandoned, protective duties could no more be revived. It was also clearly discerned that the protective principle, as applied to the production of sugar, and other agricultural as well as a few manufacturing interests, must go along with the major concession in the case of grains. The legislation of the hour meant, in a word, a complete revolution and reversal of the ancient industrial policy of the British Government, with the substitution for the time-honored system of Free Trade, pure and simple. In Parliament, the Protectionists, still vital, and now under the leadership of Lord George Bentinck and Disraeli, made a strong rally against the bill proposed by the Ministry. But the measure was passed in the House of Commons on the 15th of May, 1846, by a majority of ninety-eight votes. In the House of Lords the bill was carried through by the support of the Duke of Wellington, and became henceforth the law of the realm.

The Ministry of Sir Robert Peel had now but a month to live. While the Anti-corn-law agitation had been going on in England, the disaffection in Ireland, though less spectacular in its manifestations than before, had become more dangerous. In that distracted island the pangs of famine had sharpened the fangs of political antagonism, and there were blood-stains in the pathway. Crime came in the wake of the great movement which O'Connell had brought so nearly to success. The younger and more thoughtless of the Irish patriots sought to accomplish by terrorism what the leader had failed to achieve by reason and remonstrance. It became necessary for the Government to exert itself in some way against the lawlessness which was prevalent in many parts of Ireland. To this end a Coercion Bill came from the Ministry, and was laid before the House of Commons. It was proposed to suppress by force the

disaffections of the Irish people. It was to the Government of Sir Robert Peel a dangerous, and, as the sequel proved, a fatal expedient. The immemorial policy of the Whig party had been against the principle of coercion as applied to social disturbances among the subjects of Great Britain. The Chartists, and after them the Free Traders under the leadership of Cobden, had themselves so many times felt the weight of persecution that they also arrayed themselves against

Opposition so many elements of power that when the Coercion Bill was put on its passage, June 25, 1846, the Ministry was defeated by a majority of seventy-three votes.

Sir Robert Peel thereupon put his resignation in the hands of the Queen, and Lord John Russell was named as his successor. The new Cabinet included Lord Palmerston, as Foreign Secretary; Sir Charles Wood, as Chancellor of the Exchequer; Lord Grey, as Secretary for the Colonies; and Sir George

Grey, as Secretary for Home Affairs. The brilliant Thomas Babington Macaulay had a seat in the Cabinet, as Paymaster-General for the Government.

Meanwhile, during the progress of the re-
 cord in the preceding
 pages, an incident of
 a very different kind
 had occurred in the
 history of Great Brit-
 ain. It was at the
 middle of the fifth de-
 cade that the attention
 of the British public
 was first seriously
 drawn to the possibili-
 ties that lay hidden in
 the Arctic Regions.
 In the very summer
 of the beginning of
 the Irish famine an
 enterprise was pro-
 jected which was des-
 tined, before the move-
 ment should subside,
 to add largely to the



LORD GEORGE BENTINCK.

the principle. As for the Protectionist wing of the Conservatives, now under the leadership of Lord George Bentinck and Disraeli, their rage against Peel and the Ministry knew no bounds; and while, as a rule, they would have adhered to coercion as a principle, they were ready to abandon consistency if they might by any means overturn the Government of Peel. Finally, the Irish representatives were, of course, bitterly opposed to the coercion of their countrymen. There thus accumulated in the


geographical information of mankind. It was at this date that the daring adventurer, Sir John Franklin, undertook his voyage of polar discovery. This remarkable sea-captain had already achieved renown by his voyages and explorations. As early as 1819 he had been sent to the Arctic Seas by the Hudson Bay Company; a voyage which detained him three and a half years, and extended to a distance of nearly six thousand miles. Afterwards, in 1836, he was made Governor of Van Dieman's

Land, in which office he conducted the affairs of the Islanders with the greatest success. At the time of undertaking his great Arctic voyage—that on which his fame with posterity seems to depend—he was already in his sixtieth year. The inspiration of the enterprise was the hope of discovering a north-western passage into the Pacific Ocean. Two ships, the *Erebus* and the *Terror*, were fitted out, and in May of 1845 Sir John sailed on the ill-fated voyage. His ships were last seen by the Esquimaux, in July of the same year. From that date they disappeared forever from sight.

The interest of nearly all nations was excited by the uncertainty which shrouded the fate of Franklin and his companions. In the

Britain. It was discovered that Sir John had died in June of 1847, and that his companions had perished to a man among the rigors of the frozen zone.

It was early in the Administration of Lord Russell that the peaceable relations of France and England were seriously disturbed by a marriage project which was said to be French in its origin, but Spanish in its application. The reader on this side of the sea may well wonder how such a question as a marriage, even the marriage of a queen, could be thought to jeopard the peace of Europe. But when we regard the peculiar constitution of the European kingdoms, and particularly the dynasties which control them, we need not be so much astonished that the Inter-



EREBUS AND TERROR OUTWARD BOUND.

United States especially profound sympathy was evoked, and efforts, not a few, were put forth for the discovery and possible rescue of the Arctic explorers. We have already seen in the preceding Book how the Grinnell expedition, and afterwards the expedition of Dr. Elisha Kent Kane—most eminent of American Arctic travelers—was fitted out and despatched into the North Seas. Little, however, was accomplished towards the discovery of Franklin, although the knowledge of mankind respecting the regions of the North Pole was extended and many times multiplied. It was not until 1859 that the ship *Fox*, under Captain McClintock, sent into the Arctic Ocean by Lady Franklin, had the good fortune to steer in the track of the lost sailors of Great

marital relations of the Royal families should be regarded as important. The student of history will not fail to remember that, in some instances, the law of descent, by which the place of the crown is determined in hereditary governments, has, by sheer force of its own workings, produced an almost intolerable result. At one time it appeared that Charles V. was to receive by legitimate inheritance the larger part of Continental Europe. If the so-called Balance of Power among the European States is to be preserved, then the sovereigns who wear the crowns may well be constrained to give heed to the marriage compacts by which the crown is to be deflected in this direction or in that.

At the time of which we speak, young

Isabella II., of Spain, who had now reached the age of sixteen, was thought to be eligible for marriage. It had long been the policy of France, as far as practicable, to keep up the union of blood and interest between the French and Spanish Bourbons. The attempt to do so had, in more than one instance, been the cause of war. It might have been thought that, with the accession of the younger branch of Bourbon, in the person of the Citizen King of France, the traditional policy would have

The intrigue of Louis Philippe was far-reaching in its character. His programme contemplated the marriage of Isabella to her cousin, Francisco de Assis, and the coincident marriage of the Duc de Montpensier and the Infanta. It was conjectured by the plotters that Isabella herself in such a union *would die childless*, and that, in that event, the Spanish crown would descend to the off-spring of Montpensier. He, after the Duc d'Angoulême, was heir to the crown of France. Thus was to be

provided the *possible* union of the two crowns on the head of an Orleans Prince of France.

As soon as the purpose of the French Court with respect to the double marriage was blown abroad, it created great excitement at other European capitals. England herself, though insular and to a great degree disentangled from Continental alliances, was deeply offended at the proposed union between the French and Spanish royal families. The project led to remonstrances and diplomatic correspondence not a little. It happened that at this time Victoria passed over to the Continent, and



ELIJAH FENST KANE

been abandoned. But Louis Philippe, and Guizot, his Minister of State, seem, on the contrary, to have strongly desired that the young Queen of Spain should be wedded to a French Prince. The king himself had two eligible sons who might aspire to Isabella's hand. The elder of these was the Duc d'Angoulême, and the younger the Duc de Montpensier. It happened, moreover, that the Spanish Queen had a marriageable sister, the so-called Infanta, Princess Maria Louisa, who must also be provided with a husband.

made a visit to Louis Philippe at Eu. During the interview, the king straitly disavowed for himself and his Minister the purpose of having the Spanish Infanta married to his son, at least, until what time, by the marriage of Isabella and the birth of offspring to her, the descent of the Spanish crown should be provided for. Nevertheless, in course of time, the double marriage project was carried out perfidiously, as was believed at most of the courts of Europe. Isabella was wedded to her cousin, Francis of Assis, and on the same day

the Infanta, Maria Louisa, was married to the Duc de Montpensier. England was beaten by the intrigue. She must either submit to the successful manipulation of the French Government, or else go to war. It is not likely that in any event she would have chosen the latter course. But her indignation was extreme, and she expressed her displeasure in the strongest terms consistent with peace.

The careful reader of history, however, will have noted the small effect of such schemes as this supposedly dangerous double marriage. Never was the truth of the principle more cogently illustrated than in the instance before us. The elaborate provision which Louis Philippe was making for the inheritance by his posterity of the crown of both France and Spain was soon blown utterly away. The Revolution of 1848 in France put both himself and his sons forever out of sight. Living in exile in England until the day of his death, he must often have contemplated from a distance the humiliating and ridiculous outcome of his intrigue relative to the Spanish crown. Even if the Revolution of 1848 had never occurred, the result would have been the same; for at length the marriage of Queen Isabella and her cousin was blessed with the birth of a son—against the expectations and hopes of the French Court, whose dignitaries had contrived the marriage. These events—the expulsion of Louis Philippe and his family, and the birth of a legitimate heir to the Spanish crown—served to convert the anger of England, first into indifference, and then into contempt.

We are now arrived at that period in English history when Chartism was destined, after one huge effort to force itself as a modifying principle into the Constitution of Great Britain, to sprawl into oblivion and be seen no more. The effort in question was made in 1848. It was in this year that the energies of all Europe seemed, by gathering and compression, to explode in a universal revolution. We shall hereafter narrate, on a larger scale, how in nearly all the European capitals, insurrection put his bugle to his lips, and blew a blast which, in instances not a few, startled the legitimate kings from their seats, and sent them flying by day or night into foreign lands. Paris was the scene of such a revolt, which ended in the downfall of the House of Orleans

and the erection of a republic. Berlin was the scene of another such insurrection, almost successful, against the reigning dynasty. Brussels likewise suffered revolt, though the king of the Belgians, by a wise declaration that if his people did not wish him for their sovereign, then he himself had no wish to reign longer, snatched the bolt from the clouds and conducted it harmlessly to the earth. All around the horizon the thunder of revolution was heard, and even England felt the jar.

In that country, however, the conditions, civil, social, and political, were very different from those of the Continental Powers. England had stability, equanimity, equipoise. Her foundations were laid deep on the very concrete of barbarism. Her structure had been raised experimentally. It had been built, here a little and there a little, remodeled, altered much in details and slightly in general plan. But it was essentially the same colossal fabric which had grown into shapeliness and grandeur, if not into political beauty, through ages of development. On that structure many centuries had wrought. On it the Conqueror had used his battle-axe, and the Plantagenets their swords. The war-hammers of York and Lancaster had resounded on the wall. Tudor had reared one battlement, and even Stuart had contributed something to the magnificence of the pile. William Henry of Orange had gone round about it, and the four Georges and William of Hanover-Brunswick had at least *slept* in the stately chambers of the edifice. Now Victoria had added grace and womanhood, and the coping-stones were not without glory. Nor may we ever forget that, under the shadow of the great temple, that rule creature, called *English Liberty*, had grown and flourished.

Wherefore England was not easily disturbed. She was with difficulty shaken by agitation. Least of all was she amenable to the argument of insurrection. Tongue-force and pen-force she might indeed fear and feel; but sword-force not at all. Out of all which circumstances came English indifference to the political revolt of 1848. Nevertheless, the Chartists, who for a decade had maintained their cause in the manufacturing districts and great cities, imagined that now had come the day of salvation. Now was the hour in which, as

Englishmen, they might gain, by peaceful agitation, or, at most, the display of physical force by numbers, the democratic rights which they sighed for, and which seemed to be the rare-ripe fruit of insurrection in the Continental States.

So the Chartist agitation broke out anew. The movement was augmented by the misfortunes through which England had recently passed. O'Connell's great campaign for the repeal of the Union had ended in defeat; but the discontented spirits of both Ireland and England were not stilled. The agitation for the repeal of the Corn Laws had indeed been successful. But the Reform legislation of 1832 had brought only disappointment and mockery to the working democracy of England. The ranks of Chartism were augmented from nearly all the columns of discontent, and it was believed by the leaders that the time had now come, when, by a single great rally, they might bear down Parliament, and constrain the Government to yield to their demands.

In pursuance of this general policy, the Chartists proceeded to prepare a monster petition to the House of Commons, demanding that the principles of the People's Charter should be acknowledged by that body, and incorporated in the Constitution of the realm. It was arranged that the petition should first be signed by millions of English workingmen, and that it should then be carried to the House of Commons by a delegation at the head of a procession, which it was hoped to swell to the number of five hundred thousand persons. For this purpose, the multitudes were to assemble on Kennington Common, on the 10th of April, 1848. The Chartists hoped to make the demonstration by far the most formidable which had been known in the political history of mankind. It was believed that half a million of people could be brought together and arranged in a single procession. At this time Feargus O'Connor was the acknowledged leader of Chartism, and he was to be the moving spirit of the multitude. The fatal defect in the whole proceeding was that the Chartists themselves had no clear idea of the *After That*. Suppose the House of Commons will not hear our petition, will not yield to our demand, will not feel the display of force and numbers. What then? Shall we fight? Shall we peace-

ably disperse to our homes, and leave the English Government to ridicule both our procession and ourselves? It was precisely the same difficulty which had wrecked the cause of repeal in the hands of O'Connell. The younger and fiercer spirits who followed that storm-breathing Irish Achilles, would fain have fought; but the older, the wiser, the more conservative, including the leader himself, and vast majority, sought the end only by appeal, by argument, and by the olive-branch.

So also with the Chartists. Meanwhile, however, there was great alarm in London and throughout the kingdom. There were rumors of insurrection in every city. But, as usual, the event soon showed that the crooked flukes of the British anchors had fast hold of the ledges under the sea. The defense of the metropolis was intrusted to the Duke of Wellington. Military preparations were made to maintain the peace, and if need be, to break up the Chartist demonstration. About two hundred thousand militiamen were enrolled for the occasion, and before the day of the meeting it was evident that the demonstration was doomed to failure.¹ Instead of a half million, only twenty thousand, or at most twenty-five thousand persons, assembled on the Common. Orders had been issued by the Government forbidding the formation of the procession, as having for its purpose the disturbance of the peace of the realm. Feargus O'Connor advised his followers to obey the mandate. He and some of the Chartist leaders proceeded, however, to present the huge petition to the Commons. But the effect was naught. It was boasted that the papers contained seven million signatures. But this statement was found to be greatly exaggerated. Fewer than two millions of names were found, and of these many were spurious and fictitious. Nevertheless, it could not be said that a paper signed by a million of earnest Englishmen was absurd. The Chartist movement was a failure, not because of the political principles on which it was projected, but because those principles were already

¹ Among those who served as special policemen on this memorable occasion was at least one notable personage—no other than Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, soon to be President of the French Republic, and afterwards Emperor Napoleon III.

virtually acknowledged in the heart of England, and were destined, in so far as they were valid and applicable to the political condition of Great Britain, to be rapidly incorporated as elements of the Constitution. At least three of the six articles of the Chartist charter were soon adopted by Parliamentary approval. The principle of Manhood Suffrage is virtually a part of the English Constitution. The right of voting by Secret Ballot, deposited in a ballot-box, has also been acknowledged as a part of the *modus operandi* of all British elections. Unlike manner, the Property Qualification imposed on candidates for Parliament, against which the Chartists so vehemently and justly declaimed, has long since been abolished. It is an anachronism in politics to insist on the doing of a thing already done—on the acknowledgment of a principle already acknowledged. As in America the struggle of the Greenback party for predominance as a party ended in failure, though the principle for which all rational Greenbackers contended—namely, that the Congress of the United States has the right and power, independently of the

fact of war, to make absolute paper money, and to constitute the same a legal tender in the payment of all debts not specifically otherwise provided for—was ultimately, and almost unanimously approved by the Supreme Court, and driven into the Constitutional interpretations of our Republic; so the Chartist agitation as an organic political party movement collapsed, ended in dust and smoke, though the principles for which the Chartists contended were approved, not only

by the intelligence and conscience of the English Nation, but by Parliamentary adoption.

The correlative agitation in Ireland, however, was destined to run on for a considerable period. Daniel O'Connell now slept in a quiet grave under the blue skies of Italy. The younger and more enthusiastic division of the Irish patriots, after the collapse at Clontarf, parted company with the Conservatives, and continued to propagate the doctrines of Repeal and Revolution. The party thus con-



WILLIAM SMITH O'BRIEN.

stituted now took on the name of *Young Ireland*, and devoted itself with assiduity to the emancipation of the Irish people from the control of England. The *Nation* newspaper was established as the organ of the propaganda, and William Smith O'Brien became the leader of the new party. Belonging as he did to the upper class of society, being a man of wealth and rank, he was able to give to the cause a strong impetus. Associated with him was Thomas Francis Meagher, who had

fame as an orator—a thing always essential to agitation in Ireland. Two other leaders of great prominence also appeared in the persons of Sir Charles Gavan Duffy, founder of the *Nation*, and John Mitchel, an Irish revolutionist, pure and simple. To these men the party of Young Ireland now looked for counsel and direction.

Around the nucleus here defined was immediately gathered much of the intellect of the island. Especially did the young men fresh from the universities rally to the call for the independence of their country. They contributed to the radical newspapers the keenest part of their intellectual product in both prose and verse. Some were for going farther, and some not so far. All were for the repeal of the Union, and the establishment of Irish independence by revolution. But what did the revolution mean? It was the old difficulty over again. Did revolution mean outright rebellion, downright war, the unsheathed sword, battle and blood and death? Or did it mean something less than these?

Here the party divided. The more radical of the radical took to the leadership of Mitchel. That great insurrectionist established a new newspaper called the *United Irishman*, and it was at once perceived that around this truly revolutionary standard was gathered the body of Young Ireland. Mitchel's newspaper soon surpassed the *Nation* in influence and circulation, as it surpassed it from the first in vehemence and bitterness towards the British Government. The new organ teemed with the wildest diatribes and invectives. Rebellion was openly advocated as the only remedy for the ills of Ireland. Even the measures by which the war was to be carried on were discussed with all the bravado of anarchy. Methods of destroying British soldiers and their abettors in civil society were explained with as much coolness as though they had been the methods of the butcher's stall. Articles appeared in the *United Irishman* demonstrating the usefulness of vitriol as an agent of destruction. Mitchel and his correspondents rose to the high pitch of fanaticism, and it became evident that they meant to provoke the English Government to a collision.

Meanwhile, an actual revolution had broken out in Paris, and discharged the Orleans

princes from all further service. The event was hailed in Ireland as a sure precursor of a general revolution, in the course of which the Celtic Island must of necessity achieve its independence. O'Brien and Meagher went to the French capital to solicit from Lamartine, then almost supreme in State affairs, his sympathy and patronage in the matter of the Irish revolution. At length, matters in Dublin and in other parts of the Island came to such a pass that it was no longer optional with Government whether they would or would not proceed to the issue and trial of strength with the Irish insurrection. The Lord-Lieutenant had good reason for regarding Mitchel's paper as not only seditious, but incendiary. Still, according to current statutes, it was a difficult matter to proceed against the rampant editor and his establishment. Though his paper gave from day to day deliberate instruction in the art of killing, which, under the circumstances, appeared very much like the art of murder, there had been as yet no such overt acts as would warrant his arrest for crime. Anything short of criminal prosecution went for nothing when directed against the favorite leaders of the people; for they immediately freed themselves from duress under the law of bail, and became more active than ever.

In Parliament, it was deemed that the emergency called for speedy and severe remedies. A bill was accordingly hurried through, making all written incitement to crime a felony under the statutes. It was a deadly blow aimed at the Irish insurgents; but Mitchel at least was undaunted. He went on more violently than before, and was arrested and thrown into prison. Even from his cell he hurled defiance at the Government, and urged his countrymen to rescue him from the clutches of tyranny. But the outside party was wanting in courageous leadership. Mitchel was tried and found guilty. Standing in the dock, he made a furious and defiant speech, and went down game under a sentence of fourteen years' transportation to the Bermudas. He was hurried out of Dublin, and as the ship which bore him from sight dropped behind the horizon, the hope of a successful Irish insurrection disappeared.

The condemnation and banishment of their most courageous leader roused the animosity of

even the more moderate party of young Irelanders, and they all took on the character of rebels against the Government: not rebels indeed in fact, but rebels in spirit and purpose. Smith O'Brien, Meagher, and others left Dublin and went to Ballinacorney, where they were surrounded by a crowd of insurgents, whom they brought into a state faintly resembling military discipline. The Tipperary police stood against the insurgents, and were attacked by them. O'Brien's forces obliged the posse to take refuge in a cabin, and there assailed them with such rude arms as they possessed. The police fired from the windows, and several of the assailants were shot down. The remainder at length dispersed. It was a trivial affair, rescued from ridicule only by its serious consequences. O'Brien was pursued to Thurles, where he was taken. Meagher and two others were soon afterwards captured in the mountains. A court was called at Clonmel, and in September of 1848 the prisoners were found guilty. O'Brien was sentenced to be hanged, *beheaded, and quartered*; for such was the still merciful statute of Great Britain relative to treason. Meagher was likewise sentenced to death, with the added horrors of mutilation. Standing in the dock, the brave young Irishman cried out, with uplifted hand and steady voice: "Even here, where the shadows of death surround me, and from where I see my early grave opening for me in no consecrated soil, the hope which beckoned me forth on that perilous sea whereon I have been wrecked, animates, consoles, enraptures me. No, I do not despair of my poor old country, her peace, her liberty, her glory."

The sentences of the condemned men were commuted into other forms of punishment. O'Brien was to be transported for life. All of the convicts were sent to Australia, from which, in course of time, both Mitchel and Meagher effected their escape. O'Brien refused to avail himself of the opportunities to get away, and was at length pardoned: first, on condition of not returning to England or Ireland, and afterwards unconditionally. As to Sir Charles Duffy, he was twice brought to trial, and twice the jury refused to convict. The prosecutions ended with the condemnation and expulsion of the leaders. Young Ireland was broken up, and another element was

added to the now chronic despair of the Irish people.¹

It may well be supposed that the consequences of all the agitation and disasters which had visited the unfortunate Island would tell in some phenomenal manner on the destinies of the Irish race. The country had first been shaken from center to circumference by the voice of O'Connell, and heated with his arguments for the repeal of the Union. The discouragement which ensued after the failure of this movement, was profound. Then came the potato famine, in which hunger and disease and death ravaged, without check, through some of the most fertile parts of the Island. This was followed, hand after, by the Young Ireland insurrection, by the clamor for revolution, and the vague hope that, in some way, the yoke of England might be thrown off, and Irish happiness be secured by the way of Irish Independence. This hope also was completely blasted. The Irish patriots were doomed to see their favorite young leaders escape the death penalty only by transportation to the South Atlantic. It can not be wondered at that the

¹The ultimate fate of the leaders in the Irish Rebellion is worthy of particular note. Smith O'Brien, after his final return to Ireland, retired to Wales, and died there in 1864. Mitchel, on his escape, came to the United States, and resided in Richmond, Virginia. When the American Civil War came on, he became a violent partisan of the South. But after the war he removed to New York, and thence went back to Ireland. He was elected to the House of Commons, was refused admission to the body, and was elected again. It appeared for the time that there was to be a serious conflict between the rights of his constituency and the prerogative of Parliament. Mitchel, however, was already sinking to the grave, and before the controversy was ended he had found that rest in which, according to the epitaph of Swift, the "savagè indignation" could pursue him no farther. Duffy became a member of the House of Commons, and was afterwards Prime Minister of the Colony of Victoria. Smyth rose to Parliament, and was an honored and distinguished member. Meagher went to Canada and became a Minister of the Crown, until what time he was struck down by an assassin. Martin, who reached a seat in Parliament, held consistently to his old political and revolutionary principles to the day of his death. Thus, through strange vicissitudes, and in distant regions, though not undehonored in its final day, expired and passed from memory that remarkable body of misdirected patriotism called Young Ireland.

people of the Island gave up in despair, and began to look abroad for some possible escape from the horrors of the situation.

There, beyond the Atlantic, they caught a glimpse of a broad and open land, from which rumor had brought back, on liberal wings, the report, not only of plenty, but of freedom. It is a sad day in the life of man when the strong tie which binds him to native land, snaps asunder; when he is constrained to turn his back on the home of his ancestors, to go on shipboard, and see behind him, in the gloaming of the first evening, the green shore of his own country sink behind the sea. The IRISH EMIGRATION to America, which now ensued as the legitimate consequence of the hardships to which the nation had been exposed, while it was one of the most striking examples of voluntary expatriation ever known, was by no means a surprising event. Behind the emigrants were famine, pestilence, landlordism, robbery, the oppressions of the British Government—every compulsive force that might well drive a people into exile. In the course of two or three years from the beginning of the potato famine, the country was depopulated at the rate of about a million souls per annum. Nearly the whole tide was poured into America. The exiles of Erin, generally in rags, were seen by hundreds and thousands in the streets of the American sea-board cities, from which they gradually distributed themselves into the interior, chiefly along the line of the great railways and canals, which about that time were in construction, and finding employment and profitable wages at the hands of public contractors.

It is from this point of view that the problem of Ireland in America henceforth is to be considered. It can not be doubted that the great emigration contributed many unfavorable elements to American life. It could not be expected that ship-loads of half-starved Irish peasants, uneducated, inexperienced, of low estate, unfed in all their lives with other food than the potato, could at once and favorably assume the duties of Republican citizenship. Our own system has been largely to blame for the vices that came with the Irish exodus. But the appearance of these people has not been an unmixed curse. In the first place, something is due to the principle of in-

ternationality—to that principle which demands the exposure and distribution of our own good, of our own strength, to those who have it not, of whatever clime or race. We may not forget the incalculable benefits which the Irish emigrants received from their contact with our people and institutions. Then, again, we may well consider the material advantage to ourselves. If virtue, indeed, flowed from the hem of our garments at the touch of Ireland, strength was given back into our own constitution from the wound made in our soil by the Irish spade. The addition of so large a body of cheerful and patient laborers to our own strained resources of physical force must by no means be overlooked in considering the general features and character of the problem. Finally, it shall not be forgotten that in the day when American institutions—aye, the very existence of the American Republic—was staked on the gage of battle; when the day of conflict came, and the free system of representative government on this side of the sea was under trial of the sword; when everything which the American heart holds dear was at jeopardy in the smoke and blood and carnage of Civil War.—then the Irish contingent contributed its full quota to the Union Army, and on every field, from the Rappahannock to the Ozark Mountains, Irish life was freely and gratefully given under the Star-banner which had received and guarded the exiles of 1850 in the dark day of their banishment.

While the attention of the British Parliament had been principally drawn to the events narrated in the preceding pages, other matters of less importance, but still of interest to the reader, had occurred. Among these, one of a peculiar sort may be mentioned as illustrative of the nature and tendencies of British legislative thought at the epoch before us. The incident referred to had many of the features of that remarkable Martin-Koszta Affair to which the reader's attention has been directed in a former chapter. Beginning with a merely personal matter, the event which we are now to consider was, as in the case of Koszta with our own country, destined before its close to bring forth and elucidate many important principles of international law and comity.

The affair in question arose in distant Greece, and was based ultimately upon the rights of British citizens resident abroad. Greece was, religiously considered, under the sway of the Eastern, or so-called Greek Catholic Church. That Church, as the Roman Church in the West, had its superstitions many and its traditional practices many, of which a certain usage was annually to burn an effigy of the traitor, Judas Iscariot. This ceremony was performed in connection with the Easter celebration in each year. It was generally an uproarious performance, at which the ruder citizenship was given license, not only to contribute to the burning of Judas, but to indulge in other half lawless amusements. At length the authorities of Athens concluded to abolish the ceremony. Accordingly, in 1847, the police were instructed to prevent the annual celebration. The movement was seriously resented by the people, and a mob arose headed by two sons of the Greek Minister of War. The insurgents came at length to the spot where the Judas was to have been burned, but, being deprived of the annual sports which they had been wont to enjoy, they turned aside to find some actual Judas on whom they might be revenged. Such a Judas was not far to seek. It chanced that there was resident near the scene a certain Jew named Don Pacifico, whose house the angry mob attacked and destroyed. But Don Pacifico had the prudence and craft of his race. He was a Portuguese by descent, born at Gibraltar, but a citizen of Great Britain. It was the latter circumstance, that is, his being a subject of the British crown, that now stood him well in hand. He accordingly made up an inventory of his losses, which he estimated at the very liberal figure of thirty-two thousand pounds sterling. He also claimed that among his papers, which had been destroyed by the mob, there were certain documents establishing the indebtedness of the Portuguese Government to himself in many additional thousands of pounds. The event showed that the imagination of Don Pacifico had been thrifty in the last degree, and that his legitimate claim would have to be reduced to a small fraction of what was shown in his inventory. But the principle was all the same, and Don Pacifico loudly demanded that the Greek Government should

compensate him for his losses. He also appealed to the British Minister of Foreign Affairs, and, being a subject of the British crown, his claim was taken up and indorsed by the Minister. Thus the issue was made between Great Britain and Greece. Palmerston, at that time Secretary for Foreign Affairs, formulated a series of claims, at the head of which was set that of Don Pacifico, and demanded that the Grecian Government should liquidate the whole or abide the consequences.

The Greek authorities, however, were little disposed to allow the validity of the claims, whereupon a British fleet was despatched to the sea-port of Athens to compel payment. In the emergency, Greece appealed to France and Russia to aid her against the unjust demand of Great Britain. Both of those governments had been somewhat offended at the precipitancy of England in displaying force in the harbor of a friendly power. The English Ministry was accused of a covert disposition to loose herself from the engagement by which the independence of Greece had been guaranteed at the establishment of the Greek monarchy. France was more mild-mannered, and proffered her good offices in the settlement of the difficulty. It appears that the English Ambassador at Athens proceeded, in conjunction with the representative of France, to adjust and allow so much of the claims of Don Pacifico as might be valid, but at the same time Lord Palmerston went ahead to force a settlement in his own way.

All of these circumstances combined to give an occasion for the Opposition in Parliament to attack the foreign policy of the Government, and the methods of Lord Palmerston in the Greek affair in particular. Palmerston, however, defended himself and the course which he had taken, in a masterly speech in the House of Commons, and the policy of the Foreign Office was upheld by a great majority. The claim of Don Pacifico, reduced to more moderate proportions, was at length discharged by the Greek Government, but only after the controversy had dragged along till all parties were anxious to be freed from its further consideration. A difficulty which came near leading at one time to serious consequences was finally eliminated from the thought of the

nations concerned by the diversion of their attention to other questions and interests.

In the course of the debate in Parliament on the matter of Don Pacifico and his troubles in Athens, Sir Robert Peel made his last speech in that great body, where he had been so long distinguished, and for several years supreme. It was in the early morning of June 29, 1850, that the eminent statesman left the House of Commons for the last time. He was a member of the Royal Commission, which had been constituted to superintend the great Industrial Exhibition in Hyde Park, the preparations for which were making at that time. Sir Robert attended a meeting of the Commission, and then visited the Queen at Buckingham Palace. On leaving the latter place, he was thrown from his horse, and becoming entangled in the bridle, was crushed under the animal's knees and hoofs. His injuries were fatal, and, after suffering for three days in great agony, he died, on the 2d of July. The event produced a shock throughout the Kingdom. It was proposed that the dead statesman should be buried in Westminster, but Peel had provided otherwise in his will. In that document he had stipulated also that no member of his family should accept any title or other mark of honor on account of the services which he had rendered to the country. For this reason, when the offer was made to elevate Lady Peel to the Peerage, the honor was declined. Nor will the republican reader of the *New World* fail to do obeisance to the sterling spirit of the man who could thus deliberately rest the reputation of his family with posterity on his own unaided name.

Just at the time of which we speak, the interest of all England was excited by a proceeding of the Pope of Rome relative to his alleged jurisdiction in Great Britain. The reader must in this connection recall hurriedly the history of the English Church. He must remember how closely, from the day of its birth, that Church had been identified with the political Constitution of the Kingdom. The Reformation in England had run a course very different from the destinies of the same movement on the Continent. Every part of the Establishment had now been for a long time interwoven with the civil fabric until not only

the independency, but the very existence of the one seemed to be involved with that of the other. The Church of England had from the middle of the sixteenth century rested heavily on Catholicism. It had remained for the nineteenth century to remove most of the disabilities under which the Catholics had long groaned, and to introduce a reign of comparative toleration. No sooner, however, was the weight lifted and Rome set free, than she began her old-time tactics for the recovery of her supremacy. Strange to say, moreover, at this very time, a reaction in favor of the Mother Church was discovered in the very heart of Episcopalianism. Several of the leading ecclesiastics discovered a sudden liking for the ceremonials, to say nothing of the dogmas, of Rome. It was noticed that, in the highest places of the Church, an unusual honor began to be paid to the saints. The sign of the cross was made as reverently by Churchmen as by Catholics, and the claim of infallibility was instituted. It was observed that some of the bishops read the liturgy in a manner and tone strongly in sympathy with the Latin chant of the Roman priest; and at last it was recommended in some dioceses that auricular confession be made, and that penance be done and absolution granted for sins. This was indeed *Sancta Ecclesia Rediviva!* It only remained to elevate the host to complete the transformation. In the autumn of 1850 the people of England suddenly awaked to find that their National Church was apparently slipping back into the open portal of "the Flaminian Gate."

Pius IX. was quick to discern and to appreciate the advantage which this movement seemed to promise. He accordingly issued a letter or bull, dividing England into dioceses, to be placed under the control of one Archbishop and twelve Suffragans. More than this—and this was the gravamen of his offense—he proceeded to authorize the bishops and archbishops to take their names or titles *from the name of the dioceses* to which they were respectively assigned. This sounded very much like the assumption of a certain indefinite *territorial* dominion over the diocese, rather than that merely ecclesiastical authority against which no one could raise objections. The assumptions of the Papal bull were immediately

backed by a pronouncement of Cardinal Wiseman, the new Catholic Archbishop of England. The pastoral letter which he now addressed to his subjects was, according to its superscription, "given out of the Flaminian Gate at Rome." The communication, which was ordered to be read publicly in all the Catholic Churches of London, was little less than insolent. It declared that "the beloved country"—meaning England—"had been received to a place among the fair Churches which constituted the splendid aggregate of the Catholic communion." It went on to say that Catholic England had been restored to its true orbit in the ecclesiastic firmament, etc.

Now it was, however, that the matter was overlone. The English people suddenly sprang up in indignation against the Papal assumptions, and the Island rang from shore to shore with loud denunciations of the whole impudent scheme, which had seemingly been devised for the restoration of the country to the dominion of Rome. Lord John Russell, at the head of the Ministry, wrote a general letter, in which he called the attention of the people of England to the insidious plot of the Pope against the principles of the Reformation, and against the still greater fact of English liberty. By the opening of Parliament in 1851 the public temper had become so much aroused that the Ministry were impelled, as much by the force of the popular voice as by their own convictions, to take some action against the scheme of the Pope and Cardinal Wiseman. To do so, however, was a step attended with great difficulty. In the first place, England had now openly adopted the principle of universal toleration in matters of religion. In the next place, it was seen by the leading minds that even the extraordinary pretensions and claims, which had recently been set up with respect to Papal dominion in Great Britain, were idle and empty, void of effect, the mere sound of brazen cymbals.

But the real difficulty in dealing with the question lay in the peculiar division which then existed in Parliament. In that body there were three political parties, the Whigs, the Conservatives, and the so-called Peelites. The latter had belonged, for the most part, to the Conservative party, but had adhered to Sir Robert Peel in the matter of Free Trade,

and had thus parted company with the Protection division, representing, in general, the landed aristocracy of Great Britain. When the Peel Ministry gave way, it was not the accession of the Whigs; the overthrow of the recent Government was personal rather than political. Besides the three divisions already mentioned, there was a strong Irish contingent, and this, since the passage of the Reform measures by which the disabilities resting on the Catholics had been removed, was made up almost exclusively of Catholic members. Any measure now proposed by Lord Russell against the assumptions of Rome would be at once assailed, for purely political reasons, by Disraeli and the Conservatives proper, while the Irish party, which, in general, had coöperated with Sir Robert Peel on everything *except* religious questions, would, of course, oppose the Ministry in a measure directed against Rome.

As to the party in power, it was itself made up of extremes. Those who strongly adhered to the Church of England were rampant for the enactment of strenuous measures against the Papal interference. Of this kind were all the prelates and their following, both in and out of Parliament. At the other extreme of the Ministerial party were those moderate statesmen, who were indifferent to the vapourings of Rome, and would have been glad if the question had never been brought into the House of Commons. It was in the midst of these embarrassments that Lord John Russell brought before Parliament the so-called ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES BILL, by which it was proposed to prohibit Catholic Bishops from the use of all such titles as, being derived from their dioceses, might hint at temporal, that is, territorial, jurisdiction. To accept of any such title was made a crime, under a penalty of a hundred pounds for every such assumption. The measure in this form, however, could not be passed through Parliament. The bill was so amended as to omit the more stringent clauses, and, even in the emasculated form, was only accepted as an end to the controversy. It does not appear that the Roman hierarchy was much disturbed or impeded by the measure. The statute continued in force, or, rather, *not* in force, until 1871, when it was quietly abrogated by the same body which had adopted it twenty years before.

CHAPTER CXXIX.—FROM HYDE PARK TO BOSPHORUS.



I have now arrived at a year in the history of England in which society made a new departure from its beaten course. It is not often that the student of the social evolu-

tion is permitted to see the beginnings of things. As a rule, he is obliged to content himself with following the lines of force already operative in affairs, without being able to discover exactly their origin. In 1851, London, or, rather, all England and the world, were destined to witness, in Hyde Park, the first great INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION OF ARTS AND INDUSTRIES. The project certainly originated with Prince Albert, Consort of the Queen. We have seen, in a former place, to what an extent the interests and sympathies of the Prince were devoted to the industrial and artistic side of life. His position in English society, his ample wealth, his power and influence in public affairs, gave him abundant opportunity to study out measures for the promotion of such matters as he conceived to be of benefit to the people. It was out of these antecedents that the concept of the Hyde Park Exhibition arose in his mind. He conceived that, if by some means, a plan could be devised for bringing together, under suitable conditions, the choice products, manufactures, and artistic achievements, not only of the English people, but of all civilized States, the reflex effect of such an exposition must be salutary in the highest degree. Albert was preëminently a practical man; but he also had, in some good measure, the inspiration of philanthropy, and was even capable of dreaming of a better age. He imagined that if such an Exhibition as he contemplated could be successfully carried out, it would tend to produce, by acquaintance, a better understanding among the nations, suggest friendly counsels among them, and discourage war—all this, in addition to stimulating a healthful rivalry among the various peoples in the matter of their industries and arts. Thus even might the reign of Violence

be ended, and the reign of Peace be ushered in. It can hardly be doubted that the Prince, and those immediately associated with him, were carried forward against extreme opposition and almost insuperable difficulties, by the pleasing hopes which they entertained of the betterment of mankind by the work they had in hand.

It was on the 21st of March, 1851, that Prince Albert, speaking at the Lord Mayor's banquet in the Mansion House, set forth in a happy and not unpoetical way, the project of the Exhibition. In concluding his address he declared that it should be the end of the enterprise to "give the world a true test, a living picture, of the point of industrial development at which the whole of mankind had arrived, and a new starting-point, from which all nations will be able to direct their further exertions." The proposition of the distinguished speaker met with an immediate and hearty acceptance by many of the public men present, and before the end of the banquet the first formal steps were taken for the promotion of the enterprise.

But no such measure has ever been projected in Great Britain without at once awakening the antagonistic forces which slumber ever at the door. In that country, the party method of advocacy and opposition is applied to everything. It might be said, without exaggeration, that if the Premier of England should lay before the House of Commons a resolution that men ought to be good and happy, the leader of the Opposition would be ready with a reply; the debate would be sharp and protracted, and the majority for the measure would be determined by a division of the House! For this reason, progress in England is laborious in the last degree. The course towards better things is rendered tortuous and difficult. The streams of national life flow like water underground—turned in this direction and in that by the nature of the media, percolating through gravel-beds, deflected by mi-placed strata, and finally issuing through hitherto undiscovered orifices in unexpected



CRYSTAL PALACE, 1851.

places, on unknown hill-sides. Let the reader, however, fail not to note that, by such a process, the waters are purified and the springs rendered perennial in their flow.

No sooner was the Prince's project known than opposition arose in every quarter. First of all, it was said that a World's Fair, held in London, would bring to the metropolis a melange of all nations. With them would come their vices and diseases, and the people would become infected with both. In particular, it was urged that the Red Republicans of the Continent would come over in swarms, and that their presence in London would excite the revival of Chartism, Irishism, Revolutionism, and every other political calamity. It was even urged that the English home would be invaded, English altars polluted, English wives and daughters turned from the practices of virtue by the unscrupulous, bearded adventurers who would gather in the metropolis. In the next place, the British press, from the *London Times* all the way round to *Punch*, broke loose with invective and ridicule to such a degree that at times it seemed the Prince and his project would be blown away in a common blast of contumely and laughter.

It may well be admitted that many real difficulties attended the enterprise, even after the Royal Commission, with Prince Albert at the head, was appointed to carry it forward. In the first place, an embarrassment arose in the matter of securing a suitable site for the Exhibition. Hyde Park was at length chosen; but the most strenuous efforts were made to prevent its use by the Commissioners, for the purpose. It was argued that the beautiful park would be forever despoiled if it were opened to the vulgar hordes who would come tramping from every quarter to the monster fair. But the Commissioners at length carried the day, and the park was selected as the scene of the Exposition. In the next place, some colossal structure was required in which the arts and industries of the contributing nations might be displayed properly. This was a serious question; for it might well be asked how any edifice, under any method of building, could be reared and put under roof with sufficient capacity for the contemplated display.

The difficulty was met by the genius of Sir Joseph Paxton. It had been at first suggested to attempt the construction of a huge building of brick and stone. But the objections to such a structure were obvious. A building of the kind must at the best appear like a monster factory or warehouse. Besides, it was doubtful whether the requisite strength could be secured in a construction of the kind, to say nothing of the admission of light. It was a happy inspiration which brought to Sir Joseph's mind the idea of a building of iron and glass. He conceived that a CRYSTAL PALACE, to use his own language, might be constructed which would meet, in the happiest manner, all the requirements of the Exhibition. The event showed the entire wisdom of the plan proposed. A great palace of iron and glass, for the display of the industrial and artistic products of mankind, was successfully constructed, and London was at length gratified, not to say glorified, with the sight of the completed structure.

Meanwhile, public opinion had, to a large extent, veered around to the Prince's quarter. From the first the Queen had ardently promoted the cause in which her husband had so heartily embarked. She felt for him and all his projects as much enthusiasm and devotion as her calm and somewhat sedate, though womanly, spirit was able to entertain. As it became evident that the Exhibition was destined to be successful, and as the opening day of the Great Fair approached, the zeal of the people and exhibitors rose to the level of the occasion. The pleasing duty of formally opening the Exhibition was justly allotted to Prince Albert. It was really a great day in the history of England, and of the Western nations, when the Royal procession was formed from Buckingham Palace to Hyde Park. It was estimated that the way thither was lined with fully three-quarters of a million of people, and, at the opening hour, no fewer than thirty thousand were seated under the shining roof of the Crystal Palace. The Queen herself attended proudly with her husband, and her glowing account of the opening ceremonies may well be repeated as an adequate description of the scene. "The great event," said Her Majesty, "has taken place—a complete and beautiful triumph—a

glorious and touching sight, one which I shall ever be proud of for my beloved Albert and my country. . . . The park presented a wonderful spectacle—crowds streaming through it, carriages and troops passing, quite like the Coronation-day, and for me the same anxiety—no, much greater anxiety, on account of my beloved Albert. The day was bright, and all bustle and excitement. . . . The Green Park and Hyde Park were one densely crowded mass of human beings, in the highest good-humor, and most enthusiastic. I never saw Hyde Park look as it did—as far as the eye could reach. A little rain fell just as we started; but, before we came near the Crystal Palace, the sun shone and gleamed upon the gigantic edifice, upon which the flags of all nations were floating. . . . The glimpse of the transept through the iron gates, the waving palms, flowers, statues, myriads of people filling the galleries and seats around, with the flourish of trumpets as we entered, gave us a sensation which I can never forget. . . . The sight as we came to the middle was magical—so vast, so glorious, so touching. One felt, as so many did whom I have since spoken to, filled with devotion—more so than by any service I have ever heard. The tremendous cheers; the joy expressed in every face; the immensity of the building; the mixture of palms, flowers, trees, statues, fountains; the organ, with two hundred instruments and six hundred voices, which sounded like nothing; and my beloved husband, the author of this peace festival, which unites the industry of all nations of the earth,—all this was moving indeed; and it was and is a day to live for ever."

The Exhibition extended from the 1st day of May to the 15th of October, when the ceremonies of the display were formally closed by Prince Albert. From first to last, Hyde Park and Crystal Palace were thronged to their capacity. At times it was estimated that quite a hundred thousand persons were within the precincts. Even financially the enterprise was crowned with success. In the beginning the money requisite for projecting so great a work had been raised by private subscription. Afterwards, a large guarantee had been provided against the possible losses attendant upon the Exhibition. But at the close the treasury was

full, and a large sum was left as profit to be expended by the Commissioners.

We shall not fail to note the exemplary results of the World's Fair in Hyde Park. It was the first of many such displays; nor could it be doubted, as the event has so well attested, that all civilized States would covet the distinction and glory of eclipsing the first International Fair. The Hyde Park Exposition was soon followed by a similar display in Dublin, and by another of painting and sculpture in Manchester. The city of Paris, under the auspices of the Second Empire, held two great International Expositions; and under the Republic, two others of still greater grandeur have been given. In 1862, England did herself the honor of a second Exhibition, in Kensington. In 1873, Austria came to the front with her Exposition at Vienna; and in 1876 the Americans availed themselves of the centennial anniversary of their Independence to set forth at Philadelphia one of the grandest and most successful of all the International Exhibitions.

In the meantime, in the course of the thirty-eight years that have elapsed since the first display of the kind, nations and people have come to a truer understanding of the real significance and value of such enterprises. The rosyate expectations which were at first entertained, that such comings together of the peoples of different countries would usher in a reign of peace and fraternity for all mankind, have disappeared in the light of the reality; but much has remained of solid value, of progress and humanity, as the residue of International displays. They have grown in favor, and may well be regarded as a permanent element in the civilization of the future.

The date in English history made famous by the Hyde Park Exhibition is memorable in Parliamentary annals for the rise to influence and promised ascendancy of Henry John Temple, better known by his title of Lord Palmerston. We have already seen him taking his station, in 1846, as Secretary for Foreign Affairs, in the Ministry of Lord John Russell. That position he held during the Revolutionary year, 1848. At that time he was obliged, in virtue of his office, to give constant attention to the relations of Great Britain with almost every Continental power,

Europe was in a state of active eruption, and the extent to which England might be affected thereby was problematical even to English statesmen. The condition of affairs on the Continent changed like the varying figures of a kaleidoscope, and Lord Palmerston must needs be on the alert in the Foreign Office of Great Britain lest the kingdom should be shaken from her moorings by the agitations abroad.

For these great duties and responsibilities, Palmerston was both fitted and unfitted—fitted by intellect and training; unfitted by disposition. He was naturally quick-tempered, impulsive, and self-willed, not to say aggressive, in disposition. In the stormy time of the European upheaval he nevertheless conducted the affairs of the Foreign Office with great ability. But it was soon discovered in the Russell Cabinet that Palmerston was disposed to run his department of the Government without much respect to either the Premier or the Queen. In instances not a few he conducted important negotiations, and sent out despatches, without submitting them to the revisory rights of his colleagues or the sanction of the sovereign. As a result, when things went badly, the Government was held responsible for measures which it had not approved. A break was thus produced, which was in the nature of a fracture between Palmerston and his fellow-ministers, but a real rupture between him and the Royal family. When the Prince-President, Louis Napoleon, effected his great *Coup d'Etat*, at the close of 1851, very serious consequences were entailed by the recklessness of Lord Palmerston. It had been the settled policy of Great Britain to move with extreme caution with respect to recognizing the validity of the proceedings of Prince Napoleon. When that personage, however, had accomplished his purpose by revolution, Lord Palmerston, in an imprudent conversation with the Polish Minister, at London, expressed his hearty approval of what Napoleon had done. The remark was immediately conveyed to the French Minister, and by him despatched to his Government, at Paris. England seemed thus to be committed to the policy of recognizing the *Coup d'Etat* whether she would or not. Likewise, on the occasion of the visit of Kossuth to London, Lord Palmerston, who, in the conduct of the

Foreign Office, had done his best to support the fortunes of the Hungarian Revolution, had been deterred from giving a formal reception to the fugitive Kossuth only by the remonstrance of the Cabinet. When thus balked in the expression of his sympathy for the political exile, he was still so imprudent as to accept an address from a body of English Radicals, who had held a meeting in honor of Kossuth, and adopted resolutions including an expression of animosity and contempt for Austria. By accepting this paper from their hands, Palmerston was put into the attitude of approving the animadversions which some of his countrymen had uttered against the Austrian Government.

The Queen and the Prince Consort were much offended at the proceedings of the refractory Minister. Her Majesty had long since had occasion to send to Lord John Russell a memorandum, expressing her displeasure at the treatment which she had received from the Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and also adding explicit directions for his conduct thereafter. Palmerston's course in declaring his approval of the *Coup d'Etat* of Napoleon brought affairs to an open rupture. Lord Russell, with the concurrence of the Queen, after having obtained an acknowledgment from Palmerston that the report of his expressed views relative to the Paris Revolution was correct, addressed the Minister a formal note, notifying him of his dismissal from office. This summary proceeding was the source of great excitement both at home and abroad; and when Parliament convened, in February of 1852, the whole question was debated with vehemence and acrimony. The course of Lord Russell, however, was overwhelmingly approved by the House of Commons, and Palmerston was, for a season, remanded to retirement, if not obscurity.

The circumstance of the recent French Revolution, by which Louis Napoleon paved his way to Empire, was destined, in its English correlations, to be the rock on which the Russell Ministry went to pieces. There had arisen in England a feeling of unrest and insecurity on account of the supposedly defenseless condition of the Kingdom. By a sort of instinctive movement, the public mind was seized with the passion for organizing and dis-

ciplining a kind of National Guard against the possible emergencies of the time. The gathering, discipline, and equipment of voluntary militia companies became the order of the day, and for the nonce it seemed that Great Britain was to become a camp. There was actual dread of a French war, and the sentiment of the nation was focused in a ballad from the Laureate, addressed to his countrymen:

There is a sound of thunder a-
 storm in the South that darcens the day—
 Storm of battle and thunder of war.
 Well, if it do not roll our way,¹
 Form, form; riflemen, form!

Let your Reforms for a moment go;
 Look to your butts, and take good aims!
 Better a rotten borough or so,
 Than a rotten fleet, or a city in flames!
 Form! form! Riflemen, form!
 Ready, be ready to meet the storm,
 Rifle-men, Rifle-men, Rifle-men, form!

Form, be ready to do or die!
 Form in Freedom's name and the Queen's!
 True, that we have a faithful Ally,²
 But only the Devil knows what he means!

The military movement referred to in Tennyson's lyric had thus far been of a popular character. The idea had possessed the people that there was insecurity, and that England must prepare herself against the threatening condition of the Continent. Many men were yet living who had fought at Waterloo; many more who remembered that fatal cataclysm. Now there was come into the field another Bonaparte, nephew of the Corsican. His recent proceedings among the French showed that he would scruple not at any means of restoring the Napoleonic régime. All this was particularly alarming to the England of 1852. When Parliament met, it was necessary that the Ministry should respond to the voice of the country by some action promotive of the general military organization of the Kingdom. A Militia Bill was accordingly prepared by Lord John Russell, and laid before the House of Commons. The debate thereon at once revealed the fact that the proposed statute had been badly devised. One clause, which made the organization of the militia local in character, rather than general, was

particularly unfortunate. The attack on the Ministerial Bill was general and from all quarters, and, to the surprise of the Government, a majority was against them. Palmerston, who was now out of the Ministry, made a powerful and characteristic speech against the policy of Lord Russell, and the latter, without prolonging the controversy, resigned his office. In the existing condition of parties in Parliament it seemed almost impracticable to form a new Ministry at all; but the Queen, in the emergency, called to her aid the Earl of Derby, and under his leadership the Administration was reorganized.

The new Prime Minister was not wanting in great abilities; but he had extreme difficulty in bringing into his Cabinet men of equal character with himself. The portfolio of the Treasury was given to Disraeli, who soon showed himself, contrary to all expectation, to possess the same genius for figures and schedules which he had already displayed in the wider domain of general politics. The Ministry was somewhat conglomerate, not made up on strict party lines, but by selection and expediency. If Palmerston could have been induced to join it, sufficient power might have been developed in the Cabinet to extend the Government indefinitely. But as things stood, the end of the current Administration was seen from the beginning; the Derby Ministry was a *pis aller* from the first, and on account of its obscure membership was designated as the "Who? Who? Ministry."

A Parliamentary incident of the time serves well to illustrate the peculiar movements of the public mind in England, and the resoluteness with which opinion in that country is sometimes confronted by the individual will. In 1847 Thomas Babington Macaulay, the historian, had lost his seat in the House of Commons. For some time he had sat in that body as the representative of Edinburgh, and had reflected fame on his constituents by the brilliancy of his talents. At length, however, he gave offense to his rigid and exacting people by supporting a bill for a Parliamentary grant to the Royal Catholic College of Maynooth, in Leinster, Ireland. Accordingly, when the election came round, Macaulay's name sank to the third place on the poll-book of Edinburgh, and he was, fortunately for him-

¹ Meaning Louis-Napoleon Bonaparte.



DUKE OF WELLINGTON.

self, and still more fortunately for the interests of historical literature, remanded to private life. Proud in his humiliation, he refused to stand for any other constituency, and Edinburgh, equally stiff in her resolve, was slow to recall her offending favorite to her service. At length, however, her resentment gave place to common sense, and it was signified to Macaulay that if he would offer himself, he should be again elected to Parliament. Not he. If the electors of Edinburgh should choose, of their own volition, to return him to the House of Commons, he would heed their call. "I should not," said he in answer, "feel myself justified in refusing to accept a public trust offered to me in a manner so honorable and so peculiar." He was accordingly elected by a great majority, and at the opening of the session, in 1852, again took his seat in Parliament.

It was in this same autumn that the aged Duke of Wellington reached the end of his eventful career. He died quietly in Walmer Castle, on the 14th of September, 1852, in the eighty-fourth year of his age. He was among the last survivors of that Revolutionary Era, in which he had been so conspicuous and heroic a figure. More than thirty-seven years had elapsed since, on that stormy and tumultuous June afternoon, on the plateau of Monte Saint Jean, he had said: "Rise, Guards, and charge!" A whole generation had passed away since the great military Captain of England had issued from that sulphurous uproar of Waterloo, to be, in some sense, the Arbitrer of Western Europe. In the interval, he had been called often to the councils of his country, where the simplicity of his character and his touching, almost fatherly devotion to the Queen, rather than any great political talents, were displayed. In his last years he drew to himself, in a remarkable degree, the veneration and affection of the English people. This was particularly true in London, where his face and form were known to almost every workman of the streets. So great was his reputation that the people called him, by preëminence, "The Duke," as though there were no other duke in the kingdom. After reaching much beyond his fourscore years, he went down to the grave in full honor, and, after life's fitful fever, he slept well. His funeral called forth almost the entire population of London, and the pageant of that day

was unrivaled by anything which had ever yet been witnessed in the British Isles. The muse of Tennyson took wing, and his song said

Bury the Great Duke

With an empire's lamentation,

Let us bury the Great Duke

To the noise of the mourning of a mighty nation—

Mourning when their leaders fall,

Warriors carry the warrior's pall,

And sorrow darkens hamlet and hall.

Where shall we lay the man whom we deplore?

Here, in streaming London's central roar,

Let the sound of those he wrought for,

And the feet of those he fought for,

Echo round his homes for evermore.

We have already remarked the temporary character of the Derby Ministry. The elections of 1852, though slightly in favor of the Administration, had no emphasis. On the re-opening of Parliament, the onus of the Government fell on Disraeli, Minister of the Treasury. We have seen above that his opening pass in the management of his Department had been, in a measure, successful; but on that occasion he had merely temporized with the great questions of the revenue, which he must now discuss in accordance with some permanent policy. Disraeli had now completely abandoned the principles of Protection and become as sound a Free-trader as any. It was necessary that some alterations should be made in the income taxes of the Kingdom, that the same should be greatly reduced, if not abolished, in the interest of the landlord class. In order to make up for the resulting deficit in the revenue, Disraeli proposed a reduction of the malt-tax, and other modifications in the existing schedule. In presenting the budget to the House of Commons, he made an elaborate and able speech, again exhibiting the vast resources of his genius and acquirements. But another, as strong as he, stood at the door, and no sooner had the Minister concluded his speech, than William E. Gladstone rose to reply. Notwithstanding the great effect which Disraeli's address had produced on the House, his rival bore him down in the debate, and the Derby Ministry, beaten on the resulting vote, were obliged to resign. The conflict on this occasion was the first passage at arms in the struggle for leadership between Disraeli and Gladstone—a duel of Parliament-

ary giants, which was destined to continue with exciting alternations of victory and defeat for twenty-four years, until what time the Queen should remove her favorite from the arena by raising him to the peerage as the Earl of Beaconsfield.

With the downfall of the Derby Ministry, a Coalition Cabinet was formed under the leadership of Lord Aberdeen as Prime Minister. Lord Russell was again called into the Government as Secretary of Foreign Affairs. Palmerston, who had been the agent of the latter statesman's overthrow, now became his colleague, accepting the office of Home Secretary. Gladstone was made Chancellor of the Exchequer, this being his first entrance into the Cabinet. The place which he accepted was, as we have seen, the most difficult, not to say dangerous, office in the Administration; but the new Minister entered upon his duties

talons of France nor the spear of St. George has as yet prevailed to loose.

Of this vast complication, Turkey is the heart and center. She holds in general the south-eastern parts of Europe and the approximate regions of Asia. So far as her position is concerned, it is such as to give her undisputed control of those narrow waters which separate the Asiatic dominions from the countries of Southern Europe, and such control has been guaranteed by treaties many, for more than a century. At the upper limit of European Turkey, the river Danube discharges by many mouths into the Black Sea. Following the coast of that stormy water southward, we come to Constantinople, on the Bosphorus, a strait much narrower and more easily controlled than that of Gibraltar. Then, through the Sea of Marmora, we make our way, through the Dardanelles, into the Archipelago, and thence into the free waters of the Mediterranean.

The advantage of the situation was clearly discerned by the Roman Cæsars. Constantine and his sons selected that old Byzan-



VIEW OF THE BOSPHORUS

with the confidence of a veteran, and it was at once perceived that his abilities in handling the difficult problems of finance were as conspicuous as they had already been shown to be on the wider plain of general politics.

We have now arrived at that epoch in the history of England, when the attention of the people and the Government was drawn away from the home affairs of the Kingdom to the greatest and most perplexing international controversy which has troubled Europe in the present century. It is doubtful, indeed, whether any other fact in the diplomacy of the kingdoms of Modern Europe since the rise of statecraft, has been so great a menace, so far-reaching in its ramifications, and so difficult of settlement, as that so-called EASTERN QUESTION, on an account of which we are now to enter. It has involved the entire fabric of Europe, and a considerable portion of Asia, in the folds of a complication which neither the

tion, lying on the point of land next the Bosphorus, and looking into Asia Minor, as the seat of the Eastern Empire. In the City of Constantinople, so founded and so patronized, the Roman power long maintained itself after the Eternal City of the West had gone down before the assaults of the Barbarians. It was within a few years of the birth of Columbus that the last Eastern Cæsar, still bearing the name of Constantine, yielded his scepter to Mohammed II. and his army of Ottoman Turks. The name of the conqueror was sufficiently significant. What Abdalrahman and his Saracenic host had been unable to accomplish on the field of Tours, more than seven centuries before, that was now effected at Constantinople by the Ottoman Emperor and his fierce soldiery. Islam was set up in Europe. The Crescent shone on high above the dome of St. Sophia.

The conquest of Constantinople was more,

far more, than a mere victory of Islam over Christianity. It brought the warlike Ottomans to predominance in Eastern Europe. Than these no fiercer or more courageous soldiers battled in the sixteenth century. They were the descendants of the iron-forgers of the Altai. They had themselves been converted to the profession of the Prophet with the sword and battle-axe of Arabia. Then, in turn, they had become the most zealous and successful propagandists of the new faith. Mohammed organized his empire from the capital which he had conquered, and the Ottoman Power was an established fact in Europe.

The Turks were, from the first, Asiatics, not Europeans. They had the thought and habitude of the Orient. With the Occident they had nothing in common. Their religion was not more foreign to Europe than themselves. The whole history of the Turkish power appeared from the first in the nature of a historical displacement, by which a part of Asia had been thrown, as if by a geologic convulsion, among countries of a different type and origin. To the rest of Europe the Turks were an everlasting menace. Up from the South-east, by successful wars, they made their way towards the heart of Europe. There was no nation as far west as the Atlantic that did not, as late as the close of the seventeenth century, have serious apprehensions of what might come to pass from the aggressions of the Ottoman Power.

The Turks, for more than three hundred years, maintained their isolation among the States of Europe. They assimilated in no particular with the civilization of the West. Nor might it well have been foreseen what would be the condition of Eastern Europe in the nineteenth century if the Ottoman had not lost his power and ambition. But at length he sickened. Paralysis came, in body, soul, and member. The Oriental habit at length pre-eminently over the ethnic forces of the race. The sons of the iron-forgers became Orientals pure and simple. Mohammedanism and opium wrought together in the deterioration of the Turk, until he became the creature whom we see to-day.

In the next place we must take into consideration the condition of the subject peoples over whom the Ottoman scepter in Europe

had been extended. Those of the southern part of European Turkey, with the exception of the Greeks and Albanians, generally yielded to the sway of Islam, and were gradually assimilated to the dominant power. But in the Danubian countries the people of the subject States retained their profession of Greek Catholicism. The provinces in this region remained Christian under Mohammedan rule. As a general thing, the Ottomans were little disposed to persecute for mere opinion's sake. Particularly after the decay of the Turkish political power had well set in, did the authorities of the Sublime Porte act tolerantly towards the Christian subjects of the Empire, so long as the latter lay quiet under the system of Government which the Sultans had established. Up to this point, therefore, the reader will hardly discover the outlines of those threatening complications which, under the name of the Eastern Question, have so much distracted the States of modern Europe.

Thus much, however, is but the beginning of the problem. In the next place, consider the Russian Empire. We speak here of that European Russia extending from the Ural Range to the borders of Germany, and from the Caucasus and the Black Sea on the south to the Arctic Ocean. Within this almost infinite domain a vast power, political and ethnic, emerged suddenly to view at the close of the seventeenth century. That Inspired Barbarian, Peter the Great, appeared on the scene, and became one of the principal actors. He put himself at the head of the Slavonic race, organized an Empire on a large scale, left the old inland capital of Moscow, made his way to the Gulf of Finland, and planted there his new seat of Government. It was clearly his policy to issue and bring with him, among the civilized States of the West, the new Muscovite power, which he had created rather than inherited. In this stupendous scheme he beat about somewhat at random, and made many and grave mistakes. One thing he clearly perceived, and that was that the inland barbaric character of the Muscovite dominion must give place to a new system, which should be maritime, and therefore commercial, in its character, and international in its relations. The possession and development of sea-board emporia was a *sine qua non* in the scheme of the Czar.

In a word, there was, must be, for this new Imperial Russia, *an outlet to the ocean*, and thence to the world. The project was rational in the highest degree, and from the day of its conception until the present, the enterprise of Peter I. has never ceased to be the dream and purpose of his successors.

Let us now see how Peter's plan might be carried into effect. In the first place, it would be possible to make a way to the south-east by the conquest of Persia, through Afghanistan, into the valley of the Indus, and thence to the great waters of the Indian Ocean. But the draught on Peter's mind was not in that direction. The great States with which he desired to compete lay westward. The international system into which he would enter was European, not Asiatic. We shall see, however, that at a later age, when the British East Indian Empire was so forward in development as to check the Russian movement, the Czar Nicholas actually sought, partly by diplomacy and partly by force, to make his way through Afghanistan into India. The great disaster to the British arms in Cabul, an account of which already has been given, was, as we have seen, the direct result of the Russian policy in its Eastern application. In the second place, Czar Peter might take possession of the Black Sea, and from that vantage work his way by conquest through the Turkish dominions westward to the Ægean. Or, by varying the scheme, he might take his course directly to the Bosphorus, overwhelm Constantinople, take possession of the straits, and thus send his ships freely into the Mediterranean.

It must be remembered, however, that to deal thus with Turkey, in the first years of the eighteenth century, was a very different measure from a similar aggression after the lapse of a hundred and fifty years. But still a third course was open to Peter, and this he chose to follow. He might select the Baltic as his means of exit into the Atlantic, in which case his new capital must be founded on that coast. This was accordingly done—a measure which may be regarded as the greatest of the Czar's mistakes. The event soon showed that vast inter-commercial relations could not well be established between Russia and the Western Kingdoms by way of the Bal-

tic Sea. St. Petersburg was too far away from the fortieth parallel of latitude to become a great commercial emporium. No doubt Peter the Great was constrained to pursue the course which he finally chose, in his attempted exit to warm water and the freedom of the world. The destruction of the Ottoman Power at that time was too serious a matter to be rashly undertaken. But considered as a fact, the establishment of the Russian capital on the Gulf of Finland was an error in policy which the whole force of the Empire has not yet been able to correct.

As long ago as the times of Empress Catherine, the embarrassment of the situation was severely felt. That imperious personage, ablest, perhaps, of the woman sovereigns known in history, perceived clearly that St. Petersburg, considered as the emporium of the Empire, was a failure. We may now see clearly how Catherine chafed and fretted on account of the barriers against her progress in the only directions whither she desired to go. Over one of the gates of St. Petersburg, on the side looking towards the Black Sea, she put up this inscription: "*The Way to Constantinople.*" But that way was too arduous even for the ambition of the Czarina and for Suwaroff. Perceiving the impracticability of a conquest of Constantinople in her day, she cast a longing eye to India, and in the last year of her life we find her, in pursuance of this ambition, engaged in planning the invasion and conquest of Persia. Death cut short the enterprise, and the great drama which was on in France drew the attention of her successors to the stirring events in Europe.

But notwithstanding the mistake of Czar Peter, notwithstanding the defeat or failure of many of the plans of Catherine II., the Russian Empire continued to grow and expand with marvellous rapidity. Already in the age of Frederick the Great the military resources of Russia were observed with amazement and some consternation by the Western Powers. It is doubtful whether any other great Empire has become vast, and regular, and strong, in so few generations as have elapsed since the apparition of Russia among the European nations. Already in the closing years of the Napoleonic era the tremendous impact of the Russian power made Europe tremble. It was

against that monstrous structure that the Grand Army of the Corsican broke itself into pieces, while the Boreal tempests roaring out of Lithuania hid the residue under the snows forever. The Muscovite had come.

Henceforth Russia, by her force and vengeance, inspired a dread in all the Western States. It should not be said that France and England feared the power of the Czar; but there was constant apprehension of his aggressiveness. The Russian dominions were wide enough, and had a population sufficiently vast to constitute a physical terror to Eastern Europe, and the passions which were known to slumber in the breasts of the Romanoffs might well inspire alarm in the domain of diplomacy.

At the time of which we speak the Russian crown was worn by Emperor Nicholas I. He was at this time fifty-six years of age. He was a son of that Paul I. whose assassination, in 1801, was so fatal a circumstance to Napoleon. Nicholas, as all the Czars, and particularly the Czarina Catherine, had done before him, looked with ever-longing eyes upon the Bosphorus, and the possible exit by that route into the warm waters of the Mediterranean. It could hardly be said to be a secret in any part of Europe that the Czar desired the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire. The decadence of that power had, in the meantime, been still more clearly manifested than in the first quarter of the century. But the Western Powers had now come to look upon Turkey as a barrier to the progress of Russia, a sort of buffer between the ram's-head of Muscovism and the walls of European civilization on the East. Turkey might suffice to deaden the stroke and distribute its effects, so that they should not be felt in the West. Nor was Nicholas himself at all careful in the matter of concealing his desires and purposes. The Russian Czar was, as yet, too little removed from the honesty of barbarism to be a good diplomatist, and thus thought it no harm to speak to the representatives of the Western States relative to the probable dismemberment of Turkey. He did not perceive that his open effidity would jar on the diplomacy of the West. Calling to mind the easy process of International spoliation which his grandmother, Catherine II.,

had had with Austria and Prussia in the division of Poland, he conceived that the same method might well and cordially be adopted by himself, Napoleon III., and Victoria.

Czar Nicholas was not wanting in great ability. His dark and piercing eyes easily saw the situation, but did not see the temper of those with whom he had to deal. He thought that the only thing to be done was to gain a colleague or two in the matter of shaking the Ottoman tree, assured, as he was, that the ripe fruit would fall richly to the ground. He discerned, moreover, that his fellow, his true coadjutor in the work before him, was Great Britain. Austria had been already subordinated to his purpose. Prussia he felt sure of securing to his interest. France he did not so greatly regard, because of the revolutionary condition of affairs in that country. But England was a necessity, and he accordingly began his overtures to her. As early as 1844, on his visit to London, the Czar plainly told the Duke of Wellington and Lord Aberdeen, at that time Secretary of Foreign Affairs, what he thought ought to be done in the event of the approaching dissolution of Turkey. It seems that the courtesies of the occasion required the English statesmen to be silent, and the Czar mistook their silence for assent. Accordingly, on his return to St. Petersburg, he had his Minister of State to prepare a memorandum of the "arrangement" which he supposed he had made with Great Britain. Afterwards he opened up correspondence with England, calling the attention of that Power to his supposed understanding with her, and demonstrating the course which Russia and Great Britain should take together when the cataclysm should occur in Turkey. From these negotiations England either drew back, or again answered with silence.

The reader will not fail to perceive some of the reasons why Great Britain had, before the epoch at which we have now arrived, become profoundly anxious that the political and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Power should be maintained. In her anxiety, the strongest element was doubtless her desire to hold her commercial ascendancy in the Mediterranean. Let the student look attentively at the map of that great Inland Sea, and the

position of the European States relative thereto. Let him observe how, on the rock of Gibraltar, Great Britain has set her fortress, commanding the western entrance. Let him note the analogy between Gibraltar and the Bosphorus. The latter is the eastern entrance to the Mediterranean. If England could control that strait, she would be absolutely mistress of the situation. Note the fact that, at the south-eastern angle of the Mediterranean, Great Britain has managed, since the beginning of the century, to hold the upper hand. Could she accomplish the same at the north-east extremity, her sovereignty of the whole region of the Mediterranean would be complete.

It was not to be supposed, however, that in the case of the dismemberment of Turkey, the control of the Bosphorus would fall to England. That must inevitably be the portion of the Czar. Though that personage might willingly concede to England the establishment of her dominion in Egypt, together with the possession of Candia and other notable advantages in the East, he would inevitably take for himself the Danubian provinces, and the control of the Bosphorus. For this reason England strongly desired that Turkey, her ally and friend, not to say her dependent, should retain her place among the nations, and keep her paralytic grip on the only channel leading from the Black Sea into the Mediterranean. Great Britain would stand behind the Sublime Porte, and guarantee its autonomy and the independence of Turkey. If England could not herself obtain possession of the Bosphorus, she would see to it that the possession of the Bosphorus should remain in the hands of her ally and dependent. She would make Turkey her proxy, and would do by her what she could not openly do herself. While seeking to avoid open and deliberate responsibility in the matter in hand, she would adopt, nevertheless, the old law maxim applicable to the question: *Qui per alium facit, facit per se.*


We must now take into consideration still another aspect of this multifarious Eastern Question. Glance for a moment at the old Turkish town of Jerusalem. There the rivalry between Russia and the Western Powers was based wholly on religious differences. Within the Holy City the Greek Catholic Church and

the Roman Catholic Church were set face to face, and the bitterness of their rivalry was proportional to the folly of the superstitions which divided them. The Greek Church had its fountain-head of authority in St. Petersburg, and the Roman Church looked to the Eternal City as the seat of its government. In Jerusalem many of the sacred places were held by the Greeks; others, by the Latin monks representing Rome. In times past the protectorate of the Latin monks in Jerusalem, and, in general, the guardianship of Christian interests in all Syria, had been conceded to France. The protectorate of the Greek Church, in its whole extent, belonged to Russia. It thus happened that when a Greek ecclesiastic fell into a quarrel with a Latin monk, in Jerusalem—a quarrel relative to the Church in Bethlehem, the Sanctuary of the Nativity, the Tomb of the Virgin, the Stone on which the body of Christ was anointed, or the Seven Arches of the Mother of God—the Greek priest had behind him the Czar of Russia, and the Latin monk the ruler of France. Not without the profoundest elements of instruction is this picture of the array of the greatest political powers of modern times behind the poor, pitiful, obsolete superstitions rampant in an old Syrian town.

The matter, however, was sufficient to furnish a pretext for the antagonism of France and Russia. But yet it is due to civilization to say that a more powerful and valid reason was found for French hostility. The accession to power of Prince Louis Napoleon Bonaparte was accomplished, as we shall see in a succeeding chapter, by means at which a scrupulous ruler would have startled. But Napoleon did not scruple. He went straight forward, and accomplished his purpose. No sooner had he done so, however, than he found it necessary to distract the attention of the French people from the rather shocking manner in which he had come to power. Having made a success of the *Coup d'Etat*, he must now obliterate the memory thereof by a *coup de gloire*. Foreign war was almost a necessity of the situation; and a Latin monk in Jerusalem, quarreling about his monopoly of the Anointing Stone, constituted as good an excuse as any. It should be remembered, also, that France, in particular France under the scepter of

Napoleon III., had a *recollection*, as it respected Russia, which she desired to quench. She still remembered the year 1812, and waited for the opportunity to write the Malakhoff instead of

the Bridge of Beresina. It has been one of the peculiarities of the French people that their attention thus can be diverted from the hardships occasioned by political convulsions at



CHURCH OF THE HOLY SEPULCHRE.

home to the glorification of the name of France by victory in foreign wars.

Still another element must be introduced into the complication. We have seen already that a large part of the subject populations of the Ottoman Empire were Christians of the Greek Catholic faith. They were thus subject, ecclesiastically, to the Russian Primate of the Church, and were under the protection of the Czar. These people were also Slavonic in their origin, and were thus divorced in their race sympathies from the Turks. The Danubian Principalities were more Russian than Turkish in manner and custom and ethnic preference. Among these elements of sympathy felt by the peoples inside of European Turkey for Russia and her system, the religious identity constituted the safest and surest pretext which the Czar might seize upon as a claim for interference, and this he adopted as his argument with the Western Powers in justification of his proceeding.

In the meantime, however, Nicholas made a final open overture, in the hope of securing the assent and coöperation of England. Up to the beginning of 1853 the Czar still believed that the Government of Great Britain was in virtual accord with his own on the question of how Turkey should be disposed of in case of her dismemberment. In January of that year, while he was in attendance at a ducal party, given by his friend the Archduchess Helen, to which the diplomatical corps at St. Petersburg was invited, he plucked aside the English Ambassador, Sir Hamilton Seymour, and openly revealed to him, in a free conversation, his views relative to Turkey. He expressed his wish that the Danubian Principalities should become independent under his own protection. The Turkish Power, as such, was to cease to exist. The Czar disavowed any purpose of occupying Constantinople; but it was clear from the conversation that that metropolis was no longer to constitute a barrier to his exit into the Ægean. All South-eastern Europe was, according to the Czar's plan, to be reorganized, under the auspices of Russia and England. Nicholas told Sir Hamilton that, so far as he was concerned, Great Britain might take possession of Egypt and Candia as her part of the spoils. He did not seek to have the work done by treaty,

but simply by an informal agreement of the parties.¹

The effect of these radical propositions upon the English Ministry may well be imagined. The British Government informed Nicholas that they could not be a party to the spoliation of Turkey. The Government of the Porte was in friendly alliance and under treaty stipulations with Great Britain, and the diplomatical morality prevalent among the Western States, would by no means permit such a proceeding on the part of England as that contemplated by the Czar. That sovereign was thus, in a sense, mated at the outset; but he immediately fell back upon his right to exercise a protectorate over the several millions of Christians who were subject to Ottoman rule. On this point he expressed himself with determination, and in defense of his course and purpose, he confidently set forth the Treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji, which had been concluded by Empress Catherine and the Sultan in 1774. According to the terms of this instrument, the Ottoman Government had conceded to the Czar the right "to protect constantly the Christian religion and its churches; and also to allow the Minister of the Imperial Court of Russia to make, on all occasions, representations, as well in favor of the new church in

¹ It was in the course of this ever-memorable conversation between the Czar and Sir Hamilton Seymour that Nicholas, in a very animated and witty manner, struck off a phrase which was destined to pass into the diplomatical and common language of the times, and, indeed, to remain forever as a peculiar expression in the historical jargon of the Nineteenth Century. The Czar, addressing Sir Hamilton, said: "We have on our hands a *sick man*—a very sick man; it will be a great misfortune if, one of these days, he should slip away from us before the necessary arrangements have been made." From the moment this conversation was divulged, Turkey became known by the epithet of the "Sick Man." If one may be permitted to smile at national decay, and to enjoy the wit of an Emperor, then indeed may the pungent phrase be accepted as one of the happiest conceits which was ever uttered. The "Sick Man" of the East has survived nearly forty years, but the truthfulness of the Czar's phrase is as clear to-day as it was in January of 1853. It only remains to say that the "necessary arrangements" to which the Czar referred had respect to what England and Russia were expected in a friendly way to do on the occasion of the funeral!

Constantinople, of which mention will be made in the Fourteenth Article, as in favor of those who officiate therein, promising to take such representations into due consideration, as being made by a confidential functionary of a neighboring and sincerely friendly Power." Under this compact, the Czar now took his stand, and, in the resulting correspondence, Lord John Russell, perhaps inadvertently, admitted the correctness of the position which Nicholas had assumed. Addressing Sir Hamilton Seymour, on the 9th of February, 1853, Lord Russell said: "The more the Turkish Government adopts the rules of impartial law and equal administration, the less will the Emperor of Russia find it necessary to apply that exceptional protection which his Imperial Majesty has found so burdensome and inconvenient, though, no doubt, prescribed by duty and sanctioned by treaty." It would therefore appear clear that, according to the Treaty of 1774, and by the admission of Lord Russell relative thereto, the Czar did have the right of interference in the Turkish Principalities for the protection of the Greek Christians resident therein.

It was not long, however, until England awoke to a realization of the fact that to grant the Czar's construction of the Treaty of 1774 was virtually to give away the whole question. That construction was, that the Russian Emperor had a *general* right of interference on behalf of the Greek Christians throughout the Turkish dominion. There, for instance, at the extreme south of European Turkey, were the Greek Principalities, with about fourteen millions of people, nominally Christians. What should be done with these? Should it be admitted that the Greeks, on the line of their religious sympathies, might accept the general protectorate of the Czar to the virtual abrogation of their allegiance to the Turkish sovereign? This would indeed seem to be the meaning of the concession which the Porte had made to Catherine the Great. The Western Powers, however, and England in particular, chose to put another and very different sense into the Treaty of Kainardji. The English interpretation of that instrument now was that the Sultan had merely conceded the Russian Minister at Constantinople the protectorate of *a certain Greek church* in that city, and that no general

right or prerogative of the Czar respecting the Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire had been granted.

Nevertheless, the Czar went straight ahead with his scheme of interference. Other matters had now been cleared away. The dispute between the Latin monks and the Greek ecclesiastics in Jerusalem had been easily settled. But the demands of the Czar relative to the Turkish Christians were urgent, and would take no denial. Nicholas despatched Prince Mentschikoff to Constantinople to extort from the Sultan a guarantee that certain reforms should be at once made in his administration relative to his Christian subjects. These demands were deemed by the Porte to be unreasonable; and Mentschikoff withdrew. The Czar thereupon ordered two divisions of his army to cross the Pruth into Turkish territory, and to hold the country until the Sultan should accede to the demands made upon him.

Meanwhile, diplomacy was busy at the problem. Ambassadors from England, Austria, France, and Prussia, met at Vienna to wrestle with the question of peace and war. Though Russia had already invaded the Turkish dominions, she continued to represent herself as peaceable. She would have peace; but guarantees must be given; and Turkey must concede the Russian protectorate over her Christian subjects. The diplomatés were disposed to yield to the Czar's demands, and a memorandum was prepared in accordance with his wishes. The question seemed at the point of solution, and peace about to be secured, when everything was suddenly changed by the action of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, at that time Minister Plenipotentiary of Great Britain at Constantinople. He pointed out to the Sultan, with great force and clearness, the results which were sure to follow his acceptance of the proposed new treaty. He urged the Porte to fight, and showed conclusively that, in the event of war, the Western Powers, and particularly England and France, must espouse the Turkish cause, and that, in that event, the autonomy and independence of the Ottoman Empire would be secured. His views prevailed; and the memorandum of the Vienna Convention was accordingly rejected. With that rejection, war became a certainty, and the solution of the Eastern Question, to which

we have here allotted so much space, was remanded to the sword.

There was now, during the later part of 1853, a brief interval of that kind of negotiation which precedes a war after the same has become a certainty. When Turkey refused to accept the proposal of the Vienna mediators, she offered to strike out certain offending words in their memorandum, and to put therein a clause which would be acceptable. But this modification was rejected with scorn by Russia. Meanwhile the Emperor of the French had not only joined fully in the purposes of England, but was clearly covetous of leadership in the coming conflict. Under this sentiment, he wrote a letter to Czar Nicholas, urging him in a somewhat lofty strain to keep the peace of Europe, and closing with a threat that in case the peace was broken, he and his Ally, the Queen of England, would regard war as a measure of necessity and justice. To this the Czar replied that he was acting under the plain stipulations of former treaties. From this position he would not recede, and that, should Russia be forced into a conflict, the Emperor of the French would find her as able to defend herself in 1854 as she had been in 1812! With such pleasant reminders the two Imperial personages sought to soothe each other's feelings when they had determined to fight.

In the meantime, however, war had actually begun. Glance again at the map of the Black Sea and the surrounding countries. It will be seen that the northern and eastern shores belong to the Russian Empire, while the southern coast is held by Turkey. Each nation had its fleet in these Euxine waters, the Russian squadron having its base at Sebastopol in the Crimean Peninsula on the north; and the Turkish fleet holding a like relation in the town of Sinope on the southern shore. It had now become clear that Russia, in order to make sure of the neutrality of Austria, must withdraw her arms from the Danubian Principalities into which she had penetrated; for the Austrian Emperor was averse in the highest degree to such occupation by the forces of the Czar. It was also clear that hostilities must break out on the Black Sea. The English and French fleets and armies were already on their way to the East. As soon as they should arrive at the entrance to the Dar-

danelles, the Sultan, having control of that narrow strait, and also of the Sea of Marmora and the Bosphorus itself, would, under his prerogative, open those waters for the passage of the allied squadron into the Black Sea. Nature and civilization had conspired to make that water and the adjacent shores the seat of the impending conflict.

Russia now sought to precipitate hostilities and to gain advantage before the arrival of the French and English forces. She accordingly allowed the Russian commander in the Black Sea to hover about Sinope with a view of provoking a battle. The provocation was readily, almost anxiously, accepted. On the 30th of November, 1853, the Turkish fleet sailed out from Sinope and anticipated the Russians in giving battle. The result was the annihilation of the Turkish squadron, and the bombardment and destruction of Sinope. The news of the conflict created great excitement in England and France, and the war spirit flamed high. Soon afterwards all diplomatical correspondence was broken off. The Russian Ambassadors were ordered home from Paris and London, and those of England and France withdrew from St. Petersburg. Declarations of war were mutually made by Turkey, Great Britain, and France, as Allied Powers on the one side, and by Russia on the other. It remained to decide the issue by the arbitrament of battle.

It is not purposed in this connection to give an account of the Crimean War. A narrative of that conflict will be reserved for the chapter devoted to the history of Eastern Europe in the present century. It has been the purpose in the current narrative to make clear the antecedents of the conflict between the Allied Powers and Russia in the Black Sea, by reciting with tolerable fullness the principal features of the Eastern Question—a question which, for ages to come, must continue to elicit the keenest interest on the part of all students of history. The narrative has been given, as it were, from the British point of view,—this for the reason that Great Britain properly may be regarded as the leading factor in the maintenance of the Turkish cause, and the principal contributor to the very imperfect solution of the questions involved in the war. We may now revert for a moment to the

progress of affairs in the Home Government of England.

The Ministry of Lord Aberdeen had been primarily disposed to peace. It will be remembered that Lord Palmerston had accepted office in the Cabinet, but it was as Home Secretary. In the duties of his position he devoted himself assiduously to several questions of much importance in the domestic economy of England; but apparently gave little attention to the foreign affairs of the Government. The sequel showed, however, that his eye was steadily fixed upon the progress of events in the East, and also that he did not agree with his colleagues in their peaceable dispositions. Such a state of affairs in the Cabinet was sure to produce a rupture. Lord Aberdeen was a man of peace, and Gladstone, Secretary of the Exchequer, was in sympathy with the views of the leader. Those views predominated for a while in the policy of the Government, and it was in accordance with this policy that the futile efforts for peace had been made by the four Powers in Council at Vienna.

Meanwhile, however, the war spirit prevailed more and more in Great Britain, and Lord Palmerston, better than any of his colleagues, discerned the drift of public sentiment and the inevitable course of events. At length the news arrived that the Turkish fleet had been destroyed in the furious conflict off Sinope. The official reports of the battle showed that four thousand Turks had been reduced by slaughter to four hundred, and that of this handful not a single man had escaped without a wound. Though the battle had been fought fairly enough, the press of Western Europe described the engagement as "The Massacre of Sinope." The news in England was like the pouring out of a tank of oil on a bonfire. Lord Palmerston urged the Cabinet to move forward with decision to a declaration of war. He advocated the sending of an armament immediately into the Black Sea; for, with his usual breadth of understanding, he had discerned that that water was to be the seat of the impending conflict.

At the first his radical views were not accepted, and he resigned his office. For the moment the real cause of his retirement was dissension; but the country soon perceived that Palmerston had gone out because his

views relative to affairs in the East could not be impressed on the Cabinet. Those views had now become the sentiments of the English people, and it was not long till the Aberdeen Ministry was borne down by public opinion. The policy of Government fell into line with the common voice, and Palmerston was at once recalled to office. He was not destined at the first, however, to give actual direction to the war, which was declared by Great Britain in March of 1854. It was not until the 5th of February in the following year, when the inefficient Ministry of Lord Aberdeen had gone to pieces, that Palmerston was called, not indeed to the War Office, not to the Secretaryship of Foreign Affairs, but to the position of Premier of England. Under his auspices the Crimean War, in the course of the ensuing year, was brought to a successful conclusion. After the accession of Palmerston, there was never any further complaint of inefficiency in the support of the British cause, and when it came to settling the controversy at the Treaty of Paris, in 1856, the influence of the English Premier was conspicuously predominant.

Before proceeding, however, with the narrative of the foreign relations of Great Britain under the Palmerston régime, we may well notice a few of the important domestic questions which came under his supervision while holding the office of Home Secretary. One circumstance which has been much dwelt upon is the fact that Lord Palmerston, much more than any other British statesman of the age, had received and accepted the results of the teaching of that new natural science which was, at that time, scarcely more than germinal in the public mind. He adopted and endeavored to apply these results in his Administration, and excited much antagonism by his common sense and straightforward dealings with domestic, and even religious, questions of the time. It was in the year 1853 that the cholera, worst of Asiatic scourges, made its appearance in many parts of Europe, and at length broke out in Edinburgh. That city was at the time poorly drained, without adequate sanitary provisions of any kind, given up to neglect and dirt; in a word, well prepared by the ignorance of man for the ravages of an infectious disease. The scourge

came, and the Presbytery of the city concluded, after their manner, that it might best be stayed by a national fast. Accordingly, in the fall of the year above named, the Presbytery, by their Moderator, addressed a letter to Lord Palmerston, Home Secretary of the Kingdom. The document was so worded as to bear the character of an appeal to the nation, and of a rebuke to the Home Secretary for his implied negligence in proclaiming the fast for which the letter was ostensibly a petition. What, therefore, was the astonishment of the Presbytery and of the public generally, when Lord Palmerston replied from

all, must be met on its own field, and vanquished by the application of scientific and sanitary agents. In the conclusion of his letter, the Home Secretary expressed himself and the principles by which his office was governed as follows:

“Lord Palmerston would therefore suggest that the best course which the people of this country can pursue to deserve that the further progress of the cholera should be stayed, will be to employ the interval that will elapse between the present time and the beginning of next spring, in planning and executing measures by which those portions of our towns and cities which are inhabited by the poorest classes, and which, from the nature of things, must most need purification and improvement, may be freed from those causes and sources of contagion which, if allowed to remain, will infallibly breed pestilence, and be fruitful in death, *in spite of all the prayers and fastings of a united but inactive nation.*”

Perhaps this reply of Lord Palmerston to the Presbytery of Edinburgh is the first public document of its kind, the first to suggest openly the substitution of rational and scientific methods, instead of religious humiliations, for the remedy of physical evils, which has appeared in the documentary history of the English-speaking race.

In other particulars, Lord Palmerston was equally remarkable in administering the duties of his office. It was during his ascendancy in the Home Department that the plan of transportation as a punishment for felonies gave way, and the ticket-of-leave system was established. It is known to all the world how Great Britain, by her transportation of criminals to Australia and other remote regions, had half-unwittingly built up penal colonies, and how these colonies had reformed themselves, gradually substituting law for license, and becoming well-ordered plantations. To continue to pour into such reformed settlements the filthy ooze of London, was to defile the colonies back to their original condition. Protests arose from the settlements of New South Wales against the continuance of a system so ruinous to the reviving virtues of the colonists.



LORD PALMERSTON.

the stand-point of a man of science? He informed the Moderator, and, through that official, the Presbytery and the general public, that, according to his views of the natural world and of the system of government established for mankind, the weal or woe of the human race depends upon the observance or neglect of the beneficent natural laws under which men are born and live and die. He informed the petitioners that the cholera was not the result of the Divine anger, but of the sowing of pestilential germs in the filth which had accumulated, through their ignorance and neglect, around their own homes, and that the scourge, if combated at

At length such protests were heard by the Home Government, and, as a means of alleviating the distress of her foreign settlements, Lord Palmerston invented the ticket-of-leave. This meant, in a word, that those convicts in the penal colonies who exhibited evidences of reformation, might receive from the authorities tickets entitling the holders to go free, returning, should they choose, to their homes in England. The measure proved to be salutary. Great numbers of the ticket-of-leave men became good citizens, both at home and abroad, and the plan was made an entering wedge for the abolition of the whole system of transportation.

Lord Palmerston also secured the adoption of measures by which London and other great manufacturing cities of the Kingdom were freed from the smoke and soot of the factories. Such establishments were obliged, by law, to introduce contrivances for the consumption of their own smoke, thus relieving the public. Still another important measure was that by which the grave-yards in London were shut up against the further accumulation of dead bodies. Lord Palmerston seems to have felt a scientific horror for the further poisoning of the earth by the deposition of the dead in unsuitable localities. In one instance, application was made to him for the burial of a distinguished

ecclesiastic under the roof of one of the sacred structures. The Secretary replied with the declaration, that he could not see any possible advantage in having the decomposition of a dead body going on under the feet of the living. In denial of the request, he urged that

CERTIFICATE OF FREEDOM

No. *387/470*

By Order of His Excellency Major General Sir RICHARD BOWRKE,
K. C. B., Captain General and Governor-in-Chief of the Territory of New
South Wales and its Dependencies, &c., &c.

THIS IS TO CERTIFY, that *Seven* Years having elapsed since
Sentence of Transportation for that Term was passed on *Francis*
Hall No. *21663*, was tried at *Quadrant*
on the *19th* of *July* 1830 and who arrived in this Colony
by the Ship *Waterloo* @ *19th* *Adam* — Master,
in the Year 1831, the said *Francis Hall*
who is described on the other Side, is restored to all the Rights of a Free Subject
under such Circumstances.

Given at the Colonial Secretary's Office, Sydney, this
14th Day of *June*
One Thousand Eight Hundred and *thirty-eight*

Registered in the Office of the Principal
Superintendent of Convicts.

J. Dear

A TICKET-OF-LEAVE.

the pavements of a church were the last place in the world for the burial of the dead. The Minister concluded that England was the last civilized country in which people still insisted in accumulating the putrefying bodies of the dead amid the dwellings of the living. "As to burying bodies under thronged churches," said he, "you might as well put them under libraries, drawing-rooms, and dining-rooms."

CHAPTER CXXX.—SEPOY REBELLION.



FROM 1854 to 1856, the attention of Great Britain was almost wholly absorbed with the events of the Crimean War, and with the terms of the treaty by which that conflict was concluded. We shall hereafter notice the conditions of settlement. For the present, we pass on to consider the next great event in which the history of England found expression in foreign lands. This was THE SEPOY REBELLION IN INDIA. The outbreak of the insurrection belongs to the year 1857. The revolt and its suppression covered some of the most tragical circumstances which history has been called to record in modern times. In order to understand the fundamental character and shocking incidents of the insurrection, and of the methods employed by Great Britain for the restoration of order in India, the ground must first be cleared with one or two preparatory studies of the state of Indian civilization, and of the style of the British Government at the time of the outbreak.

The field which here opens before us is of almost infinite extent. The peoples of India are descended from the most ancient branch of the Aryan race. Long before the Hellenic tribes set foot in Europe, the Indic shepherds had built in the valleys of the great rivers of the East the institutions of society and religion. Nations multiplied in this far region of the earth. Wars and transformations and reconstructions innumerable ensued, even before the days when the horsemen of Alexander confronted the elephants of Porus. A mere outline of the history of India, from the time when the Macedonian conquest revealed the mysteries of the East to the nations of the West, down to the time when the Portuguese ships, in the early part of the sixteenth century, began to visit the coasts "of Ormuz and of Ind," would occupy a whole chapter of the present work. We must here reduce the whole to a summary.

Many nations and peoples grew and flour-

ished between the Himalayas and the western seas. Empires rose and passed away. The Indian populations increased to a hundred millions, and then to more than two hundred millions. Under Timour the Great, whose reign covered the greater part of the fourteenth century, India was conquered and consolidated; her peoples were brought under a single sway, and the Mogul, or Mongol, dynasty was established at Delhi. The successors of Timour continued to reign in the ancient capital down to the time of the Portuguese conquests in India. The hereditary sovereigns of Delhi retained at least a nominal authority over vast and populous regions, and were little disturbed by the impact of European adventurers on the sea-coasts. At length the Portuguese banner was pulled down from the place where it stood in the East, and the flag of Holland was raised in its stead in the Indies. The Dutch ascendancy was soon followed by the French, and finally by the English.

It were long to tell the story of the British East India Company; of the foothold which it gained on the western coast, and more particularly on the Bay of Bengal. The history of the planting and extension of the commercial, and finally the political, interests of Great Britain in India, is full of incidents most highly illustrative of the power and persistency of the race. At length the Government of the East India Company gave place to that of a Governor-General and other officials sent out from England. A hundred years had now elapsed since Lord Robert Clive had organized what we are henceforth entitled to call the British East Indian Empire. The primitive seat of the Government was at Hooghly, an ancient Indian town on the river of the same name; but this place was at length abandoned for Calcutta, which became the capital and the port of India. From this maritime nucleus the strong arms of English authority were ultimately stretched out over two hundred millions of native subjects in the East.

In the middle of the present century the

Indian dominions of Great Britain were organized under three principal territorial divisions or presidencies. The first of these was Bengal; the second, Bombay; and the third, Madras. From the capitals of these countries, with a few thousand officials, civil and military, the administration of all India was conducted. The native princes still existed, still held a certain rank and authority over their respective peoples. Above them all was the aged King of Delhi, lineal descendant of the great Timour, representative of the Mogul dynasty, nominal Emperor of India.

With these native sovereigns and princes,

arm of British authority was vastly cheaper and hardly less efficient than would have been an army of native soldiers sent out from England. But it had in it the potency of all dangers. Many local difficulties had occurred of such character as to give Great Britain warning of worse things possible. At the time of the destruction of the English army in Cabul, symptoms of a general disaffection were noticed in several of the subject provinces; and had it not been for the speedy and completely successful rally made by the Government, and the triumphant conquest of Cabul before the very face of all India, it



DIAMOND HARBOR, HOOGHLY.

and with the peoples under them, the Government of Great Britain temporized from year to year. It must not be forgotten that the primary business of England in India had been commerce. It might almost be said that such has been her business in the world. But to maintain her commercial ascendancy in India and in the adjacent seas, required many expedients and a vast expenditure of force. One of the most effective of these expedients was the organization and discipline of native armies under English officers. It was found that the Hindus made good soldiers, and were glad to accept service and compensation at the hands of the Government. The military establishment thus created and maintained as the right

were hard to predict what other disasters might have followed in the train.

Of all the East Indian armies that of Bengal was most dangerously composed. It had been enlisted almost wholly of High-caste Hindus, a class of the people more intelligent and high-spirited, though not less superstitious, than were the others below them in rank. The extent to which all the people of India were subject to superstition is known as an objective notion to the whole world. But the bitterness and obliquity of the social and religious prejudices which pervaded every rank and class of the population can never be appreciated and understood but by him who has studied the phenomena on the spot of their

production. The class-name by which the native soldiers of Hindu derivation in the Bengal army were known was *Sepoys*. As we have said, they constituted an excellent but dangerous soldiery; excellent, because of their easy discipline and courage in fight; dangerous, because of their superstitions and that peculiar subtlety of character for which the word *Indian* is the best definition.

At the first, the Sepoy army had been to a considerable extent officered by captains chosen from themselves. But, in course of time, nearly all the commands were taken by En-

countrymen of Low-caste condition can not be explained to the people of the Western nations or understood by them. The Mohammedan, under the influence of his Arabian religion, looked with like contempt and horror upon the character of the Brahmin. In only one thing could all be said to agree, and that was in a certain covert detestation of the English officers and of the British Government, by which they were held down and checked in their native impulses and passions.

We may well look still further into the composition of the native armies of India. In




NATIVE OFFICERS OF THE BOMBAY ARMY.

glish officers, who might thus easily rise to rank. This was a cause of jealousy on the part of the native soldiers. We must not understand that the whole military force of Bengal was made up of the Brahmin caste. Low-caste men were also recruited. Some regiments were filled up in good part with Mohammedans. Between these various elements present in the army of natives there was constant hatred, and almost equally constant diffidence. The idea of any affiliation between the different castes was repugnant to the sentiment of all. The extent to which the Brahmin soldier despised and abhorred his

the Bengalese regiments, a great majority of the soldiers were, as we have intimated, High-caste Brahmins; but in the armies of Bombay and Madras, a majority of the men were of other derivation—Mohammedans and Low-caste recruits of many orders. As originally organized, the Indian soldiers were under enlistment for service in India only. Foreign service they were not expected to perform. This is said of the Bengalese army, not of the native troops in Bombay and Madras. The latter might be called to serve abroad. The British authorities at length determined that the exemption hitherto conceded to the Sepoys

of Bengal was a mistaken measure. Accordingly, in 1856, a change was made in the military regulations, by which foreign service as well as home duty was exacted of the Bengalese forces. The Sepoy was put upon the same level and discipline with the soldier of Madras and Bombay. This change was greatly resented in the army of Bengal, which had hitherto been regarded as a favorite of the Government. The Sepoy felt that he had

together in large numbers in a given regiment, where, by associating together, they could better preserve the usages and gratify the pride of their caste. The nature of military discipline, however, is communal. Each soldier under command is even as his fellow. When the regimental line is formed and the order given, it is impossible that caste should assert itself. When on duty, however, the Sepoys at once fell under the dominion of



BRAHMINS OF BENGAL

been degraded by being reduced to the rank of the soldiers of the North-west, whom he was accustomed to regard as so far beneath himself.

The High-caste Brahmin Sepoy was in the highest degree exclusive in all his habits and sentiments. The social system made his family relatives as numerous as a clan. All these were bound together by the principles of caste, which could not be loosed. It was customary for Sepoys of a common blood and name to get

their prejudices, and the customs of caste were immediately observed. The Brahmin soldier cooked his food apart, ate it apart, slept apart, would not converse or communicate in any manner with the soldier of a caste different from his own. Besides these differences and divisions, the presence of Mohammedanism added to the hatred and animosity which burned in the breasts of the soldiers. Religious prejudices augmented and intensified the

bitterness which existed among the castes on the score of social stratification.

At first view it would appear that an army constituted as was that of Bengal could not be disciplined or kept in subordination at all. But not so. Under British authority and management the military forces were brought to good discipline and made highly effective. The wise Government played off the prejudices and passions of the native soldiers so as to make a balance of animosity. The hatred of one party for another was put in equipoise against the hatred of the other for it. Over both the sword of England was easily extended, and, though the condition was one of great danger, the authorities of Calcutta and the Home Government of Great Britain were alike free from serious apprehension.

To the circumstances already narrated other causes of disaffection and mutiny must be added. The territorial and political management of India had been greatly changed, not to say revolutionized, under recent administrations. We have already referred to Lord Clive as the great organizer of British power in the East. After him, the most energetic and powerful of the East India Governors-Generals was Lord Dalhousie. He was appointed to office in the latter part of 1847, and immediately began to extend the influence and rationalize the methods of government by which the Hindu populations were kept in order.

We may not here enumerate the various measures which Lord Dalhousie made effective during his administration. The greatest of all his schemes was the annexation of the Northern and North-western provinces of India. Thus were the Punjab, Nagpore, Sattarah, Jhansi, Berar, and Oudh incorporated with the British dominions. Lord Dalhousie reformed and re-organized territories as large as the major kingdoms of Europe, and handled populations, governments, and laws as though they had been the subjects of committee reports in the common council of an English town. The British system of cheap postage was introduced into the country. Railroads began to be built of greater extent than were possible in the narrow limits of the British Isles. A telegraph was carried from Calcutta to Agra, thence to the river Indus, and finally to Bombay and

Madras. Under these improvements, civil, political, and social, the ancient institutions of the country gave way, and what may well be called New India arose in place of that old India which had been handed down from Alexander to the Mogul Emperors, and from the Mogul Emperors to modern times.


It is needless to say that the great and salutary administration of Lord Dalhousie was an offense against the ancient prejudices of the Hindus. They began to feel themselves shaken from the very ground. It appeared to the imagination of the Brahmin that the end of all things was approaching; that the venerable system of society, which had its ultimate roots among the mysteries of the Vedic Hymns, was about to pass away. He saw the ancient kingdom of Oudh, which the East India Company had agreed to defend, abolished under the radicalism of Dalhousie; the honored chiefs converted into dependents and sycophants, and the old King of Oudh himself dethroned and transferred to a pensionary residence near Calcutta. All of these proceedings were of a character to excite and alarm the conservative peoples, among whom it was a principle of action to conceal their real sentiments and passions under the garb of acquiescence and docility.

The British Government, however, felt no fear. The officials in India went straight ahead with the administration, civil and military, heeding not the lessons which might well have been drawn from the frequent local disturbances and mutinies which they had to suppress. Improvements were freely introduced from England. At length it was determined to replace the old-style, ineffective muskets with which the Sepoy armies were supplied, with Enfield rifles. A cargo of these arms was accordingly sent out, and the same were distributed to the Sepoy soldiery.

We are now arrived at that stage in the progress of affairs when only a fortuitous circumstance was needed to fire the magazine. When a revolution breaks out, it is the wont of historians and people to seize upon the particular fact whereby the train is lighted, and to call that fact the *cause* of the revolution. Such a view of the case is as superficial as to say that the spark in the ship's hold, lighting at first a few grains of powder, then

sputtering a few moments in zigzag lines as the flame runs into the magazine; or to regard the overturning of a coal-oil lamp by the widow's cow, in an obscure stable-shed, as the *cause* of the burning of Chicago. Nevertheless, the point of ignition may well be regarded as critical, and the mistaken theory which ascribes thereto a causative influence on subsequent events

manufacturers employed both the tallow of cattle and the fat of swine. The cartridges were *greased*, to the end of making them impervious to moisture and to facilitate their movement in the barrels of the rifles. Now the cow is the sacred animal of the Hindu superstition. To eat her, or to treat her body or parts with disrespect, is one of the highest forms of sacrilege. As for the hog, he is held



PORT OF CALCUTTA

may be overlooked, along with similar errors peculiar to the human understanding.

The Enfield rifles then, put, as we have seen, into the hands of the Sepoys, brought with them the incidental circumstance which was to perform the part of a match in the coming conflagration. The fact to which we here refer has become celebrated among the peculiar episodes of modern history. The Enfield rifles were fed with cartridges, and in the preparation of the cartridges the

as abominably unclean by both Hindus and Mohammedans. In the loading of the rifles, the manual of arms directed that the crest of the cartridge should be bitten off with the teeth before inserting it in the chamber of the weapon. To the Sepoys, to touch, and especially to taste, the flesh or any of the products of the hated swine, is to be defiled almost beyond the hope of purification. Of course, the British authorities had not intended to do violence to the prejudices of the Sepoy

soldiers, and it has even been denied that the cartridges contained the offensive substances. But the probability is that the denial was an afterthought intended to trim up the consequences. "Give me a drink," said a Hindu one day to a Sepoy soldier of a higher caste. It was at a spring or well. The Sepoy looked upon the other with a glance ofathing, and was about to pass on. Should the rim of his canteen or cup be forever polluted by touching the lips of a vulgar creature of the lower caste? "You are very particular about your caste today," said the Hindu. "Perhaps you do not know that every time you bite off your cartridge you take the fat of a hog into your mouth!"


The Sepoy, horror-struck at what was said, told his companions. The papers of the cartridges were examined, and were found to be greased. The storm of insurrection broke out in a moment. The spark had fallen into the ship's hold, where the combustibles were accumulated, and the explosion followed. Nevertheless, the officers of the Government made, at first, strenuous efforts to put out the insurrection by peaceable means. The incident to which we have referred above occurred in the latter part of 1856, at the town of Meerut, a military post of considerable importance, lying a short distance from the ancient city of Delhi, between the rivers Ganges and Jumna. The first insurrection of the Sepoys was in the nature of a panic, rather than hostile mutiny. The officers of the army first sought by denial of the pollution of the cartridges to stay the revolt; and when this did not avail, an order was issued, in January of 1857, that the rifles should be served with cartridges of a different manufacture, in which the purity of the materials was guaranteed. The Governor-General issued a proclamation to the army, in which assurances were given that no offense was intended against the principles of caste or the religious customs of the country. But the mischief was done, and the spirit of mutiny spread from regiment to regiment, until at the opening of spring, 1857, the whole Sepoy army was infected. In the emergency, which was now manifest, some of the regiments were disbanded. In other cases, the leaders of the spreading revolt were executed. When the Bengal cavalry at Meerut were served with a supply of

new cartridges, they refused to use them—this against the assurance of the officers that the cartridges contained no impure materials. The recalcitrant Sepoys were accordingly arrested, brought to trial and condemned, some to imprisonment, and some to banishment. The convicts were put in irons in the presence of their countrymen, and were sent to the prison of Meerut.

On the following day, May 10, 1857, the mutiny broke out in earnest. The native soldiers marched from their barracks, stormed the prison, released their condemned fellow-soldiers, and shot down the English guard that attempted to stay their progress. The revolt flamed high. The English rallied as large a force as they could, returned the charge, and the mutineers were driven out of their cantonments. The whole body of the insurrection then broke out of Meerut, and rolled off in the direction of Delhi.

The events which now rapidly ensued showed conclusively that the insurrection had been fomented for a definite purpose, and that purpose was no less than the recovery of National Independence. As soon as the insurgent soldiery could reach Delhi, they immediately proceeded to draw the old king or emperor from his Oriental seclusion in the palace of his ancestors, the Grand Moguls, and to proclaim him Emperor of India. The antiquated sovereign had been subsisting in Eastern splendor by means of the pension which had been granted to him, in the first place, by the East India Company, and afterwards continued by the Government at Calcutta. As we have said, the King of Delhi was the descendant and representative of whatever remained of the great Mogul dynasty, which had been established over all India by Timour Lenk. There was therefore a certain rationality and legitimacy in the notion of restoring the obsolete sovereign to the throne of his ancestors. Meanwhile, the mutiny gathered head. The Sepoy troops, holding the barracks at Delhi, broke into insurrection and joined the mutineers who had come from Meerut. The British contingent was obliged to give way before the revolt, and the ancient palace of the Mogul sovereigns of India, shining in the brilliant light of a May morning, was again inhabited by a native Emperor.

Down to Benares, and thence to Calcutta, the rumor of the insurrection was borne on the wings of the wind. Conceive of the condition of affairs in that far capital, when the story was promulgated of the successful rising of a well-grounded panic which ever subjected an English colony. The British people, officials and other, now resident in Bengal, numbered in all fewer than a hundred thousand. This mere handful, by comparison, was expected to hold



THRONE-ROOM, PALACE OF DELHI

the Sepoy army at Meerut and Delli. Lord Dalhousie had now been succeeded in office by Lord Canning, as Governor-General of India. Upon him, and the officers of Government associated with him, was devolved the duty of staying the progress of the most dreadful and

in subjection multiplied millions of natives in hot insurrection against the Government. An incredible alarm spread among the English of Calcutta, wild rumors of horrible massacres of women and children filled the air. The people were frenzied, and rushed to the Gov-

ernment House, almost insane with fear, crying for protection, and clamoring for vengeance, not only against the Sepoys, but against the Hindus in general. Terror heightened the confusion, and the wonder was, and is, that Lord Canning was able to hold the panic in check, and, at the same time, take the first measures for the restoration of order.

It has been mentioned that the dethroned King of Oudh had been transferred by the Government, during the administration of

sought to allay the frenzy of the people, and in particular to check the violence of the proceedings which were urged by the officers of the Government, and by the English generally, against the natives. As yet there had been no revolt at Calcutta; but the frantic populace were ready to proceed against the Hindus as though the latter had already committed the most horrid crimes recorded in the brutalities of history.

The same spirit was exhibited in a still



BENARES.

Lord Dalhousie, to a pensionary residence at Garden Reach, near Calcutta. The suspicion at once arose that the deposed sovereign, who, in case of the success of the revolt would be restored to his kingdom, under the sovereignty of the Emperor of Delhi, was in the conspiracy. Acting upon this apprehension, Lord Canning ordered the King of Oudh to be taken from his palace and held, for the time being, as a kind of hostage in Fort William, which was the military residence of the Governor-General himself. As for the rest, he

more marked degree when the news at length reached England. The inhabitants of the Home Kingdom put no bounds to their rage and fury. The reports which went flying abroad were frightfully exaggerated, and the people well-nigh lost their self-control in discussing measures of revenge. The English newspapers of the summer of 1857 teemed with editorials and contributions, in which the most cruel methods known to the barbarities of mediæval warfare were openly advocated as the proper means of redress in India.

As soon as Lord Canning succeeded in restoring some slight confidence and order in Calcutta, he instituted such measures as might best shore up the shaken Government of India. He perceived at a glance that to wait for the coming of a British army from the Home Kingdom, ten thousand miles away, would be to wait for destruction. Unless something could be done long before a British army could come to the rescue of the East Indian Empire, the Government of England in Hindustan would either be trampled in blood or cast into the Bay of Bengal. In the emergency, fortune stood Lord Canning well in hand. He was sufficiently acquainted with all the movements on the vast board of Empire to be able to see what pieces—here a knight, and there a castle—might be seized by himself and made available against the enemy. In his sore trial he remembered that at that very day an English armament, which had been sent out weeks before for a descent on the ports of China, was already on the Indian coast, within his reach. He accordingly took the great responsibility of

arresting the squadron *en route*, and diverting it to the greater need of India. The Chinese imbroglio might well be left to settle itself as it might, or to remain perpetually unsettled, in the presence of the appalling condition of affairs at Calcutta and Delhi.

But the stopping of the English armament was not the only measure which Lord Canning adopted for the salvation of the Government and people. Early in this year, Sir James Outram had been sent with an army on an expedition against Persia. He made short

work with the campaign. Meeting the enemy at Khushab, he inflicted upon him a decisive and overwhelming defeat, ending the war with a blow. Him Lord Canning now remembered and summoned with all speed to return to India. In this matter, also, fortune favored the movement. Telegraphic communication had been effected by Lord Dalhousie between Calcutta and Lahore, capital of the Punjab. Thither Lord Canning sent on its way to General Outram the following despatch. "WE



SIR JOHN LAWRENCE.

"WANT ALL OUR BEST MEN HERE." Never was a truer telegram urged by the electric current to its destination. Outram responded with alacrity. Bringing his army with him, he returned speedily, and on his arrival at Calcutta, was appointed to the command of the two divisions of the Army of Bengal.

We may here notice a few of the leading incidents of the spread and development of the insurrection. The Punjab was saved from the revolt, or at least from its worst effects, in a marvelous manner. That province at

the East was under authority of Sir John Lawrence. That officer, however, was not at Lahore, when, on the 11th of May, the news was borne thither of the mutiny at Meerut. In his absence the command of the capital rested on Colonel Robert Montgomery. The British army at that place lay at the time in the cantonments known as Meean Meer, about six miles from the city. The army consisted of more than five thousand men, of whom about thirteen hundred were British regulars. It could not be discerned by the English authorities whether or not the native troops

On the evening on which the intelligence of the insurrection at Meerut was brought to Lahore, a great ball, half civil, half military, had been projected. It was decided that the entertainment should proceed as though nothing perilous was at the door. During the night the officers made preparations for the following day. A military parade and review was ordered for the early morning. In the arrangement for the same the artillery, heavily loaded with grape, was planted in a certain position before which, in one of the evolutions of the review, the Sepoy regiments must pre-



VIEW OF LAHORE—THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

would remain loyal or join the revolt. The situation was one of great peril. The officers did not dare to let matters drift along until an unquenchable mutiny should flame up around the very quarters where they were established. On the other hand, it was not just, perhaps not expedient, to assume that the native troops would mutiny. It was resolved, however, by the authorities, not to risk everything on the hope that the Sepoys would remain loyal and obedient. The presumption on the other side was so strong that it was determined to meet the mutiny at a single move.

sent themselves in line. The English soldiers, at the moment when the Sepoys should come into this position, were to be behind the twelve guns of the batteries, and the artillerymen were to stand at their posts with lighted matches. The plan was carried out to the letter. When the four thousand native troops whirled into the fatal position which had been contrived for them, they were halted, and the command was given to *stick arms!* It was the alternative of obedience or death. The Sepoys perceived at a glance that the European soldiers had them in their power. They obeyed

the command, and stacked their arms, and the latter were immediately borne away to the cantonments. In the lower Punjab the English were equally successful in manœuvring the Sepoys out of power, and in saving the Province from serious rebellion.

In Oudh, however, a very different result was reached. That great Province was destined to fall under the dominion of the rebels, and to become the scene of some of the most

tragic events recorded in modern history. It was on the 30th of May that the insurrection broke out in the city of Lucknow, the ancient capital of Oudh. At this place the British army, made up in large part of Sepoys, was under command of the Governor, Sir Henry Lawrence. When the rebellion showed itself he strove with great energy to stay the insurrection, and to expel the insurgents from the city. But this effort was in vain. It must be remembered that Lucknow was a city with a population of more than two hundred thousand, and to hold down this enormous mass of rebels with a small body of English soldiers was an impossibility. The Governor, therefore, fell back before the revolt, and posted himself in the Residency, or military headquarters of the Government, a short distance from the city. Here he was immediately besieged by overwhelming numbers. All through June he held out with extraordinary courage. But he was not destined to witness the result of the struggle. On the 24 of July, while he was reclining in his tent, a shell burst through, exploded, and shattered his limbs so terribly that not even amputation could save his life. He died two days afterwards, and the garrison was left to defend itself without his able and courageous direction.

Soon after the events just described, a message was carried to Lucknow from Sir Hugh Wheeler, commandant at the city of Cawnpore, distant about fifty miles. This important place, memorable forever for the horrors of this summer, lay on the south bank of the river Ganges. Here was stationed a di-

vision of the army, made up, as usual, of a fraction of English soldiers and a great majority of Sepoys. Cawnpore was regarded as one of the most important military stations in Upper India; nor must the reader fail to remember, in his attempt to realize the course and character of the Indian Mutiny, that Cawnpore is distant from Calcutta more than six hundred miles.

The English military force of the city num-



BRITISH RESIDENCY AT LUCKNOW

bered only about three hundred men, including the officers. The Sepoys in the ranks numbered fully three thousand, including the Fifty-third and Sixty-fifth Regiments of Infantry, the Second Regiment of Bengal Cavalry, and a company of the First Artillery. There were, however, in Cawnpore about a thousand other English residents, of whom a large number were women and children. Considering the whole population as a mass, about one in fifty was of European birth. It was the misfortune,

or one of the many misfortunes, of the situation, that Sir Hugh Wheeler, upon whom so great a responsibility devolved, was already seventy-five years of age. He was, moreover, a man by nature and discipline but little capable of facing the dreadful emergency which had now arrived. He had been fully warned of the spread of the revolt. When the rebellion broke out at Meerut, and soon afterwards at Lucknow, Sir Henry Lawrence sent word to his subordinate at Cawnpore to make every preparation to meet and repel the coming revolt. But Sir Hugh Wheeler was unable to grasp the situation. The position in which he planted his forces was ill-chosen, and the defenses which he prepared were little better than contemptible. Some mud walls, about four feet in height, were thrown up as a protection for the garrison. But the intrenchments were so slight that a horseman would have little difficulty in passing them at a bound.

Within this most miserable situation, the English commander gathered the fated company of Europeans, who must maintain themselves against the multiplied thousands of enraged and triumphant enemies. There were, in all, within the fortifications, about four hundred English soldiers. Of non-combatants, some four hundred and sixty-five, including the civil officials, the railway managers, merchants, and shop-keepers of Cawnpore, were gathered into the pen. Of grown women, married and unmarried, wives and daughters of the English officers and residents, there were two hundred and eighty; and the remainder were children. Such was the situation when the native host of insurgents, composed largely of the ruffian element, always aggregated about large cities, encompassed the English position and began the siege. It was in the face of this emergency that Sir Hugh Wheeler appealed to Sir Henry Lawrence for assistance, and appealed in vain. Before the extent and full horror of the situation was known, the shell from the enemy's battery had relieved Sir Henry of all the responsibilities and dangers of plan and march and battle.

Now it was that Sir Hugh Wheeler made the fatal mistake of calling to his aid another ally whose name has become infamous in the history of our century. About twelve miles distant from Cawnpore, up the River

Ganges, lies the little town of Bithoor. This place had been, previously to the annexation of Oudh by the English, the seat of one of the princely dynasties of the great race of the Mahrattas. At the time of the English accession in Oudh the throne of Bithoor was occupied by a certain prince named Bâji Râo. He was overtaken in evil, perhaps treasonable, projects, and was dethroned for his misconduct. The English authorities, however, permitted him to retain a palace in Bithoor, and gave him in his retirement a pension of eighty thousand pounds. Bâji Râo still claimed to be the Peshwa of Pundh. He had no son of his own loins, but, in accordance with the custom of his countrymen, he had adopted a son who should inherit his estates, and at length conduct his funeral rites; for this the tradition of the Mahrattas prescribed as a necessary antecedent to the blessedness of Nirvana. By Indian law, an adopted son has all the rights, privileges, and rank of a natural heir. The youth chosen by Bâji Râo as his successor bore the name of Dandhu Panth, but is universally known in history by his official name or rajah-title of Nana Sahib.

At the time of the outbreak of the mutiny, this Nana Sahib, claiming all the rights and emoluments of his adoptive father, was resident in petty princely state at Bithoor. Unwisely, however, the English Government, at the death of Bâji Râo, had cut off the pension, and the Nana Sahib was left to the inheritance of his father's personal estate only. At this he was enraged; but, Indian-like, he dissimulated his passion and abided his time. It were long, indeed, to give the story of the efforts made by Nana Sahib to regain his pensionary inheritance. In pursuance of this end he sought the aid of a young Mohammedan, named Amizulah Khan, resident at his court, and used him henceforth as his emissary and representative. Amizulah Khan went to London, and, being well educated and extremely handsome in person, cut for a season a remarkable figure in English society. But his mission was vain. The British Government refused to restore the Nana's pension, and Amizulah Khan at length returned to India. It thus happened that Nana Sahib, ex-Rajah of Bithoor, though in outward friendship and alliance with the English, bore about in his

breast a smothered volcano full of hot pitch and sulphurous fire.

It was to this dangerous, able, and revengeful Indian Prince that Sir Hugh Wheeler, already at the door of desperation, now applied for assistance. Nana Sahib readily accepted the call, and came speedily at the head of his army into Cawnpore. For a few days the Nana made a pretense of cooperating with the English; but he was soon persuaded by his countrymen to put himself at their head, crush the hated foreigners, and thus recover the ancient sovereignty of Puna. So in the city he assumed command of the mutineers, and was thenceforth the chief of the insurgents in the region of Cawnpore. Under his direction the siege was pressed. Nana Sahib notified the English commander that on the 12th of June his position would be assaulted. The attack was made, and such was the courageous fighting of the four hundred soldiers behind the mud works, that the Hindus were repulsed with large losses. The garrison also suffered. From day to day, a shower of balls was poured incessantly into the inclosure. The water supply of the garrison was limited to a single well, and this spot was under direct fire of the enemy. Whoever went thither to get water for his thirsty comrades, or for the famishing women and children, did so at the peril of his life. Rarely did such a martyr return from his mission without streams of blood pouring from his bullet wounds.

Meanwhile, insurgents from the surrounding districts of Oudh joined themselves to the forces of Nana Sahib, and another assault was made on the intrenchments. But again the thousands of the enemy were driven back. Each British soldier had now not only his own life, but the lives of the women and children in his hand. There was no alternative but that of victory, and so the charging soldiers of Oudh fell headlong with the British balls in their breasts, and the assaulting host rolled back in confusion. It became apparent to Nana Sahib, not only that the English works could not be carried by storm, but that his own hold as a leader of the rebellion was loosened by failure. He accordingly sent Amizulah Khan and another officer to tender to the English favorable terms of capitulation. Starvation was already at hand, and it was determined to

accept the overture. Terms were accordingly agreed upon, by which it was stipulated that on condition of surrender, all of those Europeans in Cawnpore who had not been in any way connected with the acts of Lord Dalhousie should retire from the city, and receive safe conduct to Allahabad. The English General, and the officers and men under his command, had no apprehension of the astounding treachery which constituted the basis of this agreement. The Hindus had long since adopted the habits and usages of civilized warfare. It had been a long time since, within the borders of India, the general rules by which armies are fought and surrendered, had been violated. But the capitulation of Cawnpore was now to constitute such an exception as should make the civilized world start back in horror.

It was arranged that the retiring garrison should be put on barges and conducted down the Ganges. At the appointed time, the whole company, military and civil, men, women, and children, were marched out of the miserable pen of death, where they had so bravely defended themselves, and were led to the boats at the river's edge. The embarkation was made, and the barges were loosed from the bank. Along the shores were gathered a vast multitude of Sepoys with their arms in their hands. Just as the boats were turning into the stream, the blast of a trumpet was heard, and instantly the straw-thatched roofs of the barges were seen in flames. The treacherous ruffians who managed the boats had only waited for the signal to dash lighted torches into the roofs, and then, jumping overboard, swam ashore. In another moment the crowds on the barges were made the targets for thousands of muskets. The flames spread. Every discharge from the shore struck down scores in death. The bottoms of the boats were instantly filled with the dead and dying. No language can describe the horror of the scene. Nearly the whole company perished miserably in blood and fire. Only a single boat-load drifted into the river and was about to be borne away by the current. Further down the stream this barge was recaptured, and about ninety persons were taken back into Cawnpore as prisoners. Of those who had embarked only four men escaped to tell the story. Those who were retaken

were at once divided, the men from the women and children, and the former were shot to death. The helpless remainder were thrown into a small prison-house, where they were set to work to grind corn and serve their captors.

For a while the outrages done to this despairing company of English women and children were limited to such indignities as came of imprisonment and servitude. But Nana Sahib and his lieutenants were not yet satisfied with their revenge. Already divisions of the British army had begun to penetrate the rebellious provinces, and Nana Sahib perceived that it was the beginning of the end. He resolved, however, that the prisoners in his hands should perish. One of his body-guards, in uniform, with two Sepoys and two Mohammedans, was sent to the prison to carry out the mandate of horrid butchery. The five murderers entered, with drawn swords, and slashed and hacked and stabbed until the room was packed with the dying and dead. The awful shambles remained in that condition until the following morning, when a second company came, dragged the mutilated bodies forth, and cast them, after they had stripped from them the remnants of clothing, into a dry well which gaped open near at hand. As the bodies were seized for this final plunge from the sorrows and sufferings of life, it was found that a few of the women were not yet dead, and at least one of the children *tried to run away!* It was the acme of horror. Some time afterwards, when the English soldiers retook Cawnpore, they were obliged to look down, with rage and tears, into that awful pit, and recover therefrom, as best they might, the mangled forms of beautiful women and helpless children whom the Sepoys had there consigned to the final ignominy. Till the history of Great Britain shall fall into the oblivion of the eternities, the recollection and story of the Cawnpore massacre will still be revived and repeated, as the most horrid incident of warfare belonging to the nineteenth century.

It may interest the reader to know something of the future of Nana Sahib. When the English marched back on Cawnpore, he was still in command of the rebellious forces. He had the courage to fight with the British army in a desperate battle, in which he was completely defeated, and his forces scattered

in all directions. He thereupon fled into Cawnpore, and thence to his own palace at Bithoor. It is said that, on arriving there, he completed the infamy of his life by the murder of a captive woman who had been spared for his own purposes from preceding butcheries. This done, he mounted his horse and fled from Bithoor forever. He well knew that the avenging angel was in the wake of his flight. He made his escape into the wild district of Nepal, and was never heard of afterwards. Rumors of his whereabouts were sometimes borne to the British authorities, but were always found to be groundless. Nana Sahib had forever vanished from the sight of those who, even if they had laid the avenging hand upon him, could never have wreaked on his treacherous life a fitting retribution for his crimes.

We may now pass from the insurrection proper to consider the reconquest of the rebellious districts by the English. It is just to say that, after the first wild hours of panic, the energies of the British race were never more heroically displayed than in the work of recovering India from the clutches of the mutineers. It will be remembered that everything of military and civil procedure had to be directed from Calcutta. Communications between the revolted provinces were, in a great measure, cut off, and the Government was under the necessity of urging forward the various military divisions from Lower Bengal as a base. It was clearly perceived that the first point to be gained in the reconquest of the country was the recovery of Delhi. That place was logically the seat of the rebellion. There old Bahádur Shah had been proclaimed as Emperor of all India. His sons had been assigned to the command of the various divisions of the Sepoy army, and the latter, to the number of more than fifty thousand, had taken possession of Delhi. All the Europeans and Eurasians, with the exception of about fifty, nearly all of whom were women, had been expelled from the city, and rebellion was rampant and victorious in all the region round about. Even the fifty prisoners were soon brought forth from their place of confinement to be butchered, in cold blood, in the courtyard of the palace.

The command of the expedition for the recovery of Delhi was given to Sir Henry Bar-

ward, who advanced into Oudh with an army numbering about ten thousand. He first met the insurgents in force at Badli ka-Sara, fought with them a hard battle, and won a complete victory. He then made his way to Delhi, and took up his position on a ridge overlooking the city. For the time, however, it was impossible to recapture the stronghold from the enemy. On the 23d and 25th of August, bloody battles were fought with the mutineers, who, sallying out in overwhelming numbers, sought to carry the British position. At length, in the early part of September,

which he was presently taken to be carried to Rangoon. Thus fell and disappeared the last lineal descendant of Timour the Great. Delhi was at once put under military government, Oudh was restored, first in the city, and then in the surrounding regions. By the beginning of the following year the British authority was sufficiently established to admit of the restoration of civil government in Delhi, and the rebellion in this quarter was at an end.

The reader will not have forgotten the dreadful condition in which the small English garrison at Lucknow was left after the death



GRAND MOSQUE AT DELHI.

the heavy batteries arrived, and the defenses of the city were soon battered down. On the 14th of the month an assault was ordered, and Delhi was carried by storm. It was not, however, until after six days of almost incessant fighting that the different districts in the city were all recovered. The terrible character of the struggle may be known from the extent of the British losses, which were a thousand and twelve men killed, and nearly four thousand wounded. As soon as victory was declared for the English, the old Emperor shut himself up in the tomb of Humayun, from

of Sir Henry Lawrence. Before the fall of that brave commander he had carefully calculated the chances, and had decided that hope for his command lay in the defense of their position at the Residency to the last day and the last man. It was known that the British authorities would put forth every effort for the rescue, and that *some time* during the autumn the sound of British cannon in the distance would announce the morning of deliverance for all who might then survive. It happened that when Sir James Outram was recalled, as we have seen, from his Persian

campaign, one division of his army, under command of Sir Henry Havelock, was ordered to proceed to Alahabad, to put down the revolt in that region, and afterwards to act in support of Sir Hugh Wheeler, at Cawnpore, and Sir Henry Lawrence, at Lucknow. This hazardous work could never have been assigned to abler hands or a more courageous spirit. Havelock was on the march by the beginning of July. On the 12th of the month he fought his first battle with the enemy at Futtehpur, and won a victory. On the 15th he had two successful engagements with the Sepoys. On the 16th he came to Cawnpore. In battle after battle he was victorious in this district of the Oudh, and sought by every possible means to strike out in the direction of Lucknow. But his forces were insufficient for the hazard, and he was obliged to await the arrival of General Outram with another division of the army. When the latter came, the campaign for the relief of Lucknow was at once renewed. Although General Outram was in supreme command, alike of civil and military affairs, he refused to supersede Havelock in the field, declaring that to the latter should remain the glory of recovering the capital and reseizing the garrison from the merciless clutch of the Sepoys.

We may here transfer our station to the inside of the Residency at Lucknow, and share in our sympathies the sufferings and trials to which the garrison was subjected during the fearful summer and fall of 1857. The siege, the defense, and the relief have become ever memorable in the annals of the century. We have seen how, in the dawn of the great mutiny, Sir Henry Lawrence took the wise precaution to withdraw his soldiers and the English population of Lucknow from the city to the Residency, and to make there his preparations for the coming storm. It was by the wisdom of Lawrence in these trying days that the possibility of salvation from the same fate which befell the garrison at Cawnpore was secured. He made the most of the days of peace and the incipency of the rebellion by the construction of strong defenses around the Residency, and by storing therein, in places of security, the largest supply of provisions which it was possible for him to gather. Thus prepared, he awaited the outbreak, wisely

choosing to defend himself in his chosen place rather than to attempt to cut his way through the enemy's country in the hope of escape.

Then came the tempest. The first shock was ably and successfully resisted. Though the besieged were under constant fire, and were pressed on every side; though their numbers were diminished daily by death and wounds and disease, yet the onsets of the Sepoys were successfully resisted, and each successive assault was repelled. We have already spoken of the fatal accident by which Sir Henry Lawrence, losing his life, rose to perpetual fame. The command of the garrison was transferred to General Inglis, and the defense continued to be bravely conducted. On the 20th of July the mutineers made another assault on the English position, but were again hurled back with great losses. The same thing happened on the 10th of August, and eight days afterwards, the Sepoys, in overwhelming numbers, and with desperate courage, a third time attempted to carry the Residency by storm. But the attack was met with the usual spirit, and the rebels were driven back with heavy losses. During the remainder of August, though the siege was pressed with ever-increasing vigor, the undaunted garrison held out courageously. On the 5th of September, the first rumors of the approach of Havelock were wafted into the Residency. That General, accompanied by Outram, had fought his way along the Cawnpore road during nearly the whole of August. It was not, however, until the 22d of September that the coming army of relief reached the Alambagh, a strong position and military station about four miles distant from the Residency. This place was held and strongly defended by the Sepoys. But the attack of the English, on September 25th, could not be resisted. The Alambagh was taken by storm, and the besieged garrison, in the inclosure of the Residency, could already hear the sounds of victorious battle. Leaving a small force behind to hold the Alambagh, Havelock pressed on to the relief of the pent-up garrison. Through the remaining miles he fought a continuous battle with the Sepoys, and on the 26th of the month, planted himself in front of the gates of the Residency, and then broke through.


Great was the relief and great the rejoicing



RELIEF OF LUDDON.

within the fortifications; but the event soon showed that the end was not yet. Though the garrison was strongly reinforced, though the danger that the Residency might be carried by storm and the defenders be given up to butchery was for the time removed, yet from another point of view the peril of the situation was hardly less than it had been during the summer months? The forces which Havelock and Outram had been able to bring

discipline. They also perceived that they had put everything on the cast of the die. They understood well enough that in case of the failure of the mutiny, Great Britain would visit upon them a terrible punishment for their rebellion, treacheries, and murders. They fought with desperation, and the English garrison found no relief by day or night. A storm of bullets and cannon-shot poured constantly on the defenses, and the losses of the



ATTACK ON THE ALAMBAGH

with them were by no means sufficient to warrant a withdrawal from the defenses and exposure to the open country. The numbers within the inclosure of the Residency had been greatly increased, but the consumption of supplies was correspondingly augmented. On the whole, the peril was only lessened and postponed, rather than removed. Nor were the besieging hosts greatly discouraged. The Sepoys had learned to fight. Their long contact with the British army had given them courage and

besieged were severe. The hot sun of the Indian summer and autumn scorched the sufferers in the inclosure with burning heat. Disease and wasting added to the ever-accumulating sorrows. Battle was before the gates, pestilence in the air and water. Not only was the whole force of the English again shut up within the defenses of the Residency, but the small garrison which Havelock had left in the Alambagh was also besieged, and could hardly hold its own against the constant assaults of

the enemy. Through the whole of October the brave garrison kept up the defense, and lived on hope of another succor, which was sure to come.

Meanwhile, in distant England, Lord Palmerston had called Sir Colin Campbell, the hero of Balaklava, from his retirement, and on the 11th of July, conferred on him the command-in-chief of the British forces in India. "When will you be able to set out for the seat of war, Sir Colin?" said Palmerston. "Within twenty-four hours," was the reply; and on the evening of the 12th, the new commander left England for Calcutta. He arrived at the latter city on the 13th of August, and with great energy prepared an expedition for the relief of the British garrisons in Oudh. His forces consisted of six thousand men, supported with an artillery contingent of thirty-six guns. What arrangements had been made in the South, what relief might be expected from the direction of Calcutta, was unknown to the sufferers at Lucknow; but they well knew that they were not forgotten, and that the day of retribution would come at the last.

Sir Colin's army at length reached Cawnpore, and from that point proceeded by the same route which Havelock had taken to Lucknow. Like his predecessor, Campbell also had to fight his way, and it was not until the 10th of November that he was able to open his guns against the besiegers of the

Alambagh. That place and another similar position, called the Dilkusha Palaces, lying south-east of Lucknow, were immediately carried. The garrison which had been so hardy pressed in the Alambagh was relieved, and the British army was free to march for the Residency.

It is narrated that on the 16th of Novem-



SIR HENRY HAVELOCK.

ber, when the shadow of despair seemed ready to descend on Havelock and those who were under his protection, a little Scotch maiden, daughter of an officer, fell asleep in the shade of the rampart. Suddenly she sprang up, and, clapping her hands, ran with flying plaid, crying out as she came: "Dinna ye hear it? Dinna ye hear it? It's the slogan of the Highlanders!" Her quick ear had caught in

the distance the sound of the Scottish bag-pipe, shrilly piping at the head of the coming regiments the well-known air, *The Campbells are Coming!* True or false, the incident is one of the most picturesque which can be selected from the vast panorama of history. The cry of the Highlanders' pibroch was indeed the premonition of victory. Sir Colin Campbell carried one after another of the rebel strongholds around the city, and, in six days from the Alambagh, fought his way to the gates of the Residency. The forces within and without the defenses were joined, and the second relief of Lucknow was accomplished.

It was at once determined by Sir Colin and his associate commanders that the non-combatants in the Residency must be saved by withdrawal from the place. To make this movement was still a matter of great hazard, for the Sepoys hung in multitudes on every quarter. On the 19th of November the English batteries were opened furiously on the strongest position held by the enemy, as though an assault were about to be ordered. While the cannonade was kept up, Campbell and Havelock ordered the quiet withdrawal of the garrison and non-combatants to the Dilkusha Palace and the Alambagh. The movement was effected without disaster, and the retreat from Lucknow was safely begun.

An incident of these days cast a gloom over the British Empire, and emphasized the close of a heroic life. On reaching the Alambagh, Henry Havelock could go no further. He was exhausted. Battle and toil, hunger, thirst, anxiety, sleeplessness, and finally disease, had done their work. On the 24th of November the hero died. Three days afterwards the Queen of England, little knowing the uselessness of the honor which she gave, bestowed on him the title and dignity of a Baronet. The honor descended to his son; nor might it be said that such a distinction was needed by him who had found his final rest in the soil of the old kingdom of Oudh, under the fiery glare of the sun of India.

The rest of the story of the suppression of the great mutiny may be briefly told. There could be no further massacres of women and children in Oudh. It was now soldier to soldier, or rather one soldier against many, for the Sepoys were nearly always from four to ten times


as numerous as the attacking English forces. As soon as he was free for action, Sir Colin Campbell marched again for Cawnpore. In that city the English cause had, of late, fared badly. Cawnpore had been placed, after its recovery by the English, under command of General Windham. Not long afterwards, the Hindu Governor, or Scindia, of Gwalior gathered an army of insurgents, and advanced on Cawnpore, hoping to recapture the city from the British garrison. General Windham marched out to meet the Scindia, and was worsted in battle. He was obliged to fall back to his defenses, and the rebels succeeded in reoccupying Cawnpore. Such was the condition of affairs which called urgently for the presence and aid of Sir Colin Campbell. He marched at once against the place, himself at the head of one division, and Sir Hope Grant leading another. The enemy were thus doubly attacked, and Cawnpore was finally restored to English authority.

The event which we have just described occupied the closing months of 1857 and the opening of the next year. During the winter, Lucknow was held by the Hindus in full force. In other quarters of the horizon the sky had cleared. It was perceived, even by the enemy, that the British power in India was unshaken, and that the day of retribution was at hand. In the presence of these facts the rebellion was dissolved into its original elements. At Lucknow, however, the mutiny drew to itself all of its remaining resources, and the duty was devolved on Sir Colin Campbell of carrying this last fortress of the revolt. With the opening of spring the campaign was undertaken for the recapture of the capital. The British army again reached Lucknow about the middle of March, and on the 19th of the month fought with the Sepoys the last great battle of the war. The English were completely victorious. About two thousand of the mutineers were killed outright in the engagement. A hundred cannon were taken from the rebels, and the army of insurgents, broken into fragments, was scattered in all directions. Lucknow was completely recovered. Nor did the Sepoys make any further serious efforts for the recapture of the ancient capital of Oudh.

In the last conflicts of the war, several

eminent soldiers lost their lives. Among the rest may be mentioned Sir William Peel, who was seriously wounded in the battle before Lucknow, and who shortly afterwards died of small-pox at Cawnpore. Another hero of fiery character and strange career, who fell in the

had taken refuge. In 1858, however, Hodson, with his own hand, seized the rebel monarch, drew him forth, and delivered him to his horsemen to be borne away to the presence of General Wilson. Hodson also captured the three royal princes of Delhi, and in a



OUTRAM, CAMPBELL, AND HAVELOCK.

last battle, was Colonel Hodson, known in India as "Hodson of Hodson's Horse." His career had been one of singular recklessness and daring. He it was who, after the recapture of Delhi, had, with the help of Hindu spies, penetrated the tomb of Humayun, where the last of the Mogul Emperors

of rage had them condemned to death. He then took a carbine from the hands of one of his men, and shot the princes dead, leaving their bodies before the gates of Delhi. During the rest of the war, he had gone through all hazards and perils, to fall at last by a Sepoy bullet in the hour of final conquest. The

reader may not have forgotten that out of the disasters of Cabul, ending in the total destruction of a British army, and of all who were dependent on its protection, a single man had escaped to carry the news of the horror to Jehlabad. That man was Dr. Brydon, who lived through the siege of Lucknow, enduring all the hardships and sufferings of that dreadful situation, to be rescued with the garrison, and to be mentioned with praise in the report of the campaign as one of the heroes of Luck-

Nearly all of the leaders who had distinguished themselves—and who had not?—were honored with titles and dignities and pensions. Several of the Generals were made Barons. Sir Colin Campbell was raised to the peerage, with the title of Lord Clyde. During the rest of his life, which extended to 1863, he enjoyed a pension of two thousand pounds a year. At the scenes of the principal events of the war, memorials were erected by the Government to commemorate the valor and sacrifice of those



HODSON SEIZING THE KING OF DELHI.

now, who had taken part in both sorrow and victory, to be remembered "as an example of the invincible energy, and enduring courage of British soldiers."

The year 1858 witnessed the re-establishment of civil authority in Lucknow. The anarchy was at an end, and the power of Great Britain in the East was presently more firmly fixed than ever before. The nation was not ungrateful to those who had upheld the cause of the country in those almost impenetrable regions ten thousand miles from London,

who died in the massacres and battles. The Residency at Lucknow bears witness in many of its details and surroundings to the tragic events, to the valor and the glory of 1857. There, to the present day, may be seen the ruined works, behind which the heroes who fought under Havelock, stood and battled for the flag of England. There may be seen the old mosque and the magnificent banyan-tree through whose branches the Sepoy bullets whistled during the siege. There, near at hand, rises the significant mound, its sides ter-

rauced and covered with the fragrant flowers of India, while on the further slope rise the feathery bamboos which overshadow the last resting-place of two thousand British soldiers who died of battle and pestilence in the siege of Lucknow. At Cawnpore, over the horrid well whose open mouth received the mutilated bodies of the murdered women and children, a memorial has been erected; while round about the spot a beautiful garden, planted with flowers and shrubs, and protected by a wall, preserves the memory of those who perished under the swords of the murderers sent to their bloody work in the prison-house by the Rajah of Bithoor.

With the subsidence of the rebellion in India, a difficult and serious task was left on the hands of the Government. By what means should a reorganization of those vast populations be effected. In the first place, the question of retribution must be met. It was resolved by the authorities, civil and military, that a distinction should be made between those who had merely participated in the mutiny, contending openly with the British forces in battle, and those who had taken part in the many horrid massacres, of which the Sepoys had been guilty. As far as practicable, this distinction was carried out in the punishment of those who fell into the power of the British. The Hindu soldiers who were taken, and whose hands were not stained with butchery and assassination, were treated as prisoners of war. But those who had been guilty of massacre were at once destroyed by being blown alive from the mouths of cannon. In extenuation of this severity, which had in it so strong a flavor of barbarism, the explanation was given by the British authorities that the Sepoys, under their peculiar superstitions, cared little or nothing for the mere fact of death, but were horrified at the thought of mutilation. The method of military execution was declined from this theory; but after times have hardly consented to the wholesale and savage process by which the guilty Sepoys were obliterated,

After the first rigors of the military method were passed, the civil government proceeded as best it might with the reorganization of the country. In March of 1858 Lord Canning issued to the inhabitants of Oudh a proclamation, in which he defined, with much severity, the measures by which they might be restored to conditions of peace. It was set forth that all chiefs and landowners who should at once surrender to the British Commissioner



MEMORIAL AT CAWNPORE.

should be spared, provided only that they had not been guilty of massacre or assassination. The proclamation of the Governor-General went on to say that any further indulgence which might be extended to the people of Oudh, and indeed their whole condition thereafter, must depend on their own course in surrendering themselves to the justice and mercy of the British Government. The general effect of the proclamation was to confiscate the lands of all who had taken part in the mutiny, and

the signified the whole population; for there was not perhaps one in a thousand of the land-owners in all Oudh who had not been engaged in the Rebellion. It was perhaps not intended by Lord Canning that the penalty should be so rigorously exacted as might be inferred from the proclamation. It was the purpose rather to make the people understand that the British Government, in the exercise of prerogative which had arisen out of the war, had become the original proprietor of the lands of Oudh, and that all who henceforth held or owned such lands must do so under a title derived from the Crown of England.

As soon as the policy of the Governor-General was known in England a violent controversy arose relative thereto, and the discussion in Parliament did not end until the Government of India was revolutionized. Lord Ellenborough and most of the Ministry antagonized the principles of Lord Canning's proclamation, and motions were introduced in both Houses of Parliament to substitute a new policy for that of the Governor-General. To the American reader, the condition of affairs and the controversy relative thereto, may well bring to mind the divisions between the Executive and Congress in the work of reconstructing the Southern States at the close of the Civil War. It appeared that, in the case of Lord Canning, he had sent certain private and explanatory letters to England in connection with the proclamation, and that these were withheld until the break was made between the Governor-General and the Ministry. Since no other policy could be substituted for that proposed by Canning, the latter officer went straight ahead to meet the difficulties before him according to his own methods.

It soon appeared that the measures proposed were not in effect so severe as they were theoretically. The people of Oudh, particularly the landowners, were now thoroughly willing to accept the best terms of settlement which might be had at the hands of the Government. It was found that Canning's policy was the remedy for many of the ancient abuses with which the people of the Province had been afflicted. The somewhat dependent position in which the land-owners were placed, gave opportunity for an extension of rights and influence among the village communities.

In fact, the domestic revolution was more in form than in substance. There had always existed in Oudh a proprietary right of the kingly and feudal governments in the lands of the country, and the transfer of this proprietary right to Great Britain did not, after all, so greatly disturb the status of the landlords and the village tenantry.

Meanwhile, the whole question of the present condition and future government of India was under full discussion in Parliament. In the preceding pages many references have been made to that famous East India Company, under whose auspices the civil and governmental development of India had taken place. As early as 1595, what was called "A Company for Remote Parts," was formed in Amsterdam, and was presently chartered, with the general privilege of trade with the East Indies, for twenty-one years. Afterwards the charter was extended to 1644. Still again, in 1655, the rights of the Company were revived, and continued till the year 1700. We have already seen how, with the maritime ascendancy of England, dating from about the middle of the seventeenth century, the power of the Portuguese, the Dutch, and the French in the far East, gave way before the greater vigor and aggressiveness of the English fleets. Even before this event, in the year 1599, Queen Elizabeth had granted to "The Governor and Company of Merchants of London, trading with the East Indies," a charter for fifteen years, conceding to the corporation the exclusive right of commerce with all the countries from the Cape of Good Hope eastward to the Straits of Magellan, excepting only such coasts and islands as might already be occupied by some friendly European State. Such was the origin of that great corporation which was destined to furnish, in after times, some of the most important, and, at the same time, most romantic, chapters in the history of the British Empire.

In the time of Cromwell an effort was made to set free the trade with East India. But the attempt was futile; and the charter of the Company was renewed by the Protector, and again by Charles II. In 1698 a second company of like character with the original was formed; but a few years afterwards the two were merged under the title of "The United Company of Merchants trading with the East

Indies." The government of the Company was in the hands of a Governor and a Board of Directors, varying in number at different times and under different statutes. In 1708 three Local Councils were established in India, one for Madras, one for Bombay, and one for Calcutta. During this century, the political and territorial relations of the Company were vastly extended in Hindustan. In 1757 the government of the corporation succeeded in deposing the nabob of Bengal, by which act great and rich provinces were secured. It was in 1761 that the defeat and virtual expulsion of the French from India enabled the Company to pursue with still greater freedom its policy of aggrandizement. Soon afterwards that most remarkable episode in the history of the country, the administration of Warren Hastings occurred, to be followed by his impeachment and the consequent revelation, to the mind of England and all Europe, of the tremendous resources, the vast extent, the complicated governmental system, the antique civilization, and limitless populations of India. Henceforth it was seen that the East India Company, as a private corporation, could not be left independent of governmental control, to pursue its own course in the management of an Empire as great in wealth, and many times greater in population, than the Home Kingdom of Great Britain. Accordingly, on the proposition of William Pitt, a Board of Control was appointed for India, to consist of the two principal Secretaries of State, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and such members of the Privy Council as the sovereign might designate. The Company's charter, however, was, in 1793, extended by act of Parliament to the year 1814. Indeed, the monopoly of trade in the East, which had been so long conceded to the Company, was not abolished until April of 1834.

If, then, at the time of the Indian mutiny, we glance at that Government which experiment, statute, and commercial interest had conspired to form through the two and a half preceding centuries, we shall find the Administration to be composed of a Board of Directors, part of whom were nominated by the Crown, and part chosen by the Company. The Crown Directors had a right of reviewing all decisions made by the general Company. The

Governor-General of India was an officer of the Crown, though he might be recalled by the Company. The system was complicated in the last degree, and in some particulars was vague and incomprehensible. As early as 1852, Lord Ellenborough had recommended that the governmental prerogatives of the Company be transferred to the Crown.

It remained, however, for the Indian mutiny to rouse Parliament and the country to the necessities of the situation. Four years previously the civil patronage which had belonged to the Company was taken away, and placed under the same competitive system which prevailed in the civil service of Great Britain. At the very beginning of 1858, before civil government was restored at Lucknow, Lord Palmerston brought in a bill for the transfer of all the civil and political authority of the East India Company directly and absolutely to the Crown of England. The measure contemplated the appointment, by the British Home Government, of a President and Council of eight members for the Administration of India. Before the bill could be passed, however, Lord Palmerston was thrown out of office by circumstances to be narrated hereafter.

He was succeeded by Lord Derby, with Lord Ellenborough as Secretary for the Colonies. A new bill was prepared, more complicated and less practical than that proposed by Palmerston. In the course of the discussion which ensued, it was found that the Ellenborough bill was virtually devoid of merit. At length Lord John Russell, whose clear judgment had so many times discovered a way through like perplexities, prepared a bill called "An Act for the Better Government of India." In its provisions were made that all the territories, all the civil and political rights, hitherto held and exercised by the East India Company, should be transferred absolutely to the Crown of England. The principal administrative officer was to be known as the Viceroy, or Governor-General. He was to be appointed by the Crown. A Council for India, consisting of fifteen members, was to be appointed, eight of whom were to be chosen by the Crown, and the other seven were conceded to the Directors of the Company. There was also to be a Council Resident in India, for the immediate support and assistance of the Vice-

roy. The act was passed on the 1st of September, 1858. The Queen was proclaimed sovereign of India, and Lord Canning, in recognition of the ability and fidelity with which he had discharged the duties of his office in the most critical epoch through which the British Government had yet passed in the East, was appointed first Viceroy of India. The civil revolution thus effected marked the beginning of a new era in the development of the British East Indian Empire—a movement which may be said to have reached its culmination when, in April of 1876, Queen Victoria, under the auspices of Disraeli, received the crown and title of Empress of India.

Reference has been made above to the sudden downfall of the Palmerston Ministry. The cause of the unexpected collapse of the Government was known and read of all. On the 14th of January, 1858, the Italian exile, Felice Orsini, for some time resident in England, but who had more recently gone over to the French capital, had taken his station near the entrance of the Grand Opera-house, and thrown under the carriage of Louis Napoleon and the Empress an explosive bomb. The Emperor and Eugénie escaped unhurt, but ten of the exposed by-standers were killed, and a hundred and fifty-six wounded. A full account of the attempted assassination of the French ruler will be given in the following chapter. In this place the event is to be considered only in its relations to England, and particularly to the Palmerston Government.

It was at once known that for some time Orsini had lived, publicly and privately, in England. It was discovered that his bombs had been manufactured in Birmingham. Orsini had spoken much in many parts of the Kingdom, urging the British Government to espouse the cause of Italy against Austria. These circumstances, and many other incidents of the attempted assassination, were noised, not only in England and France, but throughout Europe. For the time, the immemorial policy of Great Britain in making the country a haven and asylum for political refugees from every part of the world, was subjected to the severest criticism. In France especially were animadversions offered, from quarters high and quarters low, on that type of Government

which absorbed into itself the half-murderous malecontents from all other nations. In England there was some sympathy with these views—some disposition to adopt a more stringent policy relative to the political aliens who had found, or might hereafter find, asylum in the Kingdom.

At the head of this opinion stood Lord Palmerston himself. His attitude in this particular must be interpreted from his peculiar constitution. Ever since his entrance into public life his politics had been divided into two parts, the first part being devoted to liberalism in England, and the other part to absolutism abroad. Lord Palmerston was therefore allied at many crises of his career with those European rulers who had least footing in the actual sympathies of Great Britain. Thus it was in the case of Napoleon III. It will be remembered that Lord Palmerston had already had a notable fall from the English Ministry, in 1852, on account of his unseasonable defense of the *Coup d'Etat*. In the case of the Orsini affair, the English statesman's partiality again stood stoutly forth. In accordance with his own disposition, and under the stimulus of communications received from the French Cabinet, he brought into the House of Commons a bill known as "The Conspiracy-to-murder Bill." The act was in the open face of the whole antecedent policy of Great Britain. It contemplated the transference of conspiracy to murder from the list of misdemeanors to the category of felonies, with the penalty of penal servitude in periods extending from five years to the life-time of the convict. At the first view it would appear that the measure covered the case; but when we take into consideration the immemorial policy and law of the English-speaking race, to the effect that an overt act, and *not* a contemplated or prepared crime, is necessary to constitute a felony, we shall see the untenable character of the Bill proposed and defended by Palmerston. Many of the ablest Parliamentarians at once perceived the anti-British character of the measure. Particularly did John Arthur Roebuck hold up to the hostile judgment of the House the proposed statute. At length, Milner Gibson threw his influence against Palmerston, and when the Bill came to a vote for the second

reading, it failed by a considerable majority. It only remained for Lord Palmerston to resign his office. He, who at the beginning of the year had been as firmly planted in power as any Prime Minister who had conducted the Government for the last quarter of a century, suddenly lost his hold by his sympathy for the ruler of France, and by confounding the misdemeanor of *plotting* a crime with the actual commission of the crime itself.

The American reader will hardly fail, in perusing this significant paragraph, to call to mind the similar effort made, and still making, in his own country, with respect to anarchism. In the United States the British theory of free asylum has been cordially, fully, and righteously adopted. Any other course on the part of the American Republic would be to belie the very principles on which the Republic is founded. No movement in our country has been more pitifully contemptible than that which proposes to regard the United States as meant exclusively for the selfish promotion of the interests of those who have the good fortune to be born American. True, every human government must first care for its own; but the American Government can not stop with this narrow construction. The United States exists for the world, for mankind, for an enlarged human liberty. It must needs be that offenses will come under such a system. The Anarchists in American cities plotted to commit crime. In a most conspicuous instance, crimes were committed. The authorities might proceed either against the conspiracy or against the murderous deed done in Haymarket Square. The conspiracy was a misdemeanor. The bomb-throwing was a felony. As a matter of fact the Anarchists were convicted of conspiracy, and were *not* convicted of throwing the bombs. They were tried for murder, and were convicted of anarchy! The attempt made in several quarters to stretch the principles of American law, so that plotting and conspiring to commit crime shall be put into the category of felonies, along with the overt acts of riot, murder, and assassination, is one of the most

dangerous fallacies with which recent jurisprudence has been afflicted—a principle by far more evil in itself and pernicious in its tendencies than the evil which it is intended to remove.

Before his final exit from office, Lord Palmerston had the good fortune to decorate his crest with a feather from the East. The feather was plucked from the abundant plumage of China. Canton had at last been taken by the allied French and English fleets. How long the military operations on that far coast had been suspended or balked by the troubles and disasters of the British Empire, the reader may well infer. For it will not be



CHARLES ROBERT DARWIN.

forgotten how, at the outbreak of the East Indian War, Lord Canning had put forth his hand, and in the emergency diverted the English armament, which had been sent out to China, from its intended purpose and brought the fleet to his own assistance. Of small importance was it to Great Britain that the Chinese coast should be broken at the cannon's mouth, in comparison with the great crisis in India. But with the lapse of time Outram and Campbell and Havelock were successful in India. The great insurrection of the Sepoys was beaten into the earth; order was restored, and the Government, as we have seen, reconstructed on a broader and

more rational basis. Thus relieved, from her embarrassments, Great Britain found herself free to join the French in a vigorous prosecution of the war on China.

The Emperor Napoleon had meanwhile found a reasonable cause for his hostility in the cruel treatment which had been visited by the Chinese on a company of French missionaries. Napoleon III. was in a frame of mind for the prosecution of a foreign war. The French Nation had found some measurable gratification of pride in the issue of the conflict in the Crimea, and in the ability of the Emperor to bring the ambassadors of the great Powers together under his auspices in the Treaty of Paris. But it was necessary for him to continue his foreign enterprises to the end, that the French might be still further elated with his government. Thus England and France bore down in general armament upon China, and struck at Canton. It was no great matter that European fleets should prevail over the rude and primitive defense with which the Chinese were able to protect their city. Canton was bombarded and taken. At this time the Imperial Commissioner, Yeh, was in the city. The allies succeeded in running down the Oriental dignitary, and capturing him in his retreat. To him, in his obstinacy, the British authorities chose to refer the recent hostilities and destruction of life and property. Nor could it well be doubted that the cruelty and recklessness of his administration had been such as to justify severe measures against him. It was said that in a recent Chinese rebellion he had ordered the ignominious execution of one hundred thousand rebel prisoners. Yeh was accordingly treated as a political prisoner; was sent to Calcutta, and kept in confinement until the following year, when he died.

Canton taken, it remained to reestablish peace. To this end Lord Elgin, on the part of Great Britain, and Baron Gros, on the part of France, were empowered by their respective Governments to form a new treaty with China. The policy of non-intercourse adopted by the Imperial Government was one of the chief causes of offense, and against this the European ministers protested to the extent of securing the establishment of embassies at the Chinese Court. It was also agreed that China

should henceforth have representatives at St. James and Versailles. It was provided that the Christian religion should henceforth be tolerated in the Chinese Empire, and that certain of the Chinese rivers should be accessible to the merchant-vessels of England and France. As to the expenses of the war, payment therefor was, as a matter of course, exacted from China. Lord Palmerston was able, in his official capacity, to inform his countrymen of the success of the military operations in the East, before the political eclipse into which he was now to enter.

Before concluding the present chapter, we may well pause to note a single event in the intellectual and scientific progress, not only of the British people—not only of the English-speaking race—but of all civilized nations. It was in the year 1859 that the greatest of modern naturalists, Charles Robert Darwin, published his *Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection*. The work produced an immediate and vivid sensation among the thinking people on both sides of the Atlantic. The new doctrine of the Natural History of Life was at once assailed with all manner of adverse and acrimonious criticisms, with every variety of argument and prejudice. In the course of a few years, no fewer than three hundred and twelve authors had published works on the subject, a great majority of which were devoted to the attempted refutation of the hypothesis, which now gained the name of Darwinism. But it seemed that the united antagonism of a thousand assailants was insufficient to beat down the small and modest treatise which the naturalist had put forth, embodying his views as to the methods by which the various forms of animal and vegetable life on the earth have been evolved into their present aspect and activities. The ensuing quarter of a century was largely occupied in the scientific world with the debate, which was waged, with ever-increasing advantage on the side of the Darwinians; nor may it be well denied, as the controversy subsides, that a new era has been reached in the history of the human mind, as it respects its fundamental concepts of the processes and movements by which the varieties of animated being on the earth have appeared and reached their present development.

CHAPTER CXXXI. SUFFRAGE REFORM AND AMERICAN COMPLICATION.



WITH the fall of Palmerston, Lord Derby again came to the head of the Government. With him were associated Benjamin Disraeli, as Chancellor of the Exchequer; Lord Stanley, as Secretary for the Colonies; Lord Malmesbury, as Secretary of Foreign Affairs; and General Peel, as Secretary of War. Of these, by far the strongest and ablest leader was Disraeli, whose coming ascendancy in the Government of Great Britain might be easily discerned. One of the first expedients of the new Cabinet was *not* to do what its predecessor proposed to do. This principle was applied at once to the Conspiracy Bill, which was allowed to die of inanition. As for the rest, the attention of Parliament was at once directed to the question of the removal of the remaining political disabilities of the Jews.

It was very fitting that one himself by birth a Jew, though nominally a Christian, should be leader of the House of Commons in the day when the final emancipation of his race was effected. It is difficult for the man of to-day, who has the English language as his birthright and the principles of English liberty as his bulwark, to understand the bitter, causeless, unreasoning prejudices of race which still held from the exercise of human rights, at so late a period of British history, so large and influential a class of people as the Jews. It seemed as though a considerable portion of the legislation and jurisprudence of England had been specially contrived for the oppression and distress of the Jewish race. As late as 1830, almost all the rights of citizenship were positively denied to Jewish subjects. No office, civil, military, or corporate, could be held by a Jew. The profession of law, whether as barrister or attorney, was closed against him. A Jew was forbidden to teach school, and might not even serve as janitor of a school-building! He was interdicted from voting, and was, of course, ex-

cluded from membership in either House of Parliament. It is almost inconceivable that the mere bar of race descent should have been made the instrument of such degradation and oppression; and the wonder is still greater that the measures which were from time to time brought forward for the removal of the load with which every Jew was encumbered, should have been met with violent opposition, even in the House of Commons.

After the year 1830, however, the question of reform would not down. Bills were introduced at every session for Jewish emancipation, and at length public sentiment rallied to the cause. The English people, as such, went over to the side of the Jews, but Parliament—the House of Lords in particular—still refused to concede the removal of the disabilities. It was in the first year of the reign of Queen Victoria that the Jews first gained admission to certain executive offices. A Jew might be a sheriff, a constable, a langman. It was at length perceived that pressure would have to be exerted upon Parliament from without. The friends of Jewish emancipation adopted the policy of electing certain citizens, otherwise qualified, but of the Jewish race, to the House of Commons. This was by no means difficult to do. In 1847 the Baron Lionel Rothschild was elected as one of the members for the City of London, and another Hebrew, named David Salomons, for the borough of Shoreham. At this time the House of Lords had just rejected by a strong vote the proposition for the extension of full citizenship to the Jews. Baron Rothschild, who was a man of the highest character, thereupon resigned his seat, and Salomons was refused admission.

It must be understood that the anti-Jewish prejudice in Parliament had found its last barricade in the oath which, according to existing statutes, was required of all those who were inducted into office. This oath required allegiance to the British crown as supreme in State and Church, abjuration of all foreign jurisdictions, and faithful discharge of the

given official duties; and to this was added, as a clause of sanction, "on the true faith of a Christian." Behind this clause the conservatism of England took refuge. It was of course the custom of infidels, skeptics, atheists, *et id omne genus*, to take this oath without compunction; but honest Jews would not subscribe such an obligation. Great Britain took no offense at hypocrisy or perjury, provided only the applicant would swear, using the words "on the true faith of a Christian."

In the meantime, Baron Rothschild and David Salomons, the latter recently elected from Greenwich, again presented themselves for membership, and offered to subscribe the oath with the invidious clause omitted. But the point was not yielded, and both the members sought to take their seats in spite of the bar against them. Both were excluded, Salomons with considerable violence, and Baron Rothschild with such gentle force as the officer of the House might use towards one of high degree.

For several years the contest dragged on, until, finally, in 1858, a bill was introduced by Lord John Russell, providing that the official oath might be *modified* when it was to be administered to Jews. The measure was passed by the House of Commons, but was rejected in the House of Lords. At length, however, the substance of the act was accepted in both Houses of Parliament, and henceforth the Jews were admitted to all official relations on taking such a modified oath as was acceptable to their consciences and consistent with their religious faith.

Almost coincidentally with the Act just named, namely, the act of the Parliamentary session of 1858, another measure of reform was adopted, by which a long-standing scandal was removed from the governmental polity of Great Britain. It will be remembered that the great Reform Bill of 1832, while it had greatly equalized representation and extended the franchise among the middle classes of Englishmen, had done nothing to ameliorate the political or social condition of the workingmen. They who had expected so much from the legislation of Earl Grey received nothing at all. The English masses had asked for bread; Parliament gave them a stone. They asked a fish, and were given a serpent. For twenty-six

years the poorer people of Great Britain had stretched up their hands to the branches of that fallacious tree, called by preeminence the Reform Bill, and had plucked only the apples of Sodom.

Time and again the more liberal statesmen of England had moved in the direction of reviving and extending the principles of that Reform Bill of 1832, more particularly as it affected the character of the House of Commons. The time had now arrived when another of the great principles for which the Chartists had contended was to find its way into the Constitution of Great Britain. The old abusive statute which required as a qualification that members of Parliament should possess a certain amount of landed property, was still in full force. This is to say, the letter of the law was in force, but not the spirit. It has been the peculiarity of the whole institutional, and especially the constitutional, development of the British Empire, that the current legislation and all existing administrative and judicial proceedings have been encumbered and weighted down with a mass of obsolete statutes, many of which had their origin amid the half-barbarism, the bigotries and brutalities of the Middle Ages. As a result, every reformatory movement in Great Britain has been hobbled and retarded, drawn from its course to right and left, or jerked backwards on its haunches, by the long and strong thongs of ancient precedent, time-honored restriction, and irrational, or at least unreasoning, conservatism. In every instance the Old Man of the Sea has compelled the youthful Sindbad to mount on his shoulders, and ride him backwards towards the past.

These circumstances must account for the slow and toilsome progress of all reformatory movements in England. In the case before us, the Past had decided that land-ownership was a necessary qualification for membership in the British Parliament. Civilization had long since outgrown this restriction. Chartism had denounced the principle, and the conscience and judgment of England recognized the justice of the denunciation. But still the letter survived. At length a state of circumstances supervened which made it necessary to obviate the law by fraudulent practices. That stubborn spirit of conservatism for which, in

all ages, the British Saxon has been so noted, refused to admit that the law should be repealed. That indeed would sweep away a landmark of the past. Subterfuge and fraud were accordingly adopted in order that the will of England might be done in the face of the English law. It became customary for the candidates who were before the country for election to Parliament, and who were not themselves land-owners, to obtain the nominal and temporary transfer of properties to themselves, holding the same until after election and qualification for duty in Parliament, and then deeding back to the real owners what they had held in trust. This method of "beating the law" became so common that a large proportion of the members of the House of Commons might be justly charged with holding their seats by a process which, applied to any ordinary relation of life, would have been denounced as mere fraud.

The reader will find in these conditions an example of the many similar perplexities which have tended to produce and foster in the public life of Great Britain a species of political hypocrisy, of which the English people themselves appear to be but half conscious. In the midst of some such embarrassment, it is in vain that even the greatest English statesman should arise, point out the nature of the evil, and demand, with the most cogent argument and appeal to conscience, the abrogation of the offending statute. The political machinery of England, and more particularly the peculiar spirit of the people, will not tolerate such a direct, manly, and rational method of abolishing abuses. Parliament must beat around the question, adopt subterfuges, offer amendments, and finally choose some half-way expedient, under which it is hoped that the injurious usage of the past will *expire*, rather than be destroyed. In the instance before us, the effort was made, from time to time, to abolish the property qualification for members of Parliament. One act proposed to substitute a declaration, instead of the oath hitherto required of the candidate, that he was a land-owner; as though the declaration were a fobber and less hurtful form of falsehood than the direct and robust perjury of the oath.

In the next place it was sought to make

the property qualification general, by substituting a requirement that the Parliamentary should possess, not necessarily landed property, but a fund of some kind equivalent to six hundred pounds a year for a county constituency, or three hundred pounds for a borough. But this measure by no means removed the tendency to fraud. It was more easy indeed for some rich friend to loan, *pro tempore*, a sufficient sum to a moneyless candidate than it had been to make to him a fraudulent transfer of landed property. The abuse was aggravated by the amendment, and the House of Commons continued to be filled in good part with those who had obtained their seats in the open face of the law. The condition was made still more abusive by the fact that the members of Parliament from Scotland were free from the property qualification. Those who were chosen to represent the great Universities were also exempt from the action of the pernicious statute.

In the year 1858 it was found that about sixty members of the House were in their seats by the force of a fraudulent declaration. It happened at this session that one poor member, who had come in in the usual way, was unfortunate enough to fall into the clutches of the law. Once in the hands of an English court, there was no escape. His fellow-members came at once to see the precipice on which more than half a hundred others were standing. The votes of these were necessary to the Ministry. Therefore the Government by a herculean effort, and under compulsion, must abolish the sacred old statute which, since the days of Queen Anne, had required a landed property as a qualification for membership in the Commons. To Locke King, a member of the House, belongs the honor of having prepared and introduced the measure by which Parliamentary membership was made henceforth to depend on the man rather than on land-ownership.

The year 1859 was noted in the history of England for the founding of the great American Colony of British Columbia. The measure was the virtual beginning of English civilization in the vast regions lying north of the westernmost parts of the United States. At the time of which we speak, the office of Secretary for the Colonies was held by Sir

Edward Bulwer Lytton, and from his rich and capacious understanding arose the project of opening on the far Pacific a new field for the exercise of the energies of his countrymen. The new territory, to which the name of British Columbia was given, was bounded on the south by the parallel of forty-nine degrees and forty minutes, being the boundary-line of the United States; on the east by the principal chain of the Rocky Mountains; on the north by Simpson's River and the Finlay Branch of Peace River; and on the west by the Pacific. In course of time, Vancouver's Island was annexed to the new Province; and, after twelve years of independent colonial existence, British Columbia itself was added to the Dominion of Canada. Thus in the year 1871, British America on the north was carried through in one broad band, as the United States had already been, from ocean to ocean.

It was under the administration of Lord Lytton in the colonial office that a striking revival of interest occurred in Great Britain with respect to that group of Grecian Islands called Ionian. These Islands are seven in number, beginning with Corfu on the north, and extending around the western coast of Greece to Cerigo, off the southern extremity of the peninsula. They are essentially Hellenic, geographically, ethnically, historically. But for a long time the Ionian group had been the subject of covetous contention among the Latin States of Western Europe. About the beginning of the present century, Bonaparte, on more occasions than one, made the Ionian Islands the subject of special clauses in his treaties. At the Congress of Vienna, in 1815, the Islands were granted nominal independence under the protection of Great Britain. Corfu was the capital. The chief administrative officer was a British Lord High Commissioner, appointed by the Government. Under him was a legislative body, consisting of a Senate of six and an Assembly of forty members. It was not long until the Greek revolution broke out. After a hard and sanguinary conflict, the independence of the country was achieved, and King Otho, a German Prince, was put on the throne under the agreement of the Great Powers.

Herewith the populations of the Ionian Islands, themselves of Grecian origin, strove

by every means in their hands to identify themselves with the Mother-land of Greece. The protectorate of Great Britain now constituted a bar to such a movement. The Ionians, from year to year, grew more and more restless under what was in every essential a foreign domination. It became a serious matter to Lord Lytton how he should continue a satisfactory administration in the Islands. He at length determined to send out as a Commissioner Extraordinary to Corfu, William E. Gladstone, who was recognized as a Philhellene, and might for that reason be most acceptable to the Islanders. It was at the close of 1858 that Gladstone went on his mission. It appears that the Islanders at once leaped to the conclusion that the new Commissioner had come to them in the character of a liberator. He was received with great enthusiasm by the impetuous patriots of Ionia, and had great difficulty in making them understand the true nature of his mission. The general effect of his presence in the Islands was to increase the agitation in favor of a union with Greece. At the close of the Gladstone episode the discontent at the foreign protectorate was greater than ever, and the succeeding Lord High Commissioner had great difficulty in maintaining peace.

At length, however, the difficulty was solved by a natural evolution, the results of which were satisfactory to all parties. In October of 1862, a popular revolution occurred in Athens, by which King Otho was renounced to private life. In his place was chosen Prince George of Denmark, son of Christian IX., and brother to the Princess of Wales. The fact that the brother-in-law of the future sovereign of Great Britain was thus chosen king of the Hellenes, at once modified the views of the English Government relative to the maintenance of the protectorate over the Ionian Islands. It was conceded by Lord John Russell, then in office, that the Islands should belong henceforth to the kingdom of Greece. Accordingly, in 1863, the protectorate was finally relinquished, and the little Ionian Republic was merged with the mother country of Hellas. A fortunate marriage settlement had accomplished a result which otherwise would hardly have been effected but by the agency of war.

We may here enter upon an account of the final conflict by which the Right of Suffrage was extended to the workingmen of England. Time and again we have referred to the ineffectiveness of the Reform Bill of 1832, considered as a measure of enfranchisement and genuine extension of popular rights. It would appear strange that a people of the liberty-loving antecedents of the English race should, in their historical career, have exhibited so many symptoms of apprehension relative to the suffrage. It would seem axiomatic that a country possessing so great and powerful an organ of liberty as the House of Commons would revert instinctively to manhood's suffrage as the very palladium of the system of free government. But, on the other side, we have to take into consideration the composite character of English society and English institutions. We must remember that, from the days of the Tudors, from the days of the Plantagenets, aye, from the days of the Conqueror himself, England had been, politically considered, an aristocracy. There was the king. There was the House of Lords. There was the graduated order of nobility. There was the landed gentry, by far the most powerful and resolute of its kind in all Europe. These parts of British society were fixed and established by the traditions of centuries.

All these elements of England's strength and greatness were set against the principle of general suffrage. While the Commons grew, the aristocracy opposed their growth. Nevertheless, the whole history of Great Britain, since the Revolution of 1688, has been the history of the gradual rise and ever-imminent supremacy of the House of Commons. Back of this development has been heard evermore in the distance the cry of the common man—the appeal of the masses for their constitutional rights and just influence in the Government. At the time of which we speak, the liberal elements in Parliament were sufficiently numerous, could they be marshaled into a single phalanx to bear down the Conservative Ministry, and to carry an extension of the suffrage by a *coup de main*. But the divisions among the Liberal and Radical elements in the House, generally forbade such a union of effort.

At the close of the sixth decade of the century, Benjamin Disraeli was the undisputed

leader of the Conservative Party. Each year seemed to add a new demonstration of his great abilities, a new display of his powers in the Government. At this date Europe fell into commotion and war. It looked for a season as though Napoleon the Little was about to turn the tables on his critics and satirists, and to justify his claim to the war-boots and cocked hat of Napoleon the Great. It is not the place in which to enter on a narrative of those stirring events in the course of which a United Italy was to emerge from the smoke of battle, and the rising crest of Hohenzollern be seen above the turmoil of Sadowa. Suffice it to say that, in these events, Great Britain seemed to have no part or lot. Such a situation has always been annoying to English statesmen. Under such circumstances they feel that the prestige of Great Britain is lost, or at least diminished. It is a sentiment with which the great mass of the English people sympathize in a profound degree. To all Britons it seems unnatural and unhistorical that any great thing should happen in Europe in which England has no master part.

Such was the condition of affairs in 1859. The crisis in Europe required that the English Government should do something at home which might satisfy the *amour propre* of the people by compensation for the noise abroad. In such an emergency, *Reform* is the cry with which a Ministry must attract to itself the continued interest of the nation. But how should a Conservative Minister cry Reform? To the genius of Disraeli the dilemma was sufficiently embarrassing, but not confounding. He perceived that reform must be taken under the patronage of the Government, and for the present he might almost say, *Libet est moi*. So he became a Reformer, and introduced into Parliament a bill for the extension of the suffrage. It was his theory that the franchise might be extended laterally; that is, to considerable classes and groups of disfranchised Englishmen, who, so to speak, flourished in the same stratum with those who, under the Reform Bill of 1832, already had the right of suffrage. Below this stratum lay that other and profoundly deep formation, the English lower classes—the workingmen, the peasantry, the operatives, the miners of Great Britain.

It was not the purpose of Disraeli to dip down into the great sea. His measure by no means contemplated the enfranchisement of the masses. In fact, the bill proposed was in the nature of another tub thrown to the British whale. The act provided that in boroughs, all persons having property to the amount of ten pounds a year, in funds, or stocks of the East India Company; all persons who had on deposit sixty pounds in savings bank; all persons receiving pensions to the amount of twenty pounds a year; also all professional men, such as doctors and lawyers, alumni of the universities, ministers, school-teachers, etc., should become enfranchised. Another clause of the bill provided that the conditions of suffrage in counties and boroughs respectively should be equalized—a provision which had in it the elements of right and justice. But in its principal features the bill was little better than an absurdity. It was at once seen that many of the persons seemingly admitted to the franchise by the new measure were already enfranchised. Under existing statutes, a lawyer or a physician, as well as a country landlord, had the right of suffrage, provided the property qualifications were sufficient. Again, it was seen that one having the requisite funds in a savings bank might, in one year, be a voter, and in the next year, by the mere fact of withdrawing and profitably investing his money, even in a cottage provided for his young wife, would thereby be disfranchised.

Nevertheless, Disraeli brought all of his resources to the defense of his bill. A fiery and protracted debate ensued in the House of Commons, until, at length, Lord Russell thrust a sword into the whole proceeding by offering a resolution to the effect that the House of Commons would not be satisfied with any readjustment of the franchise which did not provide for a greater extension of the suffrage to the English people than was contemplated in the Ministerial Bill. Over this resolution, there was a sharp and decisive struggle, and the Government was defeated by an emphatic majority. Thereupon Parliament was dissolved and a new election was held, at which, though the Conservatives gained slightly, the decision was against the Ministry. The Conservatives were driven out of office by a vote of a want of confidence.

At this juncture the two leading statesmen in Parliament, after Disraeli, were Lord Palmerston and Lord John Russell. Neither of these, indeed, might be considered as second to the recent leader of the House. It were more fitting to say that Disraeli had, by genius and persistency, thrust himself into the same rank with Palmerston and Russell. The Queen, however, called to her aid Lord Granville, and directed him to form a Cabinet. It was soon discovered that this could not be done. Lord Russell would not enter the Ministry of Granville, preferring to serve under his great rival, Lord Palmerston. The latter was accordingly once more summoned by the Queen to take charge of the Government. He accepted the trust, and from June of 1859 to his death, in October of 1865, remained in the high office of Premier. Nor will the reader of our times fail to look back with admiration upon the veteran statesman, already in the seventy-fifth year of his age, resuming, at the call of his sovereign, the severest duties and heaviest responsibilities which can be imposed, under the existing constitutions of the civilized States, upon any ministerial officer.

In the new Cabinet, Gladstone became Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Secretaryship of Foreign Affairs was assigned to Lord John Russell. The Home Office was given to Sir George Cornewall Lewis. The place of Minister of War was allotted to Sidney Herbert; the Colonial Secretaryship, to the Duke of Newcastle; the Secretaryship for Ireland, to Edward Cardwell; and the Secretaryship for India, to Sir Charles Wood. The Presidency of the Board of Trade was offered to Richard Cobden; but the latter, ever at variance with Lord Palmerston, on account of his foreign policy, would not accept the place,¹ and the same was assigned to Milner Gibson.

No sadder incident was known in the

¹ It was on this occasion that the somewhat celebrated *out* of Cobden was delivered. He urged that he could not accept office under Palmerston on account of the severe strictures which he had made on that statesman's course and conduct. It was answered that Lord Russell, who had just accepted the Foreign Office, had been, in a former crisis, equally severe in denunciation of Palmerston and his policy. "Yes," replied Cobden, indifferently, "but *I want what I said.*"

history of this year, 1859, than the death of Lord Macaulay. On the 28th of December he fell from his place in Parliament, to be consigned on the 9th of the following month to his rest, near the statue of Addison, in the Poets' Corner of Westminster Abbey. His life had been one of singular intellectual activity. As was said by Johnson of Goldsmith, he had touched almost every variety of literature, and had touched nothing which he did not adorn. We may not pause, in this place, to recount the story of his life. It is doubtful whether a more brilliant intellect has passed across the sky of England within the present century. He had not only the genius of a great literary man, the acumen of a scholar, the accomplishments of a parliamentarian, the gifts of a statesman, but also the soul and spirit of a profound humanity which linked him strongly to his age.

In no incident of his career was the greatness of Macaulay more conspicuous than in his labors as President of the Commission for the Revision of the Penal Code of British India. Though he was then but a young man, being but thirty-three years of age, the work which he produced is conspicuous in the jurisprudence of the century. The Criminal Code which he prepared is still a part of the constitution of the British East Indian Empire. In it are reproduced, in a form at once concise and beautiful, the spirit and "real presence" of the law of England, in which Macaulay was so profoundly versed. He had the honor, besides, of introducing a new era in historical literature. Though his history of England is not more accurate than the works produced in the last half of the eighteenth century, though it is not free from the political bias and passionate vehemence of the author, it, nevertheless, introduced another style of historical writing, the usefulness and success of which have been demonstrated by the ever-widening popularity of the production. Nothing so brilliant, so varied, so lucid in treatment, so masterly in style and diction, had ever before appeared in English prose. Within thirty years of the appearance of the *History of England*, the sale of the work had reached in Great Britain a hundred and forty thousand copies, and it has been alleged that in the United States no other book, with

the single exception of the Bible, has ever had so wide a distribution.

We have already narrated the circumstances under which the Ministry of Lord Palmerston came into power. The Government, in his hands, was destined to pass through perilous emergencies in the course of the six years which lay before. In the first place, the relations of England with France, or more properly with the governing power in France, became strained. It would be difficult to explain, from the stand of consistency, the course which Great Britain had pursued towards the Bonaparte family in the relations of that family to the French throne. In the first place, England, in common with the other powers, had registered her vow at the Congress of Vienna, that no Bonaparte should henceforth occupy a European throne. That family was to be eradicated root and branch. In course of time, England perceived that she had no more affection, even for the Citizen King, than she had for the Napoleons. One of them had at least had the merit of greatness. When that Bonaparte, who had recently done police duty in the streets of London, and who, as the student prisoner of Ham, had occupied his time in composing a political pamphlet on the *Extinction of Pauperism*, suddenly stepped across the Channel to be President of the French Republic, and then Emperor Napoleon III., Great Britain first shaded her eyes with her hand, then said she would not endure it, then endured it, and, finally, applauded. Within two years from the time when the parvenu Prince took on him the French crown, England was his faithful ally in the Crimean War.

At the close of that conflict, Great Britain had some difficulty in preventing France from monopolizing the glory. Soon afterwards she became exceedingly distrustful of Bonaparte. She watched his movements with ever-increasing dislike. Now she saw him enter upon a victorious war with Austria. She saw him create a Duke of Magenta, on the field of that name, à la Napoleon the Great. She heard with astonishment the word Solferino, and then, with greater astonishment, the word Villafranca. She perceived that the whole Italian scheme had, in the last act, been pur-

possibly given over to miscegenation, and she was sufficiently annoyed to have taken the sword if a suitable excuse could have been found for the use of that weapon. It was another one of those emergencies in which it appeared to England that her prestige was giving way. Nevertheless, for the time being, she was obliged to use her glass and see in the distance, with as much equanimity as she could command, the war-eagle of Bonaparte, the sword of Victor Emmanuel circling in the horizon, and Count Cavour wearing the crown of European diplomacy.

It has been observed already that in such a situation, Great Britain always attempts to counteract by some form of home activity the effects of those foreign enterprises in which she bears no part. In the present instance, the Ministry became especially active, and the first form of subject-matter on which they seized was the construction of a new commercial treaty with France. The measure was somewhat sensational both in itself and in the methods employed for its accomplishment. The negotiations, instead of proceeding from the Foreign Office and going through the hands of the British Minister at Paris, appear to have originated with John Bright, and to have been conducted privately by Richard Cobden directly with the French Emperor himself.

France had, as a rule, been opposed to Great Britain on what may be called the general theory of commerce. The French political economy inclined strongly to Protection, while that of Great Britain had gone over, soul, body, and member, to the principle of Free Trade. The particular matter now in hand was to secure from Napoleon such abrogation of the existing restrictions on commerce between Great Britain and France as could not, in all probability, be secured from the French Government, apart from the will and preference of the Emperor. Cobden succeeded, in his personal discussion and correspondence with Napoleon III., in bringing that personage very nearly into accord with his own views. It can not be doubted that the ante-Imperial residence of Louis Napoleon in England had made him in some measure a convert to the English theory of political economy. The terms of a treaty were accord-

ingly framed in which great concessions were made to the principle of Free Trade. The duties which had been previously laid by the two Governments on importations of each other's goods were either wholly abolished or greatly reduced. The tariff on English coal and coke, raw iron, tools, machinery, yarns, flax, and hemp, was so far reduced as to make their importation into France virtually free; while, on the other hand, the duties on light French wines were abolished—a measure which led at once to a remarkable increase in the consumption of such drinks in Great Britain. It was noticed, moreover, as a striking evolution in social economy, that the heavy alcoholic liquors, which had hitherto been used in such excessive quantities in England, were reduced in consumption in corresponding ratio. Nor will the socialist of our own age and country fail to record as an important fact that drunkenness and its correlated and dependent forms of vice were greatly diminished by the substitution of the light French wines for the fiery beverages which the English people had formerly used.

When the new commercial treaty was brought before Parliament, it was subjected to a hot fire from the Opposition. But the advocacy of Gladstone and his followers prevailed. The compact conceived by Bright and Cobden passed into statutory form, and both countries were, presently, well satisfied with the working of the scheme. At the same time, the Ministry were busily engaged in promoting a measure of internal economy of the same general character with the French treaty. When the general principle of Free Trade became the policy of Great Britain, certain conspicuous exceptions still remained as witnesses and landmarks of the ancient system. Among others of the kind, the duty on paper had never been abolished. As a result, all departments of industry having the use of paper, of printed paper in particular, as their bottom fact, were stilted up above the horizon of low prices which prevailed with respect to all other values. It remained for the Palmerston Ministry to attack and level this standing example of the old Protective system.

The leadership of this movement fell to Gladstone. His proposition to abolish the

duty on paper was met with every form of argument and influence which the paper interest could invent and employ. The position assumed was, that the manufacture and use of paper was exceptional to the general principle of Free Trade; that book making and newspaper production were of a different nature from those other departments of industry in which free competition might be left to work out its own results; that it was not desirable that cheapness should prevail in literature and journalism, lest books and newspapers should become the cheap vehicle for the universal dissemination of all things bad and dangerous among the English people. The Ministry, however, prevailed over the Opposition, and the bill was carried through the House of Commons. When the same was laid before the House of Lords, that body took the unusual responsibility of voting adversely on the measure. A violent controversy arose over the action of the Lords in refusing their assent to a measure which the House had approved, relative to the revenues of the kingdom. For the time, the abolition of the paper duty was held in abeyance, and it was not until the following session that the measure was finally adopted.

It will be remembered that the project on which the recent Conservative Ministry had gone to wreck was the bill prepared and advocated by Disraeli for the "lateral extension" of the suffrage. It will be recalled how the Liberals combined against the proposed Act, and defeated it. It must be borne in mind that the movement of Disraeli for the reform of the franchise was in accordance with what he perceived to be the determination of the English people. He sought to patronize and satisfy the public sentiment with a measure which seemed to do without doing—which ostensibly granted, but granted not. With the accession of Lord Palmerston, the new Ministry inherited from its predecessor the very embarrassment which Disraeli and his colleagues had been unable to surmount. The Liberals must now try to appease the country with some measure of reform. A bill was accordingly prepared at the session of 1860, providing that the property qualifications for the franchise in counties should be reduced to ten pounds, and in boroughs to six pounds.

The measure also contemplated a new apportionment of the seats in the House of Commons. Twenty-five of the boroughs, represented at the time by two members each, were reduced to one member each. The membership thus gained was distributed to the larger counties and towns. Another feature of the bill was the proposition that in every county or borough represented by three members in Parliament, the third member should be chosen by the minority, that is, the Opposition. It was the beginning of that still debated feature of popular government, the minority representation. The method to be employed in securing the given result was the simple requirement that in boroughs electing three members, each elector should vote for two candidates and only two.

But the new Reform Bill was destined to a peculiar fate. The Opposition, under the leadership of Disraeli, assailed the measure with vehemence and ability. It was soon discovered that the proposed Act was peculiarly Gladstonian in its origin, development, and defense. It was also believed that Lord Palmerston had no heart or interest in the matter. It became doubtful whether the Liberals could be aligned in support of the Ministerial Bill. After the debate had proceeded to a great extent, the bill was remanded for the consideration of the committee, and was finally withdrawn from the House. In the meantime, other great interests had supervened, which drew the attention of the nation to events beyond the sea; the question of reform was given over to another Cabinet and a more convenient season.

Early in 1860 the long-standing difficulty between Great Britain and China took still another phase of development. Arrangements had been made between the two countries for a settlement of all existing troubles by means of a treaty. Even the terms of the treaty had in the main been agreed upon at Tien-Tsin, and it only remained that the formal ratifications of the compact should be exchanged as preliminary to peace. It was provided in the treaty that the ratifications, so called, should be exchanged at Peking. In March of 1859, Frederick Bruce, a brother to Lord Elgin, was sent as Envoy Extraordinary to China, with a view to the ratification of the settle-

ment. Meanwhile, a strong feeling of opposition had arisen in China to having the treaty ratified *at the capital*. The Emperor and his Government were averse in a high degree to having the ambassadors of foreign nations at his court. For a considerable period, France and England had been in alliance in the Chinese war, and the negotiations consequent thereon, and French ambassadors were to accompany those of England to Peking.

The British Government, knowing the indisposition of the Chinese Emperor to admit foreign representatives to his court, sent orders to the English Admiral commanding in Chinese waters to accompany the embassy with an armament. When the squadron thus provided for arrived at the mouth of the Peiho River, by which the commissioners were to ascend to the capital, it was found that the Chinese had obstructed the entrance and planted batteries commanding the approach. The English vessels undertook to force their way through, and were repulsed with heavy losses. Another expedition had to be fitted out before the way could be cleared, and much hard fighting took place before the European army came within reach of Peking. Negotiations were renewed, and the ratification of the treaty was exacted of the Chinese Government *at the capital*. In the meantime, a company of Englishmen, who had been sent under a flag of truce within the enemy's lines, had become involved in a difficulty, been seized by the Chinese, and subjected to such cruel treatment that half of the number had died. As a measure of retaliation for this outrage, Lord Elgin ordered the Chinese Summer Palace, a magnificent collection of buildings, picturesquely situated in a park on the outskirts of Peking, to be destroyed. Within the Palace had been collected, through centuries and ages, the archaeological, historical, and artistic treasures of China. No such other collection of rare and time-honored materials—no such other assembly of pagodas and temples, of grottoes, lakes, and bridges, of terraces, groves, and labyrinths—existed anywhere in the world. And yet by an act of wanton destruction, for which all future ages will hold Lord Elgin to account, the whole marvel of Chinese greatness was swept away. What good end might be subserved by such an act of vandalism in the

most populous capital of all Asia, has never yet been discovered.

The difficulty with China was not the only Oriental trouble in which Great Britain was at this time involved. A civil war broke out in that part of Syria which is dominated by the Lebanon; and the conflict was of such a nature as to draw both England and France to the rescue. It were impossible, perhaps, for an American reader to apprehend fully the conditions present in Syrian society at the time of which we speak. Suffice it that there existed in that country the ancient Christian sect called the Maronites, representatives from the earlier centuries of our era of Roman Catholicism in the East. There also was the nation of the Druses, a sect which may be defined as heretical Mohammedans. Over both was established a Turkish Government, subject to the Sublime Porte. Between the Maronites and the Druses, though at some periods in their career they had been in alliance, rivalries, enmities, hostilities, had sprung up, and each party regarded the other as its enemy in chief. In May of 1860, one of the monks of the Maronites was murdered, and it was believed that a band of Druses were the doers of the deed. The Maronites made an attack on the suspected party, and several of the Druses were killed. Then the Druses rose in considerable numbers, fell upon the Maronite villages in the vicinity of Beyrout, and destroyed them. They then besieged a large town near Mount Hermon, and when the Maronites within were hard pressed, the Turkish Governor ordered them to surrender, under promise of protection. The infuriated Druses, however, attacked the prisoners and destroyed them to the last man. The Druse population of Damascus also rose against the Christians, and a massacre ensued in which it was estimated that two thousand persons were cut down by the swords of the Mussulmans.

It was the news of these proceedings that seemed to call on England and France to interfere in the affairs of Syria. The other Powers of Western Europe agreed to a compact under which order in the Lebanon should be restored under the French and English flags. A squadron was sent out by the allies to the Syrian coast, and the Druse insurrection was quickly quelled. Presently afterwards,

ambassadors were sent to Constantinople, by whom it was decided that henceforth a Christian Governor, under the suzerainty of the Sultan, should rule the insurgent populations of Northern Syria. The whole disturbance and its conclusion was another illustration of the complete decadence and imbecility of the Turkish Government in the lands over which it had long exercised authority. Soon after the settlement of the difficulty, the Turkish ruler, Abdul-Medjid, died, and was succeeded, on the 25th of June, 1861, by his brother, Abdul-Aziz, who was destined to signalize his accession to the throne with promises of greatness and reform, and to end it, after sixteen years, by suicide.

It fell to the Ministry of Lord Palmerston to conduct the Government of Great Britain during the whole period of the American Civil War. It was an epoch critical in the last degree. In the light of the retrospect, it would appear that at no crisis in modern times have the fortunes and the welfare of the English-speaking race been more seriously imperiled than in the years 1861-62. The conduct of England towards the American Republic in that great crisis has been much discussed in every civilized country, particularly in our own. The American people have not yet recovered from the shock and strain to which they were subjected by the course of that great insular nation with which we are in strongest affinity of language, institutions, and laws. The animosities transmitted from our War of Independence had long since died away.

The Revolutionary soldiers had gone to sleep in the soil of the country, which they had helped to create eighty-five years before. Their descendants had returned to their ancient ethnic sympathies with the Mother Country, and a feeling had supervened that the whole English race had, so to speak, embarked for a common destiny.

When the secession of the Southern States began, in the winter of 1860, when a Southern Confederacy was organized and war proclaimed as the means by which it was to be perpetuated, the National Government and a great majority of the American people looked instinctively to Great Britain for a liberal measure of support and confidence. There were

good reasons why such expectations should be entertained. It was already felt, on this side of the sea, that the institution of slavery was deep down in the bottom of our National controversy. With that institution the whole movement and destiny of the Confederate enterprise were from the first involved. True, the National Government had not as yet drawn the sword against this final cause of all our woe. It was said, indeed, that it was not meant to attack and destroy the peculiar institution. But the saying was one of those unconscious or half-conscious falsehoods in which the purposes of nations are so many times concealed or denied. As to Great Britain, her antipathy to slavery had long since become constitutional. It was not at all doubted in America that England was sincerely and thoroughly committed to the policy of the abolition of human servitude in every part of the world. She had publicly announced to the nations that the touch of the slave's foot on the soil of Great Britain made him free forever. She had gone so far as to foster and promote in this country that Anti-slavery Society, at the existence of which the South had taken such mortal offense. In a thousand instances she had justly denounced American slavery as a shame and burning disgrace to the great people by whom it was fostered. It could but be expected, therefore, that when the seceded States had banded themselves together under a governmental compact in which slavery was openly declared to be the chief cornerstone, England would throw the whole weight of her influence into the scale against what she must logically regard as a conspiracy for the maintenance of slavery. It was fondly believed throughout the North that consistency, national instinct, devotion to free political institutions, and every other motive, would act as a compulsive force to hold Great Britain in sympathy with the cause of the United States, against secession and the Confederacy.

But what were the facts as they were developed from the very outbreak of our Civil War? Great Britain at once placed herself in the precise attitude towards the United States on the one side and the secession cause on the other, which she would have assumed if two friendly nations, of equal rank

and like antecedents, had gone to war on the Continent. She declared neutrality. With what must always appear to America an indecent and eager haste, she recognized the belligerency and the equal war-rights of the seceded States. She assumed precisely what Gladstone declared to be the case, namely, that Jefferson Davis and his fellow-statesmen of the South had created a nation in a day. Without waiting to see what course the National Administration would pursue, without pausing to observe what kind of a method the National Government would take in order to put down the insurrection, what kind of a blow might be given to the revolt, she rushed *in medias res*, and on the 8th of May, 1861, in less than a month after the first cannon-shot had boomed from the land-batteries of Charleston against the walls of Sumter, the English proclamation, by Lord John Russell, recognizing the perfect equality of the two parties to the conflict, was issued. The American people were astounded to know that the Government of the United States had been placed by Great Britain on an exact level with what a great majority regarded as an inexcusable insurrection.

Such was the situation considered somewhat in the abstract. Concrete acts soon followed which tended still further to establish the unfriendliness of Great Britain to the United States, and to intensify the ill-feeling on both sides of the Atlantic. The Battle of Bull Run was fought, and the National army was thrown into a panic. The news of the disaster flew to England, was published everywhere, and was received with a burst of enthusiasm, as though some international event of the happiest augury had occurred. The jubilation was out of all proportion to the occasion. It was declared that the bubble had burst—the "bubble" being nothing less than the American Republic. Lord Palmerston referred to the retreat of the Union army on Washington as the "unfortunate and *capit* movement of the Northern soldiers." The highest governmental officers indulged in the bitterest sarcasm on the National cause and its upholders. Every conceivable falsehood was circulated to the prejudice of the Government of the United States and the character of the Union army. On the other hand, the South was

lauded in all the forms of rhetorical exaggeration. The Southern soldiers were heroes; the Northern soldiers were poltroons. The South was chivalrous, liberty-loving; the North was mercenary, mean. At times, the Kingdom was in a roar of delight. Confederate victories were heralded, and Union successes falsified out of the record.

All these things, when the rumor and report thereof were borne back to America, produced in the Government and among the people their legitimate results. Before the close of the summer of 1861, hatred of the Mother Country had supervened wherever the Stars and Stripes were still the emblem of a respected nationality.

We may now consider the causes for the conduct of Great Britain with respect to our Civil War. What reasons existed for her thus planting herself in antagonism to the United States? Was there any justification or excuse for the course of England in giving her sympathy and virtual support to the cause of the Confederacy? First of all, Great Britain had, in common with other nations, the sentiment which, under such conditions as then existed in the United States, is fallaciously called *fair play*. The South was the weaker party. When a fight is on, it is the weaker party that, right or wrong, receives the sympathy of the world. To this extent England can only be said to have acted after the manner of other nations. In the next place, the *interest* of England seemed to her at the time to require the speedy success of the Southern Confederacy. It was out of the States of the South that the greater part of raw cotton which was consumed in the English factories was drawn. A large industrial interest in Great Britain was directly dependent on the regular continuance of this supply. It is difficult in America to appreciate how completely, not only the operatives proper, but almost the whole people, in such manufacturing cities as Manchester were dependent on the regular delivery of raw cotton in that mart. At the very outset the Government of the United States saw the necessity of closing the Southern ports. This could only be done by the process called blockade. According to International Law, a nation may blockade the ports of an enemy, but not its own ports.

At the outbreak of the war the United States was not disposed to admit that the Southern States were an "enemy" in the technical sense of that word. When the blockade was stretched around the Southern coast and became ever more rigorous, it was still held by the Government that the Southern States were in the character of insurrectionary provinces. There was much that was illogical in the situation. However necessary it was to establish and maintain the blockade, it was hardly logical to do so without doing precisely what Great Britain had been so seriously blamed for doing at the very outset, namely, recognizing the complete belligerent rights of the Confederacy.

This palpable break in the policy of the National Government was quickly seized by Great Britain and France as a warrant for the unfriendly course which they were pursuing. In the former country, the condition was aggravated by the immediate cessation of the supply of cotton, and the wide-spread distress consequent thereon in the manufacturing districts. Had it not been for the strong republican sympathy which existed among the people of Lancashire and in other industrial districts of similar character, it were hard to say what evil results would have immediately ensued. It was the astonishing *non sequitur* of the situation that the workingmen of Manchester, who were the real sufferers on account of the blockade, were the best friends which the United States had in England; while, on the other hand, the worst enemies of the National Government were the country squires and Tory aristocrats, who did not themselves feel even an inconvenience on account of the war in America.

It was not long, however, until Great Britain found a much more tangible basis for her hostilities. The Southern Confederacy had been quick to perceive their advantage in England and France. While all the rest of Europe was on the side of the National Government, the sentiments of those two nations from whom, as Mother Country and "Traditional Friend," we had most to expect, were wholly averse. This fact was quickly seized upon by the Confederate Government in the belief that a recognition of the independence of the South could be obtained. To accom-

plish this end, it was necessary to send abroad ambassadors to the courts of England and France. The story of the outgoing and capture of Mason and Slidell has already been recounted. In the present chapter we are considering the matter only from the English point of view. The act of Captain Wilkes in running down the *Trent*, and in taking from under the protection of the British flag the two envoys of the Confederacy, and then allowing the steamer to go on her way, was irregular and illegal from beginning to end. Nevertheless, the deed was applauded to the echo in the United States. Public meetings were held in Tammany Hall, New York, and in Faneuil Hall, Boston, at which strong indorsement and high compliment were given to Captain Wilkes for his heroic fracture of the law of nations. The National House of Representatives, with equal ignorance and patriotism, blinded by the one and fired by the other, actually passed a vote of thanks, and ordered the presentation of a sword to the commander of the *San Jacinto* for his capture of the "traitors," Slidell and Mason.

Great Britain, well knowing that the thing done was against International Law and an insult to the English flag, made all haste to improve the occasion. Her wrath knew no bounds. She demanded the release of the Confederate ambassadors, and an apology for the act of Wilkes, and was courteous enough to give the United States *seven days* in which to choose between peace and war! Of course, Mason and Slidell were liberated and sent to their destination; but the animus of Great Britain had been so unhappily displayed that there was no further hope of the restoration of good feeling during the continuance of the war. By the insane passion which the British Government displayed, it betrayed itself, and it was known henceforth, by the Government of the United States and by the whole American people, that England only waited for an opportunity to do the Nation the greatest harm in her power.

But we are still under the necessity of looking deep down into the sea of motive, and of discovering there, if we may, the ultimate reason of British hostility to the United States. That ultimate reason is to be found in the deep-seated antipathy of England to the

republican form of government as developed in our country. The organization of political society on this side of the Atlantic had been on too liberal a scale to be pleasing in the British Isles. Even that limited monarchical system, which is the boast of the dominant classes in England, could but feel a mortal offense at the successful demonstration of republicanism in America. We are here on the ground of the true explanation. Great Britain had subscribed, for centuries, a historical allegation to the effect that Hereditary Monarchy, an Aristocratic organization of society, a Graduated Order of Nobility, a stratification of the people into classes, the permanent maintenance of a political and social difference between the upper and the under man, are the prerequisites of English liberty and English perpetuity. But the United States had established political liberty, and were about to demonstrate its perpetuity on a splendid scale. The American Republic had become what Lord Bacon might have defined as a "forth-showing instance" to all nations and peoples.

All this appeared to be in the nature of a refutation of the English order and theory of society. While Great Britain would never have confessed that she regarded our republican institutions as a menace to her own, it is nevertheless true that such was her unconscious or half-conscious sentiment. As a matter of fact and in brief, Great Britain desired and hoped that the American Republic would go to pieces, and that the judgment of the English-speaking race would thus be obliged to revert to and réaccept the ancient order of political society as embodied and illustrated in the British Constitution. If we say that such a sentiment, entertained by all the governing classes in England with respect to the United States and their destiny, was *mean* in the lowest degree, we must also admit that it was *natural* in the highest degree.

The limits of the present chapter do not permit a further expansion of the subject. British society, by which is meant all the ruling and dominant parts of society, fixed itself inveterately in support of the cause of the South. Henceforth, the North, that is, the National Government, expected nothing

from Great Britain except her sneers and ill-concealed animosity. It happened, however, that destiny was preparing for all this a remedy, or at least a compensation. Under the British Constitution and in accordance with the immemorial usages of the Kingdom, many things may be done in England at which other peoples would startle and take alarm. It was the policy of Frederick the Great, publicly announced in a witty aphorism, embodying the understanding between himself and his people, that they should say whatever they pleased, and he would do whatever he pleased. It might almost be said that this policy has been reversed in Great Britain; that is, that the sovereign may say whatever he pleases, and the people do whatever pleases them. In the case before us, it pleased the ship-builders of Great Britain to constitute themselves a naval base for the Southern Confederacy. Scarcely had the war begun until adventurers and emissaries from the Confederate States began to use the dock-yards of Great Britain as the field of their operations. The Confederate States had no navy. They had no commerce on the high seas. The United States had both. The policy of the Confederates therefore fell naturally into the work of purchasing and sending forth privateers. In the beginning the United States would fain have remanded all such business to the category of piracy. But, unfortunately, the National Government had itself for a long time resisted the international movement for the abolition of privateering. Her folly in this respect now returned to plague the inventor. The Government could not consistently fulminate the decree of piracy against a species of warfare which she herself continued to recognize with favor.

Behind this covert the Confederate Captains went forth to build, to buy, and to burn. A narrative has been given already of the course and fate of the Confederate cruisers. It is sufficient, in this place, to point out the fact that of the seven principal vessels which got afloat on the high seas, and which, for longer or shorter periods, did havoc with the merchant marine of the United States until the latter was extinguished, *five* were notoriously and openly built in the dock-yards of Great Britain. There, also, they were equipped and manned.

The outrage of such a proceeding was a stench in the nostrils of the nations. The consequences entailed thereby have been outlined already in the history of our own country. It may suffice, in this connection, to remark upon the wisdom of Lincoln, and the good fortune of the United States in having at the court of St. James, in these days, that magnificent exemplar of American diplomacy, Charles Francis Adams. His steadiness in the dark day of trial, his equanimity and firmness, his

other Adams, as diplomatist or statesman, is worthy of a higher rank than he.


It may not be deemed inappropriate to depart from the chronological order of events in order to follow the sequel of the cruise of the *Albatross*, and of the connection of Great Britain therewith. An account has been presented, in a former chapter, of the Treaty of Washington, of May, 1871, and of the provision made therein for a Court of Arbitration, to be convened in December of the same year,



GENEVA, SWITZERLAND.

clear insight of the situation, his constant remonstrances with Great Britain, his patience under her continued policy of wrongdoing, and his final declaration and protest to Lord John Russell, when the two Confederate rams were about to put to sea, that "this is war," with the full warning that he then gave to the British Government that the *consequences* of all this flagrant injustice must in the nature of things, be treasured up unto a day of settlement,—must ever bear witness to the common opinion of his countrymen that no

at Geneva, Switzerland, for the purpose of determining the validity or invalidity of the claims of the American Government against Great Britain, for the destruction of the commerce of the United States by the Confederate cruisers. The event proved to be the most important in the history of modern diplomacy. The Geneva Tribunal was constituted on the 15th of December, 1871. The appointment of the five arbitrators had been left, one each, to the Governments of the United States, Great Britain, Italy, Switzerland, and Brazil. The



T. W. BIRNELL. V. 1851.

judges appointed were, on the part of England, Sir Alexander Cockburn, at that time Lord Chief-Justice of the Kingdom; on the part of the United States, Charles Francis Adams; on the part of Italy, Count Frederick Sclopis; on the part of Switzerland, M. Jacques Staempfli; and on the part of Brazil, Viscount d'Itajuba. The counsel for Great Britain were Lord Tenterden and Sir Roundell Palmer, afterwards Lord Selbourne. The counsel for the United States were J. C. Bancroft Davis, William M. Evarts, Caleb Cushing, and Morrison R. Waite. The court, in its entirety, was the most august and able tribunal which international jurisprudence has called into being within the present century.

After the organization was effected, and the statement of the causes of the two great nations had been made, the court adjourned until June, 1872, from which time the sessions were continuous to the close, in September of the same year. The proceedings awakened the profoundest interest, not only in the nations specially concerned in the controversy, but throughout Christendom. The pleadings and arguments were, from beginning to end, a battle of the giants, in which the representatives of the United States gained steadily to the close of the contest. Near the beginning, an action was taken by which "Three Rules relating to Neutral Nations," were formulated, which, while they have not as yet been generally incorporated into the law of nations, became the basis of the settlement and the final award of the court. These rules are as follows:

"A neutral Government [under such circumstances as existed at the time of the American Civil War] is bound—

"1. To use due diligence to prevent the fitting out, arming, or equipping within its jurisdiction of any vessel which it has reasonable ground to believe is intended to cruise or carry on war against a power with which it [the neutral government] is at peace; and also to use like diligence to prevent the departure from its jurisdiction of any vessel intended to cruise or carry on war as above, such vessel having been specially adapted in whole or in part within such jurisdiction to warlike uses.

"2. Not to permit or suffer either belligerent to make use of its ports or waters as the

base of naval operations against the other, or for the purpose of the renewal or augmentation of military supplies, or arms, or recruitment of men.

"3. To exercise due diligence in its waters as to all persons within its jurisdiction, to prevent any violation of the foregoing obligations and duties."

The principles of international conduct here enunciated were, in the first instance, brought before the court tentatively as covering the position and claims held by the United States. After the discussions were concluded, these rules were fully adopted by the court in a special stipulation of the treaty, as follows: "And the high contracting parties agree to observe these rules as between themselves in future, and to bring them to the knowledge of other maritime powers, and to invite them to accede to them."

After a three months' session, the decision of the tribunal was reached, on the 14th of September, 1872. All the members of the court, with the exception of Sir Alexander Cockburn, signed the report and the award. The English Lord Chief-Justice wrote a long dissenting opinion; but his views were, of course, of no effect on the general decision of the court. That decision constituted what is known in diplomacy as the GENEVA AWARD. The general position assumed by the United States was fully substantiated, with the exception of the somewhat extravagant claims made by the National Government under the title of "consequential damages." As a final and complete settlement of the so-called "Alabama Claims," a sum in gross of fifteen million five hundred thousand dollars was awarded to the United States, as full and complete compensation for the damages done to her commerce and nationality by the English-built, English-equipped, and English-manned privateers of the Southern Confederacy.

Returning from this anticipation of events that were to come as the legitimate fruits of British sowing, we note the continued animosity of the English-ruling classes towards our National Government to the very close of the war. With the exception of Bright and Forster and a few others, such as the Duke of Argyll, all the public men of England remained wedded to their idols. The newspaper

press of the kingdom seemed to be given over to a delusion that it might believe a lie. The stream of mis-representation with regard to the progress of the American War continued to flow bankfull to the end. If anything could have equalled the completeness of the collapse of the Confederacy in the early spring of 1865, it would have been the still more utter collapse of public opinion in Great Britain. All the cherished dreams of the dominant party in politics and society suddenly burst like a bubble, and faded into viewless air. Great Britain awoke one day to the shocking realization that there was no longer anywhere in the world her darling Southern Confederacy, but only the American Union, one and indissoluble. It may well be hoped that the lesson was sufficient, and that the arrogance, selfishness, and unconscionable self-esteem which had conspired to throw the kingdom and the English people into a vicious attitude and malign relation with the largest political division of the English-speaking race, and to pour the embers of heart-burning and distrust into many millions of patriotic breasts on this side of the Atlantic, have been forever extinguished in the heart of the British Nation.

The Palmerston Ministry survived until after the close of the Civil War. Though the difficulties of the Government of Great Britain were the most serious, they were not by any means the only foreign embarrassments with which the Cabinet of Palmerston had in those days to contend. In 1863 the Danish complication with Germany relative to the Provinces of Schleswig and Holstein led to hostilities and the clamor of arms. Denmark, as we shall hereafter see, was hard pressed by her more powerful neighbors. The project of severing the disputed Provinces from the Danish crown struck coldly on the consciousness of Great Britain. The integrity of Denmark had been guaranteed by the Congress of Vienna, to which both England and France were parties. Consistency seemed to require that Great Britain should now prevent Austria and Prussia from breaking the balance of power. The Prince of Wales had but just married the Princess Alexandra, daughter of the King of Denmark, thus presenting her full of youth, beauty, and almost every charm and virtue known to womanhood, as the future

Queen of Great Britain. The marriage was as popular as the Princess was attractive to the British public. The Danish Government believed that dependence might be placed on Great Britain as a buttress of support in the war with Germany. The British Ministry took up the cause of the Danes, and was ready to declare war; but in so doing, the cooperation of France was a necessary condition of success. Lord Russell accordingly became a suitor to Napoleon III. to join him in the work of maintaining, by arms, the integrity of the Danish dominions. But what was the surprise of the English Ministry when the Emperor of France coldly refused the overture! Great Britain suddenly found herself in the humiliating, not to say ridiculous, attitude of a rejected suitor. The Danes were, out of the necessity of the situation, left to fight their own battle, and the English Cabinet was left to face the sarcasms of Disraeli, and the attacks of the whole Conservative party in and out of Parliament.

It was in this emergency that Lord Palmerston fought and gained his last battle in the British House of Commons. On the 4th of July, 1864, Disraeli challenged the very existence of the Ministry by introducing a resolution to the effect that the Queen's Government had failed to maintain the policy of upholding the integrity and independence of Denmark, had lowered the just influence of England in the capitals of Europe, and had thereby diminished the securities for peace. On these propositions the adroit author of them made a powerful and effective speech, and it appeared for the time that the Government would be beaten. There could, indeed, be little doubt that the arraignment of the Ministry by Disraeli with respect to the mismanagement of the Danish question was a true bill. A considerable fraction of the more advanced Liberals had long been dissatisfied with Palmerston and his whole foreign policy. It appeared for the nonce that the veteran statesman, whose memory of great things reached back to Austerlitz, was about to be humiliated in the last year of his life. It is probable that such would have been the result if the issue had been fought out on the line proposed by the leader of the Opposition. But in the emergency, an amendment was

proposed by Kinglake, by which the question was carefully transferred to the safer ground of a *general* approval or disapproval by the House of the Palmerston Government. This gave opportunity for the aged Prime Minister to defend himself and his measures in the last speech which he was ever to make in Parliament. He was already eighty years of age; but his genius, as the event soon proved, had not yet taken flight. He spoke for a long time with his usual cogency, taking advantage, with all his old-time skill, of the peculiar conditions and temper of the House. His influence prevailed.

"Slow sinks, more lovely ere his race be run,
Along Morea's hills, the setting sun."

The proposition of Kinglake in support of the Ministry was adopted by a clear majority, but it was the last day of the glory of Eudymion. During the session of 1865 it was perceived by all that Palmerston's career was at an end. He began to totter with feebleness, and became almost blind. He was still able on his eightieth birthday to ride on horseback to the Hilsen fortifications, and make a personal inspection of the works. At an earlier period in the same year he had ridden from Piccadilly to Harrow, a distance of twelve miles, in a single hour—a feat which may well emphasize not only the extraordinary vigor of the man, but also testify to the unconquerable force and longevity of the English race at its best estate. From his last Parliamentary contest, Palmerston retired to his residence, called Bocket Hall, where, after a short illness, he expired on the 18th of October, 1865.

Before finally dismissing this period of English history, covering the relations of the Kingdom with the United States during the Civil War, we should not fail to notice the domestic cloud which, in the meantime, had settled darkly over the Royal Palace. After a wedded life of unclouded serenity through a span of twenty-one years, the Queen was now fated to enter the shadows of perpetual widowhood. Before speaking in particular of the death of the Prince Consort, we may properly refer, with praise, to the fact that, in the midst of the storm and passion of the times, when it seemed that all England was in a roar

of delight over the supposed collapse of the American Union, Prince Albert had the wisdom and generosity to maintain, by voice and action, his well-known friendliness to the United States. At the time, it was not known in our country how steady and valuable a friend we had lost in the death of the Queen's husband. After events have set the matter right, and the memory of the Prince Consort will long be green on this side of the Atlantic.

The pure domesticity of the Royal Family during the life of the Prince has already been emphasized. Viewed politically, and with respect to the perpetuity of the reigning dynasty, the marriage had been so successful as not only to satisfy but well elate the friends of the House of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha. No fewer than nine children, strong, vigorous sons and daughters, all of whom grew without accident or distress to manhood and womanhood, were born of the fortunate marriage. The eldest of these was the Princess Victoria, born in 1840, wedded at the age of eighteen to the Crown Prince of Prussia, more recently German Empress and widow of Frederick III. The second was a son, Albert Edward, Prince of Wales, born in 1841, to whom, in 1863, was given in marriage the Princess Alexandra of Denmark. In our own day he still stands, as from his birth, heir expectant to the crown of England. The third was the Princess Alice, born in 1843, and married in 1862 to Prince Louis of Hesse-Darmstadt. The fourth was Alfred, born in 1844, Duke of Edinburgh in 1866, to whom was married, in 1874, the Grand Duchess Maria, daughter of Alexander II. of Russia. The Princess Helena was born in 1846, and was married, in 1866, to Prince Christian of Schleswig-Holstein. The fourth daughter, Louise, was born in 1848, and was wedded, in 1871, to the Marquis of Lorne. The third son, Arthur, was born in 1850, and Leopold, the fourth son, in 1853. Beatrice, the last heir of the House, was born in 1857. The younger, as well as the elder Princes and Princesses, have been distributed in marriage among the oldest Houses of Europe; and if the England of the present day has found some reason to be querulous about the heavy pensions which have had to be settled on the multiplied and multiplying descendants of

Prince Albert, she has, on the other hand, under her own theory of human government, great cause to rejoice at the fact that the extinction of the reigning dynasty, or any serious trouble with respect to the descent of the Crown, seems to be either wholly impossible or a great way off.

Prince Albert the Consort promised a long

however, the great bell of St. Paul's began to toll, and with the morning light it was published from Windsor Castle that the Prince Consort was dead. He had expired having the Queen, the Prince of Wales, and the Princesses Alice and Helena by his bedside. The event served to bring his high character and blameless life into strong relief,



PRINCE OF WALES

life. While he could not be called a very robust or vigorous man, he, nevertheless, bore good health, and was of strictly temperate habits. In the first days of December, 1861, he contracted cold, and was thrown into a fever. At first little attention was paid to his ailment; then it was known that he was seriously, though it was not thought dangerously, ill. On the night of the 14th of December,

and into a still bolder contrast with the dark background which had been painted socially and morally by the preceding kings and princes of the House of Hanover-Brunswick. To the Queen herself, the death of her husband was an immedicable wound. She entered with sorrowful serenity that career of grand widowhood which has now lengthened out to nearly thirty years, during which her chief domestic consolation has been in the great family of sons and daughters, at whose head she still sits in the dignity of royal motherhood.

The death of Lord Palmerston was not the end of the Liberal Government. A modification was, of course, necessary in the Min-

istry, and it was expected by the public that the Cabinet would be entirely reconstructed. The Queen named Lord John Russell as Prime Minister; and that statesman, now seventy-three years of age, assumed the direction of Government. The only other change made in the Ministry was the calling of Lord Clarendon to occupy the place made vacant by Lord Russell in the Secretaryship of Foreign

Affairs. The leadership of the House of Commons still devolved on Gladstone. The general effect of these changes was slight; but the student of Parliamentary history could not fail to discern in the signs of the times an approaching, perhaps imminent, Ministerial revolution.

For the time being, however, public attention was drawn away from the evolution of home politics to the serious, calamitous, disgraceful condition of affairs in Jamaica. Just two days after the death of Lord Palmerston, Governor Edward John Eyre, of that Island, reported to the Colonial Secretary the outbreak of an alarming insurrection of the negro population under his government. It were, perhaps, a thankless task to undertake, in this connection, a thorough analysis of the antecedents, causes, and conditions of this revolt. Perhaps we may best sum up the whole by saying that the insurrection had its roots in the institution of slavery, and that its immediate cause was the injustice and tyrannous conduct of the British Government in the Island. We have already explained that, with the abolition of slavery, a state of affairs had supervened in Jamaica very similar to that with which the Government of the United States was for many years embarrassed after the downfall of the Confederacy. The lands of the Island had been held, under the ancient *régime*, in large tracts by white landlords, who cultivated their estates by means of slave labor. In course of time, much of the land was deteriorated in fertility and value. Parts of the estates were thrown out to the commons, ceased to be cultivated, and were overgrown with thickets.

When slavery was abolished, the ex-slaveholders of Jamaica, who were now obliged to pay wages to the negroes for their labor, found it expedient to permit the Black men to occupy and cultivate for themselves, the abandoned lands just referred to. Nearly all of such lands were by this time encumbered with delinquent taxes and quit-rents, which had accumulated against them. The general condition on which the negroes were permitted to occupy was that they should discharge all delinquencies of tax and rent that might have accrued. This was done in a great number of instances, and the Black men thus acquired

for themselves a kind of property right which it is difficult to define. At length the industry of the Blacks brought the lands again into cultivation, and thereby restored their value. Whereupon, the original owners or their representatives came forward to reclaim their estates, which the negroes had occupied and improved. In order to dispossess the latter, a process was resorted to very similar to that employed in more recent times in the eviction of Irish tenants by their English landlords. It was resistance to this process of dispossession by eviction, with all of its aggravating circumstances and injustice, that led to the negro insurrection of 1865.

The revolt began on the 7th of October, at a place called Morant Bay, in the south-eastermost part of the Island. There had been at this town some previous disturbances, and Governor Eyre now sent thither a squad of troops to aid the authorities in the arrest of the offenders. On the 11th of the month the magistrates held a meeting in the Court-house Square of Morant Bay, where they were protected by a small body of volunteer soldiers. While the proceedings were under way, the Court-house was attacked by a large force of rioting negroes armed with bludgeons and corn-knives, and eighteen persons, including the principal officer of the county, were killed. Meanwhile, the troops sent by the Governor approached, and the rioters dispersed in all directions. No further effort at resistance was made or thought of by the negroes, who were doubtless dazed at their own success. The whole country, however, was at once declared under martial law, and the authorities, under direction of the Governor, proceeded to hunt down the rebels, and to hale them before courts-martial for punishment.

What followed is one of the most disgraceful chapters in the colonial history of the British Empire. Such another carnival of inexcusable butchery was hardly ever held under the auspices of any power claiming to be civilized. No rebels in arms were found by Governor Eyre's soldiers anywhere; but capture, hanging, flogging, and burning became the order of the day for many weeks together. No age, sex, or condition was exempt from the cruelties and brutalities to which the terrified negroes were subjected.

According to the report of a Royal Commission, which was presently sent out by the Home Government to inquire into this reign of terror, no fewer than four hundred and thirty-nine persons were actually put to death with hardly the form or mockery of justice! The same report showed that six hundred others, many of them women, some of whom were about to become mothers, were cruelly, bloodily, mercilessly whipped with wire cats o' nine-tails, until scores of them were ready to die,

and the prosecutions were at once brought to an end. An elaborate document, covering the theory and application of martial law, was prepared by Lord Chief-Justice Cockburn. Eyre was removed from the governorship of Jamaica, and was succeeded by Sir Henry Storks. A measure was at once agitated for a complete reformation of the government of the Island. In December of 1866, an act was passed by the Jamaican Assembly, requesting the Queen to take such steps as



JAMAICA INSURRECTION

It was also shown that a certain George William Gordon, a Baptist negro minister of good character, who had the courage to stand up for his race, and to hold some sort of buckler in the face of their enemies, was arrested, condemned to death, and hanged, with scarcely the semblance of evidence against him, and with none of the ordinary means of legal defense in his hands.

The news of all this produced, as well it might, a great sensation in England. John Stuart Mill took up the cause of the Islanders,

would abrogate the existing order and secure the benefits of a local, civil autonomy in the Island, similar to that which existed in the other colonial governments of the Empire. Thus was the ancient constitution under which, during more than two hundred years of abuses and wrongs, Jamaica had been misgoverned, overthrown and abolished. A new order supervened, by which even the composite and divergent populations of the Island were brought at length to a condition resembling harmony and progress.

CHAPTER CXXXII. FENIANISM AND DISESTABLISHMENT.



T was not under favorable auspices that the quasi-Liberal Ministry of Lord Russell assumed the task of Government at the close of 1865. There were in the kingdom at that date many elements of discouragement and discontent. Superficially, the prosperity of the year was greatly disturbed by the cattle plague which had spread through several parts of the Island, and had swept away more than forty thousand animals. Even this large loss was not the whole. Science was baffled in dealing with the contagion, and it was found necessary to prevent its further ravages by killing whole herds of cattle in the exposed counties. It was a time of social and financial alarm. The premonitory rumors of the Fenian conspiracy in Ireland had reached the Government and the people. Asiatic cholera was making its way westward, stage by stage, through the sea-ports of the Mediterranean. The foreign relations of the Kingdom, while not positively disturbed, were suffering at the extremities, like the *autumn* of some huge insect thrust out far into hospitable regions. There were also premonitions of a financial panic—a thing particularly dreaded by the great commercial interests of the Kingdom. Deep down under all this was the profound discontent of the masses with their political condition. The question of a reform of the franchise, which had been postponed during the whole of the Palmerston régime, was ever ready to assert itself. It was known that Gladstone, who was now the dominant Liberal in the Cabinet, and Bright, who was the master spirit out of the Cabinet, both seeing eye to eye on the question of a general reform of the suffrage, had long postponed the renewal of the attempt to reach the lower classes with the ballot, and to secure a more equitable apportionment of the seats in the House of Commons.

The season at length arrived for the work

to begin. At the opening of the session of 1866, the speech from the throne drew the attention of Parliament formally to the extension of the suffrage as one of the duties incumbent upon Her Majesty's Government. It devolved on Gladstone to lead in the contest. Accordingly, on the 12th of March, in the year just named, he brought before the House a Ministerial Bill, in which it was proposed to reduce the property qualification on the franchise from fifty pounds to fourteen pounds in the case of suffrage in the counties, and from ten to seven pounds for the boroughs. There were other clauses in accordance with which the franchise, under certain conditions, was to be extended to lodgers, to those having deposits in savings banks, and certain other classes of persons. Considered as a whole, the bill was very mild in its provisions, inasmuch that the Radical reformers felt for it a measure of contempt, while the Conservatives, being now in the Opposition, set themselves against the measure as a mere matter of politics. It came to pass, at length, that some of the discontented and extreme Liberals banded themselves together and demanded of Gladstone the radical and substantial amendment of the pending bill. The Ministry found itself between two fires. The dissident Radicals were known as the *Adullamites*, so-called by John Bright from their malcontent disposition, for David had once, in the day of trouble, hidden in the cave of Adullam, and called to him "every one that was in distress, and every one that was discontented." The Adullamites, though from an entirely different motive, joined with Disraeli and the Conservatives, and when the Gladstone bill came to a vote it was defeated. It only remained for Lord Russell and the members of the Cabinet to put their resignations into the hands of the Queen. The Liberal Ministry was at an end, not indeed for attempting to carry a reform of the franchise through Parliament, but because the measure which they proposed was so tame as to create no

enthusiasm, having the name of reform without the substance.

A new Conservative Cabinet was now constituted, with Lord Derby for Prime Minister. While himself a statesman of great abilities, the real leadership fell, as before, to Disraeli, Chancellor of the Exchequer. The Parliamentary struggle which now ensued was

which he now found himself. He had always, in the Parliamentary debates, merely acted the part of a destructionist with the measures proposed by the Liberals. He had said little against the reform of the suffrage as a principle. His attacks had been upon this measure and that proposed by the Liberals. His political expediency and adroitness now stood him well in hand.

The people, in the meantime, had stirred up the kingdom with a reform agitation almost unequalled in extent and vitality. Great meetings were held everywhere, and the most far-seeing of them who upheld the ancient order saw the handwriting on the wall. It was no longer to be doubted that the workingmen of Great Britain were in terrible earnest in the matter of gaining the right of suffrage. The Reform League became active as never before. The agitators in London prepared to hold a monster meeting in Hyde Park, for the discussion of the question of extending the franchise. The leaders of the movement were careful



1860 DERBY

one of the oddest episodes in the political history of Great Britain. The recent Liberal Ministry had been pledged to a reform of the suffrage, and had failed, being overwhelmed by the Opposition under the leadership of the very man who had now, by the success of the Conservatives, inherited the unsolved question. The far-sighted Disraeli had, in fact, for many years hedged against the very situation in

to keep within the forms and spirit of the law; but the Government, in a moment of folly, undertook to prevent the meeting. On the morning of the 23d of July, 1866, when the head of the column of Reformers reached the gates of Hyde Park, they found them closed. A large division of the multitude hereupon turned aside to Trafalgar Square, where the masses were addressed by John

Bright and other orators. But before the close of the day, a vast throng had assembled around the enclosures of Hyde Park, where the half-intentional pressure of the crowd on the iron railing caused it to give way for a considerable distance, and the human flood poured in. The people scattered at once by thousands through the park, running and shouting and triumphing in a license which otherwise did little harm. There were fist-cuffs and broken heads, mutually delivered by the police and the rough citizenship, but otherwise the demonstration ended with night-fall, and London, on the next morning, examining her vitals, found every organ in its place and performing its usual functions.

It was in the face of all this that the Derby Ministry must now stand or fall. In the emergency, it occurred to Disraeli that the time had arrived for a new chapter in British politics. Hitherto, it had always been the principle of political action that the party in power should hold to its dogmas and defend them until overthrown by an adverse Parliamentary majority. The Conservatives and Liberals had always stood each to their batteries until the guns were silenced by a veritable charge and victory of the Opposition. In the present instance, it occurred to Disraeli that it would be just as well for the Conservatives to become reformers themselves, and thus gather the wind out of the Liberal fleet, leaving it becalmed at sea. Why should a Conservative Ministry go out of power and office on such a slight technicality as political consistency? It appears that the age and time and occasion were ripe for such a change in the ethics and methods of British politics. Wherefore, Benjamin Disraeli, Conservative leader of the House of Commons, walked boldly into the arena, and declared that the Derby Government would itself take up and promote a reform of the franchise.

On the 5th of February, 1867, the Queen's speech from the throne, at the opening of Parliament, had declared to the Commons and Lords that their attention was about to be directed to the method of the representation of the English people in Parliament, and to an extension of the elective franchise. In accordance with this policy, which had doubtless been inspired by himself, Disraeli announced

that the Government would, first by a series of resolutions and afterwards by a formal bill, undertake the measures on which England had determined. On the 11th of February the preliminary skirmish was opened. The leader of the House proposed his resolutions, some of which were platitudes, others truisms, and still others absurdities. It was a business, however, in which Disraeli was thoroughly at home. He kept the interest of the House by this means until the 25th of the month, when he brought in a Reform Bill, quite similar in its provisions to the one on which he had overthrown the Russell Ministry in the preceding year. The franchise in boroughs was to be reduced from ten pounds to six pounds. That in the counties was to be fixed at twenty pounds. A great number of instances of individual and professional extensions of the suffrage were enumerated; but, on the whole, the Bill was the same in method and spirit as that which the recent house had refused to accept at the hands of Gladstone.

On this measure the debates were taken up anew. Many amendments were offered, to which, while Disraeli declared he would never consent, yet he consented. The struggle over the measure as a whole continued until the beginning of March, when three members of the Ministry, refusing to follow Disraeli further, resigned and went out of office. On the 18th of the month another surprise was administered to the House by Disraeli's introducing a second Bill in place of the first, the provisions of which—that is, of the new Bill—were so radical and thorough-going as fairly to take the breath of both Parliament and people. Nevertheless, it was perceived that the manager understood the situation, and that the stormy elements around him were only the sport of that Machiavellian wit, for which no parallel can be produced in the history of modern times. It was at once perceived that the country was to have its way. Even the Radicals, or some of them, took the alarm at the thorough-going character of the measure before the House. John Bright, who had favored the first Bill proposed as the best which the spirit of the age demanded or would bear, set himself in opposition to the second Bill on account of its apparently revolutionary character. With the progress of the debates,

however, it became clear that the measure would be adopted. A few amendments were forced through the House, and other modifications were made or accepted by the Ministry. But on the 15th of August the Bill was finally put on its passage, and was carried through the Commons by a fair majority. Disraeli had succeeded in his new scheme of outdoing the Liberals in their own chosen field of agitation and reform.

Thus, after the lapse of about thirty years, another of the great principles of the People's Charter was admitted into the Constitution of Great Britain. In accordance with the new Bill, all male householders in English boroughs who were assessed for the relief of the poor, and all resident lodgers who had been so for one year, and paying a rental of not less than ten pounds annually, were admitted to the franchise. In the counties the possession of a property yielding an annual value of five pounds was the requisition. Those who occupied lands or tenements paying a rental of twelve pounds a year were enfranchised. The great principle of the Bill was Household Suffrage. It was not the purpose and intent of the measure that all manner of men in the bottom of society should be allowed to vote, but the provisions were such that all the English householding peasantry were admitted to the suffrage. On the question of a redistribution and apportionment of the seats in the House of Commons, much was also accomplished. Many of the small boroughs hitherto represented in Parliament were disfranchised, and others were reduced in their representative capacity. At the same time the great and populous municipalities, such as Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, and Leeds, received additional representation according to their increased importance in the Kingdom. The University of London was granted a member in the House of Commons. The principle of minority representation was established to this extent, that in every borough entitled to three members of Parliament, the elector should vote for two candidates only, the effect of which was to secure the third candidate for the minority. In London, which by the provisions of the Act was entitled to four members in the House, each elector might vote for three,

which would leave in this instance the fourth member for the minority.

It only remains to note the extension of the Reform Bill, in the following year, to the electoral methods of Scotland and Ireland. In the former country, the measure adopted was essentially identical with that of England, with the exception of the clause relating to the assessment for the poor, which was omitted. The Scotch apportionment of members in the House of Commons was also amended by an increase of representation. In Ireland, similar provisions were made as to the qualifications for the suffrage, but no improvement was attempted with respect to the representation in Parliament. It was thus, after a struggle which had extended through a whole generation, that the principles of popular liberty, expressed in a broader and freer exercise of the right of suffrage, were at last accepted as a necessity by the political parties, and were interwoven with the constitutional fabric of Great Britain. Nor will the thoughtful reader fail to observe with interest and instruction that new political expediency, devoid doubtless of the moral quality, but highly successful in application, whereby the genius and craft of Disraeli were enabled to compel the British Conservatives of 1867 into the service of the greatest and most salutary civil reform of the age and country.

We are now at the threshold of another of those remarkable chapters which record the struggles of the Irish people against the political authority and social domination of Great Britain. No extended narrative, or even recapitulation, can here be undertaken of the numberless political conspiracies, secret organizations, and widely extended plots whereby the Celtic population of Ireland have time and again striven to free themselves from the thralldom which they profess to be galled withal. The origin of such movements is to be found deep down in the ineradicable prejudices of race and religion. Perhaps the prejudice of race alone might be overcome; perhaps the prejudice of religion alone might be obviated; but the prejudice of race and religion has thus far constituted an insurmountable barrier to the affiliation and unity of the Irish and English peoples.

As early as 1858 the first rumors of the

existence of the Fenian societies were whispered in Great Britain and America. The Fenian Brotherhood may be defined as a secret politico-military organization based on the fundamental motive of the independence of Ireland. The tradition of such an order is as old as Ireland itself. The name *Fénian* is given in the Ballads of the Irish Fidi, or Bards, as the name of certain military clans which fought for the native kings of the Island, long before the beginnings of authentic history. There is a period in the primitive development of the Irish race which may properly be called the Fenian Period, when the native sovereigns of the race, surrounded by their clans, battled for independence of each other or supremacy in Ireland. Out of these ancient traditions the Celts have always been eager to gather inspiration in their endless contests with the Saxons.

It was a happy conceit which led the discontented of 1857 to choose for their new political association the ancient name of FENIAN BROTHERHOOD. We must remember that, for more than ten years, the population of Ireland had been escaping in shoals to the American coasts. The exiles of Erin in the United States entered quickly and with enthusiasm into their new relations as citizens of the Republic; but they did not cease to turn with longing eyes to the green Mother Island across the Atlantic. To the restless Irishmen of the American cities, their new situation seemed to provoke some effort in behalf of the Old Country. At length, in 1847, in the city of New York, the Fenian Brotherhood was founded by Michael Doheny, John O'Mahoney, and Michael Corcoran, afterwards a Brigadier-General in the Union Army. The head-quarters of the society was in Union Square. At this time an order of like character existed in Ireland under the name of the Phoenix Society. Its founder was James Stephens, who, in 1858, came to America; and the two societies were merged into one, under the presidency of O'Mahoney. Correspondence between the Irish and American Brotherhoods was at once greatly extended. It became the order of the day to raise funds in America for the support of the Irish cause. The leading spirits from this time until the outbreak of the Civil War in the United

States, were O'Mahoney and Stephens, who went back and forth between Old Ireland and New Ireland, establishing new chapters of the Brotherhood, and rapidly extending its influence, not only in the Mother Island, but throughout the United States and even into British America.

At this juncture of affairs, the secession of the Southern States occurred. The side of the American Republic, so to speak, was torn out by the Confederate leaders, and the gleam of bayonets was seen everywhere in the North and the South as the marshaling lines of blue and gray soldiers swept into the field of battle. When the armies were organized, it could but be observed that the regiments, especially those from the great cities, had in them a large percentage of Irish soldiers. In the Confederate ranks the eager Celtic countenance was seen in every line, though the numbers were not so great as in the armies of the Union. It was evident that, for the time, the Fenian enthusiasm had found vent in the unfortunate war for and against the Union of the States.

If we look closely into the heart of the question, we shall find the large Irish contingent in the Union army cherishing a secret or half-revealed hope and expectancy that, in the course of the conflict, Great Britain would so conduct herself as to bring on an Anglo-American war. We have seen how fatally near was that hope to a realization. The Irish-Americans who fought for the Union, and even those who fought against it, perceived that a war between the United States and England meant, in all probability, the revolt and independence of Ireland. We may well suppose that when the affair of the *Trent* was amicably settled, there was a certain heart-sinking in the breasts of thousands of Irish-American soldiers—a feeling of disappointment that they had thus been deprived of the opportunity of marching, under the Stars and Stripes, against a British army in Canada.

Canada? Aye, that was, indeed, the region to which the Fenian gaze was now directed. The Civil War in the United States ended with the complete restoration of the Union. Fenianism sprang up anew. Far and wide the Brotherhood extended its divisions. In

almost every considerable American town, there was a Fenian lodge and muster-hall. Great sums of money were transmitted to Ireland, and in March of 1867 a general rising of the Irish people was planned and awaited. The scheme contemplated an Irish insurrection against which the British authorities would, of course, at once proceed with vigor and animosity. Hereupon, the vast army of Fenians in the United States would arise in its might, and precipitate itself on Canada. The pressure on Ireland by the British soldiers was to be counteracted by a still greater pressure in Canada by the American-Fenian army. In fact, the movement began to look exceedingly portentous. It can not be claimed that the politico-military plan adopted by the Fenians was irrational or even impracticable. Doubtless it would, in any event, have ended, finally, in failure; but it would have been at such excessive cost and distress to Great Britain as to have led, in all probability, to a great change in the civil administration of Ireland, or, possibly, to the independence of the country. The trouble and weakness of the whole movement lay in that fatal want of practical ability, in that overzeal and absence of prudent foresight, which have marked all similar enterprises undertaken by the Celtic race. There is undoubtedly in this respect an ethnic weakness in the Irish people, for which it is difficult to account on any other ground than that of a race-inaptitude for the management and conduct of large affairs.

In the crisis under consideration, the proposed rising in Ireland ended in mere agitation, dust, and smoke. It has been noted by critics friendly to the Irish cause at this juncture, that the first days of March, 1867, were marked in Ireland by an unprecedented fall of snow, obstructing all the roads, filling the fields fence-deep with impassable snow-beds, packing the mountain gorges and coverts of the peasantry to such an extent that for nearly two weeks, including the date appointed for the insurrection, all formidable gatherings and musters of the Fenians were made impossible. Only in a few places in the counties of Cork, Kerry, Limerick, Tipperary, and Louth, did any actual rising take place. The insurrections were local, feeble, easily

suppressed by the police. For the rest, the insurgents were quickly scattered, and their leaders arrested and brought to trial. One of the most prominent of these was Colonel T. F. Burke, who, from being a valued Confederate soldier, had gone back to Ireland and England to be one of the leaders of the expected revolt. On the 23d of November he was arrested, along with another Fenian Captain named Casey, and the two were lodged in the Clerkenwell prison. Shortly afterwards a barrel of powder was exploded against the outer wall, producing a shock as if of an earthquake. Six persons were killed; eleven others were mortally wounded, and about a hundred and twenty others received injuries of greater or less severity. Five men and one woman were arrested for the crime. The woman and one of the men were soon released for want of evidence against them. Three of the other men were tried and acquitted; but the fifth was condemned and executed in spite of the most strenuous efforts made in his behalf. Colonel Burke was himself condemned to death; but a public meeting was held in St. James's Hall, London, and a powerful and convincing speech was delivered to the multitude by John Stuart Mill, who pleaded eloquently for clemency to the prisoner. The evidence against Burke had never been conclusive as to the commission of any crime, and the sentence of death was not carried into execution.

In a short time another startling event occurred, being the successful attempt of a band of Fenians in Manchester to rescue two prisoners, who were in a van, in charge of the police, on the way to jail. The van was stopped in the street in open day. One of the Fenians, in the attempt to shoot the lock off of the door, had the misfortune to kill a police officer who was inside. The doors were then opened, and the two prisoners, named Kelly and Deasy, making their escape, were seen no more. Of this offense against the law, five of the Fenians were found guilty, and were condemned to die. It was at length discovered that one of the condemned men had had absolutely nothing to do with either the plot or the crime. One other of the convicts also escaped the death penalty; but the remaining three, Allen, Larkin, and O'Brien,

were executed. All of them went to their death like heroes. The news of the executions was carried to the countries on both sides of the Atlantic, and the Fenians were more than ever enraged against the English Government.

In the meantime, the Fenian cause in America had run its course. In the first place, a quarrel broke out in the Brotherhood, and two separate societies were formed, professing the same general objects and principles, but at enmity with each other. From this time forth the plans of the American Fenians went always from worse to worse. One of the favorite schemes of the order was the invasion of Canada. This part of the programme was now favored by one wing of the Fenians and disapproved by the other. At length the former party went ahead on the line of its own purpose, and threw forward a body of armed men to the Niagara River. On the night of May 31, 1866, that stream was crossed, and Fort Erie was occupied by the invaders. The Canadian volunteers who came against them were defeated and dispersed. It appeared for the moment that the war had actually begun; but at this juncture the Government of the United States came to the front, forbade any further exodus of the Fenians, and arrested the leaders of the movement on the American frontier. By this time the Canadian authorities had rallied and sent forward a body of troops. The Fenians on the Canadian side were overpowered, and many of them, under sentences of courts-martial, were shot. Some by retreating, succeeded in recrossing the Niagara, and saved themselves by flight into the interior. By the close of the year 1868 the excitement had subsided; and though the Brotherhood was maintained for a considerable period afterwards, the *motif* of the enterprise was gone, and the word Fenian lost its terrors, not only in America, but also in Great Britain.

Coincidentally with this race disturbance occurred in England the first serious break of civil society with the TRADES-UNIONS. It were difficult to point out the beginning of such associations in Europe. It is certain that the attempt would carry us far back into mediæval times, and perhaps to the classical ages. The general cause of Trades-Unionism, however, is not far to seek. It might almost

be said that the fact is concomitant with property itself. Certain it is that the appearance of Trades-Unions is a perfectly natural phenomenon in all those countries whose people are sufficiently advanced to have a division of labor and a distribution of values. It is equally certain that the appearance and development of unionism have ever been the signal for the alarm and relentless opposition of the so-called upper classes of society. The Trades-Union has been, from the hour of its birth, the *bête noire* of capital and capitalists. In England the guilds of trade have had a peculiarly stormy career. The whole feudal system, dominant in the civil and social constitution of Great Britain, has from the first set itself with relentless animosity against the very existence of Labor Unions.

Viewed from the side of the laborer, such organizations appear to be not only natural, but inevitable. The laborer, at a certain stage of his evolution, marks the example which capital has already set him, in the organization of those who purchase and employ industry. In every country the employers' Unions have forerun by a considerable date the Unions of the working classes. It is indeed a peculiar sort of economic logic which concedes to the employer the right and privilege of combining with his fellow in order to produce results against the natural laws of trade, and which at the same time forbids the artisan to enter into a like combination with his fellow-workmen to secure himself against the effects of the combinations above him.

The English Trades-Unions had their first formidable apparition in the great manufacturing towns. It was in Sheffield, Manchester, and Birmingham that the presence of trade combinations began, at the epoch which we are now considering, to manifest themselves in a manner well calculated to alarm the existing order. As early as 1855, certain secret acts of violence of a peculiar character began to be known and rumored through the kingdom. The character of the things done pointed to the Trades-Unions as their origin. A charge of powder would be fired with a fuse by night against the house of some laborer who had opposed the principles or practices of the Union with which he was allied by his calling. The family of a workman would be tor-

rorized by some kind of fray or attack, designed to frighten the offending household out of the community. Sometimes the workman himself was beaten; sometimes his tools were broken up and destroyed. The phenomena were, in short, precisely such as have more recently become familiar in every American city where labor organizations exist, and where striking has been adopted as the method of obtaining redress of grievances.

The outrages against life and property referred to above began in Sheffield, but the same facts soon afterwards appeared in Manchester and other manufacturing cities. In 1867 an investigation was begun under the auspices of a Parliamentary Commission, and many scandalous practices were brought to light as a part of the method of the Trades-Unionists. But the inquisition had not proceeded far until it was demonstrated that the practices in question had been provoked by the long-standing abuses of society. The reader of to-day may well be surprised to know that less than a quarter of a century ago, within the distinct memory of men not yet beyond the middle stage of life, all such organizations as Labor Unions were absolutely outlawed in Great Britain. The statutes of the realm not only did not recognize the right of such associations to be formed and to exist under protection of the laws, but actually forbade all such associations as unlawful, pernicious, dangerous to the peace of society. Not only this, but the whole dominant public opinion of England held the same ground and taught the same principles. There was not an influential public journal, not a respectable pulpit, not a judicial tribunal, in the Kingdom of Great Britain wherein any other principle than that of absolute prescription of Trades-Unionism was either declared or tolerated. Nevertheless, the Unions did exist. They were a natural growth—just as they have been in America—of the existing industrial conditions. But their being a natural product of the established order did not prevent the ruling classes of society from the attempt to put them down both by suasion and by force.

We may not here enter upon the history of the struggle which ensued. It extended from 1667 to 1875, the agitation broadening and deepening until public opinion was gradu-

ally shaken into a better frame. Parliament was obliged to abandon the old proscriptive theory, and to frame new statutes in which the rights of workmen were acknowledged fully, and fortified by law. The new statutes were, as usual in English legislation, of a very moderate and conservative character. Organized society conceded just so much to the individual, just so much to the masses, as was necessary to the ends of peace—nothing more. The principles of the new laws were, first of all, the recognition of the absolute equality of contract on the part of workmen and their employers. Should there be an infraction of this principle on the part of either, the other might proceed against him by legal process for the recovery of damages. The rule of imprisonment for the mere violation of industrial principles was abrogated; a workman might no longer be imprisoned except for the actual commission of crime. At the same time, the rights of general society were strictly guarded. Those who were employed, for instance, in the service of the municipality, as in the management of the water-supply or gas-supply of a city, might not, with impunity, break their contract to do service to the hurt of the people at large. The new rules were in some respects severe, or at least just, as it respected employers. The latter were no longer autocrats. They might no longer, at the suggestion of caprice or anger, violate the agreements which they had made with workmen—no longer use them and abuse them at their will.

Another important principle, as it respected the Trades-Unions, was established by the legislation of 1875. The rule of striking against the reduction of wages, or for other hardship, was frankly and fully conceded; but the right of strikers to go beyond their own act to interfere with other workmen, to forbid the prosecution of the enterprise which they had abandoned, to break, destroy, and persecute, as a means of bringing employers to a settlement, was denied and interdicted. On the whole, the legislation of the period marked an important stage in that industrial evolution through which all civilized people are now passing, in the course of which, ere the work be fully done, the wage-system of labor itself must either be radically modified, or else

give place *in toto* to that coöperative system of industry which appears to be the destiny of the times to come.


We may here turn briefly from the home history of England to notice another foreign war in which she was engaged. Our attention in this instance is directed to Abyssinia, and to the career of King Theodore III., Emperor, or *Negus*, of that country. The story is another of those remarkable episodes in which the foreign relations of Great Britain in the present century so much abound. In the first place, it must be remembered that Abyssinia is a Christian rather than a Mohammedan State, and that the people are thus, on the side of their religious sympathies, allied somewhat with the peoples of the West. In the next place, it should be remarked that, on the ethnic side, the Abyssinians are out of union with the Nigritian races, and even with the Arabs. The race descent is rather Hamitic than otherwise, and the development of the country, civil and political, has throughout been, to a certain degree, anomalous.

The Government is monarchical. King Theodore, nearly fifty years of age at the time of which we speak, had himself obtained the throne by usurpation. His character might well remind us of some of the great historical personages of antiquity. He is represented as having had much of the native talent and all of the eccentricity and barbaric passion of Peter the Great. Theodore was, however, by no means a barbarian. He had lofty purposes and great ambitions. His generosity, when his anger was not kindled, knew no bounds. He had, in some measure, the ken of a statesman. He would have been glad to enter into relations—civil, political, and marital—with the Western peoples. At one period in his career he strove, with much anxiety, to open a personal correspondence with no less a personage than Her Majesty, the Queen of England. He would be her lover, and would lead Victoria from her weeds of widowhood to the splendors of Oriental nuptials, the richness of Oriental apparel, the gorgeousness of an Oriental crown. It does not appear that the serious Queen of Great Britain was greatly moved by the worship of her African adorer. It is even doubtful whether his missives ever reached the steady eyes of the Royal mistress

of Windsor Palace. At all this, Theodore, in the true lover's mood, became greatly angered. He could not conceive why it was that the Queen of England should not desire his devotion; and if even a partial concept of the difference between him and the Queen—between his people and hers—did enter his consciousness, it was only to aggravate the evil.

This King Theodore had his capital in the city of Magdala, a natural stronghold, situated about two hundred miles from the Gulf of Aden, latitude $11^{\circ} 22' N.$, and longitude $39^{\circ} 25' E.$ Here was reared by nature a vast Basaltic plateau to the level of nine thousand one hundred and ten feet above the sea. On this plateau a second elevation rises about one thousand feet; and on this, with precipitous sides all around, was built the Abyssinian capital, a place which Cesar might well have described as "fortified by the nature of the ground." Theodore was a man of military ambition. He had a treasury and an army, the latter composed of nearly a hundred and fifty thousand men of war. The sea-port of Magdala is the island and town of Massowah, in the Red Sea, a short distance from the African coast. It was in this island that the agents and representatives of the British Government first made the acquaintance of King Theodore, first became familiar with his methods and principles of Government.

The king, at the beginning, conceived a great liking for the few English officers who came to his shore. This was particularly true of the British Consul Plowden, who, from Massowah, had given material aid and counsel to Theodore in the matter of putting down an insurrection. Plowden joined the king in this work, and was unfortunately killed by the Abyssinian insurgents. The character of the monarch was well illustrated in what ensued. When the rebellion was suppressed, he deliberately ordered the execution of more than a hundred rebels, as a sort of sacrifice to the memory of his friend, the Consul. Soon afterwards Captain Cameron was sent out to Massowah to take the vacant consulship. He adopted the opposite policy from that of his predecessor, and would have little to do with the king of Abyssinia. The latter had already become jealous and suspicious of England and of all Englishmen. The Queen would not



EMPEROR THEODORE GIVING AN AUDIENCE

answer his love-letters, and he resented the insult. The suspicion of Theodore grew hot against Captain Cameron, and presently, in an hour of inadvertent wrath, he ordered the arrest of all the British within his reach. Cameron himself was taken; and the news flew to England that British subjects had been thrown into Abyssinian prisons under the capricious rage of an African despot.

At first an effort was made to open negotiations with Theodore, with a view to securing the liberation of the captives. It was a delicate work, for the fear was constantly present that the prisoners might suffer a wholesale slaughter by the king's orders. An embassy was constituted of Mr. Rassam, British representative at Aden, Lieutenant Prideaux, and Dr. Blanc, who, making their way to Magdala, opened negotiations with the king, only to be seized in turn and added to the other prisoners. It was perceived that a military invasion for the liberation of the captives was the only remedy. In such an emergency Great Britain never hesitates. The Cromwellian rule of action was that every Englishman shall be protected if it requires every other Englishman to do it. The Government of Lord Russell immediately sent despatches to Sir Robert Napier, Commander-in-Chief of the British army in Bombay, to transfer his forces to the Abyssinian coast, and bring Theodore to his knees. The expedition landed at Mulkutto, on Annesley Bay, in the autumn of 1867, and the advance was thrown forward under command of Colonel Merewether. The English General adopted the plan of making friends with the Abyssinian chieftains, and many of them, tired of the despotism of Theodore, made common cause with the British.

The expedition into the interior, however, was one of great hazard. The advance proper began in January of 1868; but it was not until April that a force of three thousand men debouched into the plateau before Magdala. Meanwhile, the native monarch had displayed great skill and courage. Though a large part of his army had broken away by mutiny, he defended himself with a courage and heroism worthy of success. On the 10th of April a pitched battle was fought, the Abyssinians coming on to the charge with the

ferocity of wild men, and much of the discipline of the civilized. But courage and enthusiasm were as naught before the discharges of British musketry and cannon. About two thousand of the Abyssinians were killed or wounded. On the north side of Magdala, sitting like a fortress on a rock, a narrow approach was found, and a British storming party, making its way to the summit, shattered the city gate and rushed in. Theodore had taken his stand at the post of danger, behind the gate, and when the portal was broken, he put himself forever to rest with the rough consolation of suicide. The English prisoners already had been sent in safety to the British camp. Lord Napier at once proceeded to the complete demolition of Magdala. Not one stone was left upon another. The widow of the king and her son were carried away by the victorious invaders. The mother died in the British camp, and the son was taken to England. There he was educated at the charge of the Queen, and was sent to India; but he died before maturity, and the House of Theodore III. was extinguished. The expedition, conducted by Sir Robert Napier, was regarded in England as one of the most complete military successes ever won by British arms in the East. The commander was made Baron Napier of Magdala, and received a pension during the remainder of his life.

We have now arrived at that period in the recent history of England, when the whole narrative is colored and impregnated in every part with the spray from Ireland. From the date which we have now reached, namely, the close of the sixth decade of the century to the present day, there has been no time when the principal tone and rhythm of British politics have not been derived from the ethnic, social, civil, and religious relations of the people of the two Islands. We already have remarked upon the ineradicable differences between the Irish and English nationalities. Prominent among these divergent sentiments and dispositions has been the religious discord which has sounded immemorially on the two sides of St. George's Channel.

It is not needed to recount in this connection the circumstances which, extending through many centuries, have wrought out a

completed Protestantism in England and a perfect Catholicism in Ireland. It is sufficient to note the fact of the divergence, and of the irreconcilable character of the two parties to the controversy. In the present century the Irish peasantry has been as profoundly and ardently Catholic as even the common folk of Italy, Spain, or Portugal. Here the priest of the Mother Church has remained supreme. Here the ancient tradition has flourished, and the ancient worship has been preserved in its fervor and reality. The inquirer, after a candid survey of the field, may well turn aside and say: "What place is there for Protestantism in such a country as this? What righteousness, other than that which is native to the genius of this race, can here be planted and made to grow?" The extension of the Episcopal Establishment over the people of Ireland has been a mockery from the first day. If the world be indeed in process of evolution into better and higher forms, then the support of English Episcopaliamism by the people of Ireland, against all of their instincts and volitions, has been from the beginning destined to cease, and to be remembered only as an intolerable injustice, borne impatiently for a season.

These ideas continued to obtrude themselves into British politics. The Conservative party opposed their progress and dissemination. That party, now in power in the House of Commons, sought by every means to prevent the reopening of questions relative to the Irish State Church. It could be foreseen that quietude and the mere continuance of the existing system by sufferance were the only means of maintaining it longer. To debate such a question is always to destroy the abuse. Hitherto, only a few radical members of Parliament, willing to hazard the consequences of extreme ideas, had ventured to pronounce the word Disestablishment. But that term could no longer be discarded from the vocabulary of British politics. On the 16th of March, 1868, a debate broke out in Parliament based on a resolution introduced by John Francis Maguire, and bearing on the general condition of Ireland. In the course of Maguire's speech, he spoke of the Irish Episcopal Establishment as a "scandalous and monstrous anomaly." The question at once

caught fire. It was perceived by the Liberal leaders of the House that the time had come for the introduction of another great reform. On the 30th of the month just mentioned, Gladstone introduced a series of resolutions declaring that the Established Church in Ireland *should cease to exist*; that it was not desirable for the Government of Great Britain to support that Church after the revenues derived from the Irish people should be taken away; and that the Queen be asked to surrender her interest in the temporalities of the Irish Church.

The debate was now opened in earnest. It was perceived that in the speeches of the Conservatives, the speakers hardly dare venture upon the defense of the existing ecclesiastical order in Ireland. Even party discipline, energized by the leadership of Disraeli, was not sufficient to bring the Conservative party to the further active maintenance of the abusive and intolerable system which had so long prevailed in the Celtic Island. At length the question came to the direct issue, and Gladstone's resolution in favor of disestablishment was adopted, in the House of Commons, by a majority of sixty-five votes.

The Conservatives, however, were unwilling, in the existing condition of affairs, to give up the Government. It was determined by Disraeli and the other leaders of his party, that an appeal should be made to the country. At the close of July, Parliament was accordingly dissolved and a new election ordered for the following November. The question of disestablishment was debated before the people, and the result of the elections showed quite an increase in the Liberal majorities. The Conservative ministry resigned, and a new Cabinet was formed under the leadership of Gladstone. Even John Bright was brought into the Government as President of the Board of Trade. Everything went forward at full tide. The Queen's speech indicated to Parliament that the Ministry would undertake important legislation relative to the State Church in Ireland. On the 1st of March, 1869, the Prime Minister brought in a bill in which it was provided that the Irish Church as a State Establishment should cease to exist—that it should become simply a free Episcopal Church, resting on the same general

conditions with the other Dissenting organizations in the country.

The result of the measure, if adopted, would be, first of all, that the Irish Bishops in the House of Lords should lose their seats. The Church of Ireland, being reduced from all political relation, could no longer be represented in one of the Parliamentary bodies. The general effect of the proposal was the complete severance of the Episcopal Establishment in Ireland from the State Church of England. Many provisions were made in the Bill for the preservation of the existing interests and vested rights of Irish Churchmen. The Government, however, if successful, would find little difficulty in meeting all the expenditures and prospective outlay from the large sums which must, under the provisions of the measure, revert to the treasury of the Kingdom. As a prudential principle, it was provided in the Bill that, after all just claims had been met, the remaining fund coming into the hands of the Government should be reserved for the promotion of various enterprises among the Irish people.

On these propositions a great debate ensued. The Conservative Opposition adopted the policy of saving—it that should be possible—the existence of the State Establishment in Ireland, and of granting, as a concession to public opinion, only such concessions as might not under any conditions be longer withheld. But the triumphant Liberals, led forward in solid phalanx by Gladstone, marched straight ahead for the principal position held by the defenders of the Past, determined to be diverted by nothing from the victory which was now within their power. On the 26th of July, 1869, the Ministerial Bill, having been adopted by the House of Commons and accepted by the House of Lords, received the assent of the Queen, and the Irish Church was struck from its foundations. It was provided in the Act that an interval should elapse before the measure should go into effect. The Establishment was permitted to continue on the old basis until the 1st of January, 1871—this to the end that the multifarious relations by which the ecclesiastical organization was bound to secular society in Ireland might be gradually and harmlessly broken and dissolved. The legislation, considered as a whole, was one

of the most important acts of Parliament within the present century, and, as the event has shown, was but the introductory stage in the vast and profound agitation which has extended to the present day with respect to whole structure of Irish society.

It had been foreseen by the Liberal Ministry that the movement which they had started could not be stopped with the simple disestablishment of the Irish Church. There were at least two other great questions lying at the very bottom of the condition of Ireland



WILLIAM F. GLADSTONE.

which must of necessity spring into view and demand solution as soon as disestablishment was accomplished. Gladstone had had the courage to announce at the outset that the Liberal policy contemplated still further advances in the direction of Irish reform. The two great issues to which reference has just been made were, first, the system of LAND TENURE, and, secondly, the SYSTEM OF EDUCATION, in Ireland. It could but be foreseen that a proper solution of each of these questions must, in its turn, be as revolutionary in nature and extent as was the disestablishment of the

Church. But Gladstone and his followers were undaunted by the prospect before them, and went forward at once to attack that ancient and deep-seated Irish land system which has constituted a problem in the political history, not only of Great Britain, but of the whole English-speaking race. How the evils which have been handed down through centuries of abuse, accumulating from generation to generation, stiffening into usage first and into law afterwards, twining by many ramifications around the Constitution of Great Britain, and having the general effect of reducing the Irish tenantry to a lower and ever lower level of hardship, cruelty, and injustice with respect to the lands which they have immemorially occupied, but could not own, may be abrogated by legislation and replaced with a new system at once rational, liberal, and just—has been a question greater, perhaps, than the abilities of any statesman or group of statesmen which England has yet produced. Nevertheless, this was the question which the Gladstone Ministry was now obliged to face. By their own act the issue had been thrown into the arena, and the Liberal Government must stand or fall on the result.

The courage with which the Prime Minister now took up the system of land tenure in Ireland was worthy of all praise. Whatever may be said of the wisdom or unwisdom of the remedies which were proposed, nothing can be said against the spirit and resoluteness with which the Government took up the question of alleviating the ills of the Irish peasantry by bettering their relations with respect to the lands on which they lived. Nor may we well appreciate the condition of the agitation which was now begun in Parliament and throughout the country, without pausing to review, in a few paragraphs, the existing system of land tenure in Ireland.

In the first place, the use of the word *system* in this connection, is hardly justified by the conditions to be examined. It could hardly be said that there was a "system" of Irish landownership. There were many features about the condition of land tenure which were unmistakable. Some of these features were so common as to be recognized almost everywhere in Ireland, but many others were

local and peculiar. The whole social, political, and industrial condition of this unfortunate country had been transmitted, like most other corresponding facts in England, from the Middle Ages. But the hardships of original barbarism had been aggravated by a hundred other hardships, extending through several centuries. Among these hard conditions may be mentioned, first of all, the fact of war. Ireland had been invaded, devastated, conquered, time and again, by the dominant people. One Irish revolt had followed another, and each revolt had, in its turn, been put down by the same hand and the same method. Irish insurrections and suppressions had become a monotonous fact in the history of the Island from the times of Henry VII to the age of Victoria.

Of all the conditions of Irish society, changed by recurring British conquests, the most constant and destructive was the confiscation of the lands. Originally, the Irish people, like other mediæval peasantry, had owned their lands. But by conquest, they had lost possession. First one province, and then another, in revolt would be invaded, and, as a penalty for insurrection, the lands would be subjected to confiscation. We may not here enumerate the occasions and circumstances of the various land-seizures by which the Irish people were ultimately dispossessed—despoiled of their own homes. But dispossession became the prevalent condition throughout Ireland—this in the face of the fact that the Island is agricultural in nearly all of its natural suggestions. The same is true of the development. From an immemorial day the Irish Celts have been tillers of the soil. They were, moreover, from the earliest times, strongly *attached* to the soil. Hardly any other people have had a stronger home instinct. The Irishman is never, by preference, a rover. He has little of the adventurous spirit by either sea or land. On the contrary, he fixes himself by ethnic preference to a certain district, a certain locality, a certain home. However poor the condition may have been in which the Irishman in recent centuries has found himself in his own country, he has never been wanting in ardent attachment even to the hard lot which human history has assigned him. To him the green sod, the surrounding hills, the

intervening vales, the blue smoke ascending from the hut where his father lived before him, the humble hamlet in the distance, the spire of his own church with its ever-ringing bell, have constituted a landscape dearer than any other in the scenery of the world. Of his own choice he leaves it never. Of his own will, he holds fast to the soil out of which he deduces his whole existence. There is not in all Western Europe or the two Americas another people so devoted to *the earth*, so constant in handling that precious dirt out of which all things grow and blossom, as are the Irish peasants.

Of cities and towns, on the other hand, Ireland has but few. After Dublin, Belfast, Cork, Limerick, and Waterford, the remaining cities may be passed without mention. Great manufacturing interests do not exist here. No vast aggregations of artisans, tradesmen, or miners are found. The population is distributed on the lands as a tenantry, or at most gathered in small hamlets and villages, which rarely expand into the proportion of towns. How great therefore to this people the hardship of dispossession! How extreme the penalty of living and toiling ever on lands which they may never own! How degrading the conditions of that perpetual rent-paying system, removed by only one degree from positive servitude! All this is to say that, in process of time, and by many methods, the principal of which was confiscation, the Irish lands passed into the hands of foreign, that is, English, owners, and by these same processes and methods the Irish people were reduced to the place of renters, fixed upon the soil by a series of regulations devised by British landlords in their own interest, and held down under the weight of ever-increasing poverty and debasement.

Such, on the one hand, was the system of English landlordism, and such, on the other, the subjection of the Irish rent-paying peasantry during the whole of the present century down to the time of the Gladstonian reforms. While on the religious, that is, the ecclesiastical, and on the political side, the condition of the Irish people had been alleviated by several Parliamentary acts, on the industrial and land-renting side nothing whatever had been accomplished. It is probably true, on the

contrary, that in 1869 the conditions of land tenure in Ireland were aggravated with more evils and poisoned with more injustice and cruelty than at any previous date in the history of the country. It had come to pass—as was said of the slaves in America—that the Irish tenants had no rights which British landlords were bound to respect. Lord Palmerston is credited with having said that tenant-right was landlord-right, which was equivalent, if true, to an utterance of the most absolute slavery. Another aphorism of like kind ran in this wise, that tenant-right was landlord's *wrong*, as much as to say that every symptom and claim of right and privilege, to say nothing of equality, on the part of the tenant, was an utterance not only of disloyalty, but of incendiarism and crime.

It is difficult for people living in America, and will at length be difficult for people living in Great Britain, to understand the complete autoeracy of English landlordism as late as the sixth decade of the current century. The landlord had all power; the tenant, none. If the latter fell into a still more abject poverty than that which he had inherited; if he could no longer, from misfortune, disease, or decrepitude, discharge the ever-accurring rentals which his foreign master exacted,—he was subject to that dreadful process called *eviction*; that is, he might be turned out, ejected, expelled from his home, and the poor residue of his goods be hurled after him by a summary process of police, and without respect to season or condition. The history of eviction in Ireland could never be written. It is a tale of woe among the lowly—a record of heartlessness and selfish avarice applied to the suffering bodies and lives of the weak, with a relentless cruelty for the expression of which human language is wholly inadequate. The vices of the system reached to the very bottom. It was *itself* a vice of monstrous proportions, and its corrupting and degrading influence had gone on until a point had been reached beyond which it was impossible for the grinding despotism of the master-class to exact anything further.

One of the greatest curses attendant upon this universal land tenantry was the curse that it inflicted on the soil itself. It is in the nature of all such crimes to bend around at

the last, like the fabulous serpent with the tail-dart, and sting itself fatally in the head. The working of the system discouraged—almost interdicted—all effort at the improvement and development of the Irish lands. In the case of a thrifty peasant who, by excess and skill of industry, brought his lands into higher cultivation and superior productiveness, the landlord was always quick to discover his advantage by imposing a higher rate of rent. The more the tenant toiled, the more he was taxed. The more he produced, the heavier burden was imposed upon him. On the contrary, the improvident were rather encouraged than stimulated to industry. It might almost be said that in Ireland it was better to hold poor lands under half cultivation, and to keep the improvements thereon at a minimum and in a state of decay, than for the occupant to employ his energies only to be taxed down again to the lowest possible level. It was inevitable that under such conditions all agricultural enterprise should sink away; that everything should revert to desolation; that the renter's cot should stand in the midst of brambles and waste, rather than be improved and preserved for the benefit of foreign landlords.

These landlords were absentees. They lived in another island, across a water narrow enough for the collection of rent, broad enough to conceal the condition of the Irish peasantry from the open inspection of the English people. The ruling classes always possess the means of information and the processes by which it is distributed. The newspaper of modern times belongs to the upper man. The under man has no voice; or if, having a voice, he cries out, his cry is lost like a shout in the desert. Capital, in the places of power, seizes upon the organs of public utterance, and howls the humble down the wind. Lying and misrepresentation are the natural weapons of those who maintain an existing vice and gather the usufruct of crime.

The fact should here be recorded that, in a single county of Ireland, the land tenure was somewhat more tolerable than that described above. In the county of Ulster, tenant-right was not wholly the right of the landlord. For reasons that can not be enumerated here, the people of this part of Ireland had, in the

course of generations, obtained a better order than could be found in any other part of the Island. This is the part of the country which is circled by the North Channel, lying over against Scotland. Doubtless the industrial system of the latter country, and particularly the methods of land tenure therein, passed over by community of race, and insured, at length, a state of affairs more happy, or at least less abusive, than otherwise would have prevailed. In Ulster the tenants had a few rights which landlords were obliged to respect. The privilege of eviction, which the master-class exercised at will in other parts of the Island, was here restricted to the case of non-payment of rent. The tenure was rather that of a lease than of mere tenantry-at-will. The occupant of the land might hold it indefinitely, and transmit to his son after him. He might go so far as to sell out his rights by quitclaim, and the landlord was obliged to recognize the purchaser as his renter under the same rights and conditions which had held with respect to the former tenant. Many other slightly favorable circumstances in the land-tenure system of this part of the country, made the holdings of the tenants much more valuable and satisfactory than those present in the other counties. As a result, the country was better improved. It could but be noticed that just in proportion as the conditions of land-holding were ameliorated, not only were the lands brought into a higher state of cultivation and increased productiveness, but the peasants who dwelt thereon were raised to a higher plain of contentment, industry, and happiness.

Such, then, were the aspects of the case as they were presented to the Gladstone Ministry at the beginning of 1870. On the 15th of February in that year, the Prime Minister laid before Parliament his celebrated IRISH LAND BILL. The measure was, to a certain extent, revolutionary; for it was based on a new theory of land tenure, fundamentally different from that which had hitherto prevailed. It contemplated the abrogation of those absolute and arbitrary rights which the landlords had claimed and exercised. The new theory was, that tenantry of land was a copartnership in production; a part of the benefits belonging to the tenants as well as to the landowners.

The aspect of affairs in Ulster gave the hint and outline of the new legislation. One of the most oppressive and iniquitous features of the prevalent system in the larger part of Ireland, was the claim of the landlord to the improvements made on the lands held by the tenant. In such improvements there is always a certain fixedness which gives to the landowner an advantage over the tenant. When the latter is at length evicted, or removes at his own will to another estate, the improvements which he leaves behind represent a considerable part of all the labor which he has exerted during his occupancy. These improvements he must, to a great extent, surrender to the estate which he abandons.

The rule in Ireland had been peculiarly distressing and unjust. All compensation to the tenant for the properties which he had created on the estate of the landlord was refused. The new legislation was directed to the cure of this injustice. But the principal object was to annul that prerogative of the

landlord by which tenants might be evicted at will. Under the provision of the measure, the dispossessed or removing tenant might claim and collect by law a just compensation for the improvements which he had, in whole or in part, put upon the estate. But his great advantage was in the clause which forbade his eviction so long as he continued to pay his rent. On these great and salutary principles the debates in Parliament were conducted. The Conservatives did less to obstruct the measure than they had done in the matter of the disestablishment of the Irish Church. Strangely enough, a part of the opposition to the Bill came from the Irish members of the House, who, while recognizing the great advantages to be gained by the Act, regarded it as not sufficiently thorough-going to meet the demands of the existing conditions. On the 2d of June, 1870, the Land Bill was passed by Parliament, and on the 1st of the following August the royal assent was given to the measure.

CHAPTER CXXXIII.—REFORMS OF THE EIGHTH DECADE.



IT WILL be remembered that the third branch of reform which the Gladstone Ministry had promised, related to the Higher Education in Ireland. But before this part of the governmental scheme could be brought into form, an agitation had arisen on the whole question of education, particularly the primary education, in England. It began to be recognized as a fact already known to educators in other lands, that the elementary education in England was the poorest, most irregular, and inefficient to be found in any of the Western nations above the grade of Italy and Spain. For fully a half century the German States and the United States of America had been far ahead of England in their systems of primary instruction. In England there was, indeed, no *system* at all. The children of the nation received their instruction in schools

which were supported in part by private gifts; in part, by endowments; in part, by governmental aid; and, in a few instances, by local taxation. In all of the schools, religious, or rather sectarian, influences and interests had prevailed to the extent of working the greatest hardships and injustice to the children of all the Non-conformists of the Kingdom. The latter had no rights under the law in schools which were not created and maintained by themselves.

The general condition was such as to be a scandal, not only to Great Britain herself, but to the nineteenth century. It was on the 17th of February that William E. Forster, Vice-President of the Council on Education, brought into Parliament an Education Bill providing for a general system of public elementary instruction. As might be expected in such a country as England, and among such a people as the English, the proposed measure looked, first of all, to the principle

of compulsion in attendance at the public schools. Few things are pleasing to the British mind that have not in them the predominating element of authority. The Forster Bill provided that all children in England and Wales should, between the ages of five and twelve years, be compelled to attend the public district schools. The execution of this

every district. The funds for the support of the same were to be derived from three general sources; first, from a local tax, levied under the direction of the School Board for that district; secondly, from direct grant out of the treasury of the Kingdom; and, thirdly, from such fees as were paid into local treasuries by persons not otherwise entitled to the privi-

leges of the schools in those districts. As to the existing system, it was preserved as far as practicable, and carried over under the new methods. It was not found expedient that all, or even a large part, of the existing schools should be destroyed, but rather reorganized under the new law.¹

As might have been anticipated, the greatest opposition to the new system was made on account of its secular character. Ultra-religionists of every shade and character took arms against a measure which, if successful, would break their own narrow monopoly of the public schools. Church-of-England men opposed the Forster Bill, because the State Es-

tablishment might be injured by the secular education of the people. Roman Catholics

¹ Charles Dickens, of great memory, lived to see the educational agitation which was now on, but not its consummation in the new statutory acts of the epoch. Doubtless, in his last days, his mind reverted with ever-increasing pleasure to the reform which his genius and pen had so powerfully contributed to bring about in the educational system of Great Britain.



WILLIAM E. FORSTER.

clause was, however, left to the option of the School Boards of the respective districts; that is, if in any place the Board should decide in favor of compulsion, that should be the rule. But if the decision should be against compulsion, the attendance was to remain free, as before.

The Bill contemplated the establishment and maintenance of a public free-school in

opposed it, because they rejected the principles of secular education *in toto*. The Non-conformists also antagonized the measure, because they held it unjust that themselves should be taxed to educate the children of others in doctrines of religion and society which they did not accept. This, indeed, was a most serious break which Forster had to consider; for the Non-conformists represented in Parliament were the adherents of the Gladstone Ministry, and their votes might, ere long, be necessary for the maintenance of that Ministry in power. So great was the opposition to the measure that the Bill was more than once saved from defeat by the aid of certain Conservatives who had the same interest in the cause of education, and were as much devoted thereto, as the Liberals themselves. The Bill was finally adopted, and it was not long until the benefits of the new system were so manifest that the voice of carping and prejudice was stilled forever.

Circumstances had meanwhile supervened which induced the Ministry to continue the educational reform in England before attempting the solution of the Irish educational problem. The next measure undertaken was embodied in the so-

called University Tests Bill, and was directed to the correction of abuses existing at Oxford and Cambridge. It is an instructive lesson to study the origin and development, the principles and methods, of the two great English Universities. Noting the difference between the spirit and organic law which prevailed in these institutions from the later Middle Ages down to a time within the memory of men still living, and the spirit and

organic law which ought to prevail at any university of liberal learning in any civilized age or country, we can but be impressed with the amazing progress in the direction of liberty and the emancipation of man which our most recent period has exhibited. Why it is that universities show a natural tendency to become the last hold of conservatism and bigotry; why it is that liberalism, freedom,



CHARLES DICKENS

emancipation, all the concomitants of the real progress of mankind, receive as a rule so cold a reception in the halls of the higher learning; why it is that all narrowness and littleness find there a warm accord; why it is that the Past is there enthroned and the Future ever expelled; why it is that the birds of ill-omen, the owls of semi-barbarism, and all the denizens of the night take refuge and hatch their young under the eaves and roofs of ancient

universities,—are questions which require much philosophy and not a little equanimity, on the part of the modern inquirer, to solve.

At Oxford and Cambridge the abuses of mediæval darkness were strongly entrenched. Until a recent day, dissenters in religion were excluded from the advantages of those venerable institutions. Only the elect of the Established Church might gather there the treasures of classical learning, the wealth of scientific principles, the lore of philosophy, the honeyed sweets of Hymettus. It remained for the Gladstone Ministry to break down the middle wall of partition, and to admit all Englishmen on terms of equality and justice, not only to the advantages of learning afforded at Oxford and Cambridge, but also to the honors which those institutions had to confer and the ambitions which they had to inspire. It is a fact worthy of note that the Bill by which the ancient restrictions were removed and the law of free competition substituted therefor, was *three times* passed by the House of Commons before it was finally accepted, with many grimaces and expressions of discontent, by the House of Lords. There sat the Bishops of the Established Church, last to yield to the pressure of humanity, last to accept the generous principles of a larger liberty.

Before considering the attempt of the Government in 1873 to reform the Irish University system, we may well note a few of the leading measures which had, in the meantime, occupied the attention of Parliament and the country. First of these was the Ballot Bill, introduced into the House of Commons by Forster, in February of 1871. Hitherto, the method of voting at the polls in Great Britain had been *visa voce*. Each elector was required to speak aloud at the voting-place his choice of men and measures. It may be seen at a glance how many and serious are the objections to such a system. If society were of a uniform consistency throughout; if it were organized on truly republican principles, so that every elector might stand on terms of perfect equality with every other; if, in other words, the under man had as little cause to fear the upper man as the upper man has to fear him,—then the method of open voting might be preferable to the secret ballot. It may be said

in favor of the former system, that in a free country it is a positive stimulus to independence of political character, that the voter be required to go openly to the polls and declare his choice aloud in the hearing of witnesses. It is not unlikely that, in course of time, society will return to this method, because of its independent and man-making character. Of a certainty, no citizen of a free government ought to be under the slightest constraint in the matter of publicly declaring his preference at the polls. The right to do this is, indeed, the very essence of civil liberty.

But, practically, the question has to be considered in relation to the existing condition of society. Even in the United States such a social system has supervened as to make it dangerous for the under man openly to declare his choice. In Great Britain, where the social stratification is more universal and obdurate, the danger of voting *visa voce* is correspondingly aggravated. We have already seen how the Chartists fixed upon the secret ballot as one of the six articles of the People's Charter. From the time of the Chartist agitation down to the epoch which we are here considering, the question of the ballot had never ceased to be revived by the Radicals in the House of Commons. Nor had the common people ever relinquished the hope that the safeguard of secret voting would, at length, be conceded to them. In the Ballot Bill proposed by Forster, it was provided that hereafter, at each election, official voting papers should be prepared and distributed at the polling-places. The method of election was, that the voter should go to the polls where his registry was determined, and there deposit his secret vote in the box from which, at the close of the polls, the ballots were to be taken and counted by the proper officers.

The reform contemplated in the measure was greater than might appear to an American reader, long accustomed to similar usages of the ballot-box in his own country. Many of the corruptions, intimidations, and abuses which had prevailed under the old system in Great Britain were abolished under the new. But the Bill was forced through Parliament against the strenuous opposition of the Conservatives in the Commons and the still more unreasoning hostility of the Lords. It may be

noted that in the debates attendant upon the passage of the Act, the question of extending the ballot to women was frequently advocated, and was by no means regarded as so dangerous an innovation as the same measure has been reckoned to be by Conservatives in America.

Still another project, which was carried out under the auspices of the Gladstone Government, was the reformation of the British army. In that department of the public service, as in every other, abuses had crept in and had become so crystallized by long prevalence, that their eradication seemed almost impossible. This was especially true with respect to the manner of obtaining commissions in the army. These, instead of being the reward of a military education or of valor in the field, were purchased by those who were able to pay the price, and the usage had so long prevailed that the transaction had come to be regarded as other business methods of the public market. The British officer purchased his commission. He held it as long as he chose, subject, of course, to the discipline of the army, and then sold his rank to some other aspirant, who, henceforth took his place in the service.

It is to the credit of the British Government that this crying abuse did not originate in an Act of Parliament, but in a Royal warrant, wherein the privilege of purchasing commissions was granted by the sovereign. It is needless to say to how great an extent merit was discouraged and demerit promoted under such a system. It was determined by the Liberal Ministry that the practice of purchasing commissions should cease. In the summer of 1871 a Bill for the Reorganization of the Army was introduced by Cardwell, Secretary of War, and, after a hot debate, was adopted on the 3d of July in that year. The House of Lords, however, taking advantage of the fact that the session was near its close, refused to concur, and the Government suddenly found itself balked in the work of reform. It remained for Gladstone, however, to discover a way through the embarrassment, and at the same time to set the ministerial foot with some emphasis on the recalcitrant House of Lords. He boldly declared that the sovereign, under direction of the Government should, of her own prerogative, cancel the Royal warrant on which the abuses in the army were dependent. This

was accordingly done; but the daring procedure on the part of the Ministry created great excitement, and, on the whole, tended to weaken the hold of the Prime Minister even on his own followers in Parliament.

We have now arrived at that period in recent English history when the Alabama Claims, held and urged by the Government of the United States against Great Britain, were brought to settlement before the Geneva Tribunal. An account of the proceedings before this august court, and the judgment given thereby against Great Britain, has already been presented. At the same time, England was shaken by the throes of Continental Europe. Now it was that the Emperor Napoleon III. entered upon the last rash act of his astonishing career. He declared war against Prussia for a cause which posterity must ever hold ridiculous. His armies were defeated, and his Empire went down with himself amid the fire and smoke from the crater of Sedan. Nominally a prisoner for a brief season at Wilhelmshöhe, he soon left the land of his captivity and repaired to England. There, with the dethroned Empress and his son, the Prince Imperial, he took up his residence at Chislehurst, where, on the 9th of January, 1873, he died, being in the sixty-fifth year of his age.

Resuming the broken narrative of the Educational Reform in Great Britain, we come to consider the effort made by the Gladstone Ministry, in 1873, for the passage of the Irish University Bill. At the opening of Parliament the Queen had indicated in her speech the importance of the subject to which the attention of the two Houses was to be directed. The measure proposed was the work of Gladstone, and upon that statesman devolved the duty of defending the plan which he had devised for the betterment of the Higher Education in Ireland. That country, like England, had two principal universities. The first was the University of Dublin, old and well established, thoroughly interwoven in all its laws, usages, and management with the Church of England, or rather, the Episcopal Church in Ireland, of which it constituted the educational expression. As a matter of course, the Catholics were excluded from its benefits. This is to say that Dublin University was open to the

elect one-fifth of the Irish people—the fifth composed in large measure of Englishmen and their immediate descendants—while to the other four-fifths all of its fountains were sealed. The second institution was the comparatively recent Queen's University, an account of the founding of which has been given already. This university was a strictly secular establishment; and in that system of government, also, the Catholics had neither part nor lot. In a word, the university privileges of Ireland, with the exception of those furnished by a small Catholic University, established and supported by themselves, were totally denied to the Irish Catholics in their own country. The Catholic youth might indeed enter the Queen's University; but that institution was conducted on principles which no Catholic could accept without breaking with his Church, and such a course could not rationally be expected of a people so ardently devoted to the interests of their own religion.

The Bill proposed by Gladstone must, if possible, meet the contradictory conditions existing among the Irish people. The project was one of extreme difficulty. The Gladstonian idea was to remove from Dublin University its denominational character, and at the same time to make it central and paramount to all the other colleges in the Island. Dublin was to be the center and sun of the system. This made necessary the removal from the institution of the Faculty of Theology; for it was absurd to suppose that the young men of Ireland could pass the ordeal of that body of instruction. In the next place, it was necessary to strike from the curriculum such departments of inquiry as Moral Philosophy and Modern History; for it could not be hoped that any professor in the world was sufficiently adroit to give instruction in that system of ethics which was deduced from theological dogmas, without putting at naught both the facts of psychology and violating every sentiment of those to whom he should address his instruction. The general result therefore was, that Dublin University, though indicated as the center of the Irish system, was to be considerably reduced in the extent and variety of its curriculum. Such a measure could but offend, not only the University itself, but the whole Episcopalian system of

which it was a part. The event soon showed that the smaller institutions, some for one reason, and some for another, were in like manner offended; for where is the university or college which, under the inspiration of localism, is not fain to regard itself as supreme? Where is the college which voluntarily enters into a system where its own place is that of perpetual subordination?

We may not here enter into all that was said in the great debates between the Liberals and the Conservatives relative to the Irish University Bill. It had been noted already that the Gladstone Ministry was losing its hold upon Parliament and the country. Occasional elections for filling Parliamentary vacancies had told against the Government. Here and there the Conservatives gained a member. The Opposition, under the leadership of Disraeli, began to display unusual spirit. There were dissensions in the Ministry itself, and the mistakes, which not a few had been made by the dominant party during the last four years, were skillfully paraded by the Conservative orators. Perhaps, moreover, there was something in that political restlessness which, in all free or semi-free countries, so frequently displays itself in the change of leaders for the mere sake of changing. In the present instance, it can not be doubted that England had been constantly agitated since the accession of Gladstone to power, and now the country was tired of agitation. It was clear to the Ministers themselves that their days in office were numbered. When the Irish University Bill was put on its second reading in Parliament, it was defeated by a majority of three votes. The majority was, of course, composed of the Conservatives, the Radical Irish party, and other disaffected Liberals. The Gladstone Ministers resigned their offices, and the Queen called Disraeli to form a new Cabinet. The latter declined the service, for the reason that it was not clear to him that he could command a majority in the House of Commons. The Gladstonians were accordingly recalled to office. The Cabinet was reconstructed, and the Government dragged on feebly for a season.

This method, however, was not to the liking of the Prime Minister. He determined to regain all or to lose all by dissolving Par-

liament and appealing to the people. The announcement of this determination was a complete surprise. The elections which ensued were hardly begun until it was clear that a great political reaction had taken place throughout the country. The bottom motive in it all was simply the English fear that the car of Reform propelled by the Liberal party was pushed too fast and too far. That political timidity for which the British Nation has been proverbial since its emergence from the Middle Ages, again prevailed to check the progress of those salutary movements which had marked the history of the last six years. The Liberals were defeated at the polls, and the Conservatives came back to the House of Commons with a majority of fifty members.

The Gladstone Ministry now made haste to retire, and Disraeli was at once installed as Prime Minister. Thus, in the spring of 1874, that extraordinary and eccentric personage, that genius born of an Oriental race in the foggy island of Britain, was for the last time placed in one of the proudest political positions to which the statesmen of modern times may aspire. The Cabinet which he constructed was one of great ability. Lord Cairns was made Chancellor; Lord Derby, Secretary of Foreign Affairs; Lord Salisbury, Secretary for India; Lord Carnarvon, Secretary for the Colonies; Mr. Cross, Secretary for Home Affairs; Mr. Hardy, Secretary of War; Mr. Hunt, Secretary of the Admiralty; Sir Stafford Northcote, Chancellor of the Exchequer. As for Gladstone, he virtually retired from sight, coming into the House of Commons only at intervals, and speaking little on the questions proposed by the new Government. The lately triumphant Liberals went into a political eclipse, which, in the course of the next three years, threatened to be total, if not perpetual.

For a season after the accession of the Conservative Ministry, no striking display of force was seen under the new political order. One of the first contests in Parliament was over a measure introduced into the House of Lords by the Archbishop of Canterbury for the Regulation of Public Worship. We have already had occasion to refer to the ecclesiastical movement, which had been observed in the Episcopal Establishment towards the Church of

Rome. The impulse in this direction had had its origin in the extreme High Churchism of the University of Oxford. As a result, an excess of Ritualism had appeared in many of the first churches in the Kingdom inasmuch that the difference between the Episcopal worship therein and the ceremonies in the Catholic cathedrals consisted chiefly in the distinction. But not all, not even a majority, of the Churchmen of the Establishment followed in the wake of this movement. Many held back, preferring the simpler and severer forms of worship which had been handed down from the reign of Edward VI. As a result, there came to pass great and perplexing diversities in the religious manners and doctrines of the people—this inside of the Established Church. The existing ecclesiastical law was not sufficient to prevent the divergences of practice and belief, and an appeal was made to the civil law to regulate what the Church Courts could no longer control. A spirited debate ensued on the Archbishop of Canterbury's Bill, and the measure was at length forced through Parliament by the dominant party. But it was soon discovered that, so far from accomplishing the expected results, so far from bringing the methods of worship and doctrine to a common standard, the Act proved to be a mere nullity, standing in the statute as the expression of a wish and purpose rather than as a vital energy.

The next governmental measure which demanded the attention of Parliament was a bill for the protection of them that go down to the sea in ships. It had come to the attention of the public that a large part of the vast merchant marine of Great Britain was unseaworthy—unsafe as a vehicle of commerce and passage. The existing laws on the subject were imperfect, ineffective. Indeed, the current legislation was of a character to aggravate the abuse; for the laws of insurance provoked and perpetuated the evil. The ship-owners little cared to bear the expense of marine improvements and of such outlays as were requisite to keep their ships in repair, for the reason that they were well insured, and, in hundreds of instances, it was actually profitable to the owners that their vessels should go to the bottom of the sea. But this method of security and gain involved the loss

of valuable merchandise and still more valuable human lives. The agitation against the existing abuse was led by Mr. Plimsoll, a philanthropic member of the House of Commons, and after fiery and angry debates, extending to midsummer, a bill was finally passed for the better protection of English seamen and English commerce.

With the year 1875 there came into modern British history a new condition, which may be defined as Imperialism. The appearance of such a fact in the midst of a democratic age and a people politically progressive may be ac-

second circumstance was the existence of the British East Indian Empire, and the relations of that vast country and of those multitudinous populations with the Russian Power. As far back as the days of Lord Clive, more particularly as long ago as the times of Warren Hastings, the British mind perceived certain gorgeous outlines, certain splendid cumuli in the Oriental heavens, under the shadow of which the existing social and political sentiments of Great Britain were somewhat modified. In the third place, we may refer the half-formed Imperialist concepts of these days

to the Prime Minister of England. Disraeli was undoubtedly one of the most gorgeous and spectacular of modern statesmen. Himself of Eastern descent, his mind naturally inclined to the vast and splendid, not to say the factitious, in national character. Few men of the century have cherished and followed vaster and higher ambitions than he. Soon after his accession to power, it became evident that his dreams were of many colors, and of a foreign cast. One of the striking manifestations of this disposition came to the surface at the opening of Parliament in 1876. The Prime Minister announced that the Queen of England was about to add to her royal titles that of



VICTORIA, EMPRESS OF INDIA

counted for by three circumstances. The first of these was that ever-reviving Eastern Question, by which the attention of England was drawn away from the Home Islands, and from Western Europe, to the countries of the East—to Egypt, to Crete, to Greece, and to the Ottoman Empire. Familiarity with the course of events in those far lands brought of necessity, out of the Levant, a certain modicum of Eastern ideas, which, though they might never grow in English soil, were nevertheless planted there in political conservatories, and looked on with some wonder as interesting exotics. The

Empress of India. The proposition was strongly opposed by many of the Liberals, and was, perhaps, distasteful to a majority of the English people. The pressure from without was, in this respect, so emphatic that the Ministry agreed that the new honor and title should not be employed in the Home Kingdom of Great Britain, but only abroad; that is, in India itself. There were many statesmen so stout in their English preferences as to argue that the Imperial diadem of the Indies, made new, so to speak, for the occasion, was no addition to the crown of Alfred and the

Conqueror, of Plantagenet and Tudor. But the splendor-loving Prime Minister had his way, and Victoria reigned as Empress of India.

It is in evidence that the Queen of England greatly admired and honored the remarkable personage at the head of her Government. We may not assume that this admiration was personal, or that it was even a reciprocal sentiment for the Prime Minister's loyalty and devotion to herself. The daughter of the Duke of Kent has never been sentimental. Her German descent and English education, as well as the traditions of the English crown, have conspired to make and to keep her one of the most practical of great women. Her admiration for Disraeli rested rather upon that strong conservatism which he displayed in politics and his fidelity to the royal and aristocratic order in Great Britain. To these elements of English nationality none was more faithful than he.

It was natural under these conditions that the Queen should devise some distinguished honor for the man who had served her Government so long and well. If the honor were ever to come, the time was at hand to confer it. Disraeli was already in his seventy-first year. At that age a statesman can hardly be blamed for looking back upon the hard-fought battle of life, and for considering the expediency of a brief day of rest ere the curtain fall. In such a condition of affairs an English leader naturally looks to the peerage. Already, in 1868, the Queen had signified her

desire to make Disraeli a Peer of the realm. But at that date he did not feel that the time had come for his retirement from that great arena, the House of Commons. He accordingly declined the honor for himself, but accepted for his wife the title and dignity of Viscountess of Beaconsfield. In 1876 the conditions were altered. On the 11th of Au-



EARL OF BEAUCONSFIELD

gust in that summer, being then in the full tide of his power and renown. He made his last speech in the House of Commons, and it has been noted that the closing words of the speech were "the existence of that Empire." On the following morning it was announced throughout England that Benjamin Disraeli had been created a Peer under the title of

the Earl of Beaconsfield; nor was the honor less distinguished for the fact that it once had been tendered to Edmund Burke, and by him declined.

The American reader will not understand that such a change of relation as that through which Lord Beaconsfield passed in 1876 implies the disappearance of the actor from public life. It means in England that his active career in Parliament, more particularly in the House of Commons, is at an end. In the case of Beaconsfield, he was destined yet to appear in one of the most dramatic spectacles of the last quarter of the nineteenth century; namely, in the Congress of Berlin. We shall not in this place, but rather in a subsequent chapter, narrate the revival of the Eastern Question in European politics, the war between Turkey on the one side and Servia and Montenegro, inspired by Russia, on the other; the conference at Constantinople; the progress and incidents of the Turco-Russian War; the issue of that conflict; and, finally, the assembly and deliberations of the International Ambassadors at Berlin, in July of 1878. All these matters belong rather to the recent history of Eastern Europe than to the annals of Great Britain. It is sufficient in this connection to record the fact that the interests and reputation of England were sustained in the Congress of Berlin by the Earl of Beaconsfield in a manner most satisfactory to the nation. The British public saw with delight her representative standing in that great conference face to face with Prince Bismarck, his equal in intellect and almost his equal as a diplomatist.

We here draw near the close of the chapter covering the most recent events in English history. It only remains to present an outline of a few additional movements to bring the narrative to a close. It is exceedingly difficult to give a true historical estimate of those tendencies and aspects of society lying immediately under our own observation. In such a case, perspective is wanting, and the mind of the writer is unconsciously swayed by the dominant temper and passion of the day. On the Parliamentary side, the greatest by far of all the more recent agitations in England is that suggested by the words HOME RULE. The expression was not new. Ever since the union of Ireland with England at the begin-

ning of the present century, an occasional demand had been made for the creation of an Irish Parliament, as a means of dissipating the chronic discontent of the people of that Island. It was believed by a small body of public men, that, without any general disturbance of the so-called Imperial system by which Great Britain and Ireland were held in union, a Parliamentary body might be properly permitted in the latter country, having jurisdiction and prerogative in all matters of local legislation. This would signify, in a word, that the vexed and vexing question which had so much disturbed the Great Parliament with respect to the affairs of Ireland might be remanded constitutionally to an Irish House of Commons, for satisfactory settlement.

As early as 1868, Disraeli himself, in a canvass of the country, had spoken of an agitation at that time appearing in Ireland for the measure afterwards known as Home Rule. An Irish political organization already had been elected under the name of the Home Rule League for the promotion of this cause. During the eighth decade which followed, and running beneath the events narrated in the preceding pages, was this new form of agitation. At length the parties in England began to consider the question, and to divide on the new issue presented in Irish politics. Meanwhile the Government got on its hands two petty African wars, an account of which will be given presently. The great conflict between Turkey and Russia came and went. In 1877 a period of business depression came, to be followed with that inevitable distress and discontent among the common people which always train after commercial panics and collapses. The winter of 1878 was one of great severity. There is one fact in modern society which, perhaps fortunately for the world, political parties can not explain away. No lie, however adroit, can make a hungry man believe that he is full. No loud-mouthed professions of devotion to the cause of the suffering on the part of a dominant faction in Government can make the sufferers follow longer the banners of pretenders. It is for this obvious reason that the days of distress are always days of political revolution. In 1878 and 1879 the poorer people of the kingdom, especially in Ireland, felt the pangs of hunger, and, resorting to the

sublime fallacy of pain, they laid the blame of their condition on the Conservative Government. Many other circumstances, which may not be enumerated here, added to the popular discontent and the consequent weakening of the Ministerial party.


As to the Liberals, we have seen how complete and dispiriting was their downfall in 1874. With the retirement of Gladstone no competent leader of the Opposition could be found, and the Liberal party went from bad to worse, until, in 1876 and 1877, it may be said to have reached the nadir. But it is in the nature of political vicissitudes that the bottom point of decline is the point of reaction and revival. The Liberals emerged at the very time when the Conservatives, weighed down by the unfortunate condition of the country, began to sink. The Home Rule agitation lay like a bank of clouds across St. George's Channel. The time had come; Gladstone suddenly loomed up from his retirement, where he had amused himself, in the meantime, with controversial essays against the Papacy, and challenged, not only the policy, but the existence of the Conservative Government. He defied the Ministry and dared them to submit themselves and their measures to the people. The challenge was not at the first accepted. The Parliament was already nearing its Constitutional limitation. At length the Ministers were rather provoked and taunted into a dissolution and an appeal to the people. The same occurred in March of 1880, and the elections followed soon afterwards. As soon as the results began to be declared, it was evident that one of the greatest political reactions ever known in England had taken place. The Conservatives were routed. When the smoke cleared up, and the footings were made, the triumphant Liberals came out of the contest with a majority of a hundred and twenty members, and the humiliation which they had suffered six years before was visited in double measure upon their opponents.

At the first, it seemed that the shock had been felt as high as the Throne itself. The Queen, in so far as she was permitted under the English Constitution to have political sentiments, was heartily with the Conservatives, and it may not be doubted that she felt

not only a woman's mortification, but a Queen's grief, at the Liberal triumph. Her feelings in this respect were still further wounded by the fact that Gladstone must again be called to the head of the Government. This result she was human enough to try to obviate. She first sent for Lord Hartington, and requested him to form a new Cabinet; but that nobleman was unwilling to assume a responsibility which he knew to belong to the great leader of the Liberals. The sovereign then called Lord Granville; but he also declined, for the same reason which had prevailed with Hartington. It only remained for the Queen to yield to the inevitable, and summon Gladstone again to power. This accordingly was done, and a new Ministry was constituted, into whose hands some of the most important issues of the age were remanded at once for solution.

But we may properly here turn aside from the stirring Parliamentary dramas about to be enacted, to present an outline of those two mimic African wars in which the British Government became involved during the ascendancy of Beaconsfield. The first of these was the Ashantee War. The petty African kingdom of Ashantee lies on the interior of the Gold Coast, eastward from Liberia. It comprises an area of about seventy thousand square miles, and a population of more than a million. The capital is Coomassie, at a considerable distance from the coast. Here the native monarch held his court in a sort of barbaric splendor. The Ashantee Kingdom was organized on the basis of a military aristocracy. A number of petty lords had each his local court and government. Many of the usages of the Ashantees are repulsive to the sentiments of Europeans. The practice of polygamy is universal, and the constitution of the kingdom assigns to the monarch an exact maximum of three thousand three hundred and thirty-three wives. The religion of the land demands human sacrifices, such offerings being made in the belief that the dead are in need of servants and attendants in the other world.


For a long time the Ashantees had held relations with the Dutch on the African coast. From them the King, by treaty, received an annual tribute in return for the advantages which the Dutch miners had in the country.



THE LIBERAL MINISTRY OF 1880.

In order to understand the situation we must take into consideration also the Fantees, whose territory lay between Ashantee Land and the Gulf of Guinea. The Ashantees and the Fantees were kinsmen by race descent, and had been in alliance, but at length became estranged and hostile. The territories of the two States were divided by the river Prah, and across this stream warlike excursions were frequently made, the one people into the country of the other. On two or three former occasions the English had been at war with the Ashantee

Ashantees to terms, compelling the king to pay an indemnity of six thousand ounces of gold, and to give up his son as a hostage. A British protectorate was established over Fantee Land, and all the other petty dependencies between the river Prah and the sea. In 1843 the Crown of England assumed the government of this part of the coast, and from that time forth there was mutual suspicion and mutual misunderstanding between the Europeans and the Ashantees. At length, in 1867, an arrangement was made between the En-



COOMASSIE.

nation, and in one conspicuous instance had suffered a disastrous and humiliating defeat. On the 7th of August, 1826, Sir Charles McCarthy, then in charge of British interests on the Gold Coast, fought a battle with the army of the Ashantee king, ten thousand strong, at Dudowah, was defeated by the negroes, and himself slain. Only about fifty men of the whole force succeeded in reaching the English head-quarters in Fantee Land, which was the base of operations.

Of course, Great Britain soon brought the

English and the Dutch, by which all the forts of the latter lying eastward of the Sweet River were surrendered to Great Britain, while all the English forts west of that river were given to the Dutch. By this transaction the king of Ashantee lost the annual stipend which had been paid to him for the rights of occupancy by the Dutch. As a consequence, he justly claimed that the English, in taking control in place of the Dutch, had assumed their obligations to himself. But this claim was disallowed or neglected by the

British authorities, and became the basis of hostility.

The immediate occasion of the outbreak of the war, however, was the act of one of the Ashantee chieftains, in decoying four Europeans into his town and making them prisoners. The British Governor demanded the surrender of these captives, and the demand was

By this act he was brought into direct contact with the British, and the Home Government was constrained to send out an army to bring the refractory nation to submission. The command of the expedition, which was sent out in the fall of 1873, was given to Sir Garnet Wolseley, who reached the Gold Coast in the beginning of October, and found an army of Ashantees, forty thousand strong, ready to oppose his progress. But if they had been four hundred thousand strong they could hardly, by their half-savage methods of warfare, have stayed the British invasion of their country.

On the 20th of January, in the following year, the English crossed the Prah, and entered Ashantee Land. They met and defeated the native army in two or three battles, and on the 4th of February reached Coomassie. The Ashantee king was now glad to make what terms he might with the conqueror. Everything must be done with the utmost haste. It was well known to Sir Garnet that a month's delay in that



GENERAL SIR GARNET WOLSELEY


refused by the Ashantee king. Several other circumstances aggravated the difficulty. The Fantees were in alliance with the English, or rather under their protection, and this fact was a source of alarm and jealousy on the part of the king of Ashantee. His ill-feeling grew to such a pitch that, early in 1873, he took the hazardous step of crossing the Prah with an army, thus invading the land of the Fantees.

region would be fatal to his army; for the fevers and other maladies to which Europeans were subject in the African summer were far more fatal than the exigencies of battle. The English commander accordingly exacted his terms in haste, and set out for the coast. Coomassie was burned. An indemnity of fifty thousand ounces of gold was agreed to by the king, and the latter was obliged to

renounce his claims of sovereignty over the petty States which had hitherto been subject to him. He was also obliged to grant freedom of trade between his capital and the coast, and to keep open the highway from Coomassie to the river Prah. Finally, he must agree to renounce and abolish the practice of human sacrifice. Sir Garnet Wolseley then retired from the country, and the expedition returned to England.

More important by far was the war with the Zulus of South-eastern Africa. Zulu

as it is sometimes written. For a considerable period he had been on terms of friendship and intimacy with the English, but was in constant difficulty with the Boers, or half-Dutch peoples of the adjacent Transvaal Republic. The same thing was true of other native tribes, some of whom were always at war with the Boers. It appears that the civil affairs of the Transvaal were badly managed. When Sir Theophilus Shepstone was sent out as Governor of the British colonies on this part of the African coast he was led to believe that



PONTOON BRIDGE OVER THE PRAH.

Land lies to the north of the colony of Natal. It has a sea-line of about a hundred and thirty miles, and includes among its population several important tribes. The country is to a great extent aboriginal in both its people and productions. The wild animals peculiar to the region represent several African types, such as the antelope, the rhinoceros, the hippopotamus, the buffalo, and the lion. The people are brave, warlike, energetic. At the time of the outbreak of the Zulu war, the king of the country was Cetwayo, or Cetswayo,

the Boers desired to pass under the dominion of Great Britain. He accordingly published a declaration to the effect that the Transvaal Republic had become a part of the British Dominion. It thus happened that England, by an act of usurpation, inherited the quarrels and difficulties of the Boers with their neighbors. The Zulus were greatly alarmed by the new aspect of affairs, and became suspicious and jealous of everything done by the Europeans in their part of the country.

One of the disputes between Zulu Land

and the Transvaal Republic was with respect to the ownership of a small territory lying between the two States. The matter was referred to the decision of British Commissioners, who made the award in favor of the Zulus. But the new British Governor, Sir Bartle Frere, refused or neglected to execute the terms of the settlement. Cetewayo was surprised and angered that the English authorities, after having decided the question in his favor, should be guilty of what seemed to him—and to all the world—to be an act of bad faith. Hostilities broke out. The English Governor demanded that the Zulu army should be disorganized and dispersed. Cetewayo refused to acquiesce, and the British forces began an invasion of the country of the Zulus. On the 23d of January, 1879, a

severe battle was fought and the English were utterly defeated. The disaster was humiliating in the last degree, and was, as a matter of course, soon retrieved. A new force under command of Lord Chelmsford, again marched into Zululand, routed



CETEWAYO, IN ENGLISH GARB

the barbarians, captured the king, and brought the war to an end before the middle of autumn. The native monarchy was abolished, and a civil government, known as the New Republic, was organized in its stead. As for the dethroned king, he was remanded to imprisonment, but the principal native chieftains, who had been his subjects, were permitted to remain in local authority.

One of the principal incidents of this petty and by no means honorable war, was the death, in one of the skirmishes with the Zulus, of the Prince Imperial of France. An account has already been given of the retirement of Napoleon III., with Eugenie and their son, to Chiselhurst, in England. There, for about seven years, the education of the Prince was conducted at the military school of Woolwich Arsenal. After his graduation he

would fain see actual warfare. The Prince appears to have had in him much sentiment and romance. When the Zulu war broke out, several of his classmates were in the army of Lord Chelmsford, and the Prince, at his own earnest request, was assigned to a place on the General's staff. In this relation he entered Zulu Land, and exhibited during the campaign much military spirit. He was assigned, on a certain occasion, to the command of a reconnoitering party, having the duty of determining the situation of affairs about twenty miles from camp. While on this expedition, his company was surrounded by a large force of Zulus, and in the effort to cut his way through, the Prince was killed. His body was taken back to England, and deposited in the Memorial Chapel at Chiselhurst, beside the sarcophagus of his father.


The death of the Prince was a severe shock, almost a death-blow, to the hopes of the Bonapartists of France, who had looked to the son of Napoleon III. as the embodiment and impersonation of all Imperial expectations for the future. But the world at large was less concerned with the political effect of the Prince's death than with the shocking calamity which it brought to the beautiful but now widowed ex-Empress of the French. To her the loss of her son was the final stroke. Nothing in history—that is, in its merely personal parts—is more melancholy and affecting than the spectacle of this lone woman, fallen from glory, a widow in a foreign land, stripped of her Imperial diadem, her husband dethroned and dead, and now, at last, her promising and gallant son cut down in the wild chaparral of South-eastern Africa, stabbed to death with twenty wounds, and hacked into mutilation with the assegais of the Zulus.

At the very time these events were occurring in South Africa, England found herself again at war in Afghanistan. The situation and relations of that country with respect to the British East Indian Empire have already been described. In every instance in which the Eastern Question, by disturbing the peace of Europe, has brought the ominous name of Russia to the attention of the Western Powers, Great Britain has taken the alarm with respect to her Indian frontier on the side of Afghanistan. The latter country

has seemed to Russia to constitute a sort of south-eastern passage into India, just as the Bosphorus has constituted the south-western passage into the countries of Southern Europe. The gravitation of the Russian Empire has pressed in both directions, bearing alike on the Panjab and the Ottoman dominions. In both directions the pressure had been distressing—as far as any physical force may be said to be

before. The conflict with Turkey seemed to imply another Anglo-Russian war, and the expectation of such an event was for a while rife in Great Britain.

It could not well be doubted that, in case of the outbreak of hostilities between England and Russia, the armies of the Czar would pour down by way of Persia, through Cabul or the passes of the Hindu Kush, and precipitate



HINDU KUSH MOUNTAINS

distressing—to Great Britain. For about fifty years she has suffered alarm and dread on account of her exposure in this direction. It was so on the occasion of the difficulties which culminated in the Turco-Russian War. The aggressions of Russia brought to England serious apprehensions that the settlement which followed the Crimean invasion of 1855 would have to be reviewed by the same methods as

themselves on India. It was therefore of great hypothetical importance to the British Government to hold Cabul as an outpost and dependency against Russian aggression. It will be remembered that after the overthrow of Dost Mohammed, the government of Cabul finally went to his son, called Shere Ali. It was now deemed of importance that an English mission and embassy should be estab-

lished at the court of Shere Ali, so that the Home Government might be constantly informed of the movements of Russia in that remote region, and more generally that the influence of Great Britain might be and remain paramount in Afghanistan.

To this end it was arranged that an expedition in the character of a peaceable embassy,

Peshawur, in September of 1878, and came to the frontier lines dividing Afghanistan from India. Here they were met by messengers from Shere Ali, interdicting the further advance. Since the British Embassy came in a peaceable character, the forbidding of its progress into Cabul was easily construed into an insult and act of hostility. As a matter of fact,



SHERE ALI.

but really bearing with it the potency of war, should be despatched from India to Cabul. It was known that the Russian Government had either sent or was about to send an ambassador of its own to the court of Shere Ali, and the English were determined not to be behind in establishing their mission at the same place. The expedition accordingly set out from

the expedition at once took the character of an invasion, and the movement, supported by military force, continued until Cabul was again occupied by British soldiers. Another division of the army took possession of Candahar, and the Government was soon in condition to dictate its own terms of settlement.

At this juncture Shere Ali died, and was

succeeded by his son, Yakoob Khan. The latter made haste to confer with the British authorities, and at a place called Gandamak a new treaty was made and signed, on the 5th of May, 1879. It was agreed that the Ameer should grant new boundary-lines for British

should support that country against all foreign enemies. The establishment of the English mission at Cabul was also granted by the Ameer, and Sir Lewis Cavagnari became the representative of England at the Court of Yakoob Khan. Everything seemed to have



HAZARAH, FROM NORTHERN HIGHLANDS.—AFGHAN WARRIOR.

India, and that he should be compensated for the cession by the payment from the treasury of British India of sixty thousand pounds. It was also agreed that, for the concessions thus gained by Great Britain, she should hereafter regard Cabul as under her protectorate, and

turned out in perfect accord with the plans and purposes of Great Britain.

Scarcely, however, had the English Embassy been planted in Cabul until a revolt broke out, very similar to that which had happened in the case of Sir Alexander Burnes, in

the days of Dost Mohammed. The English representatives and other officers in Cabul :

ghanistan to quell the insurrection. The English forces a second time fought their way without serious resistance to Cabul, which was entered and taken on the 24th of December, 1879. Yakoub Khan was, of course, deposed, made prisoner, and sent to India to await his trial on a charge of perfidy and massacre. The rebellion was completely suppressed, and British garrisons were established in the country to hold, as if it were an outpost, the conquered province of Cabul.



YAKOUB KHAN.

were attacked by the insurgents and murdered. The atrocity was in every respect shocking, and another British army had to be sent into Af-

raeli to the Liberals under Gladstone; and the issues arising from the controversy have not, to the present day, been satisfactorily adjusted.

CHAPTER CXXXIV.—BATTLE FOR HOME RULE.



WITH the opening of the Parliamentary session of 1881 began the last great contest with which the recent history of England is concerned respecting the civil and domestic condition of Ireland. The Home Rule party, as

a party, now made its formal apparition in the House of Commons. On most questions of national policy the new party was in natural sympathy with the Liberal Ministry, and on the Irish question the Liberals were in natural sympathy with the new party; but the vicissitudes of politics destroyed, or reversed, these natural relations. The Home Rulers

were brought around to the side of the Conservatives in opposition to the Government, and the Gladstone Ministry had to content itself with Liberal support only. At the head of the Home Rule party appeared a new leader in the person of Charles Stewart Parnell. The body of his following was made up exclusively of Irishmen, many of them poor men and of small reputation in the political world, while a few, such as the historian McCarthy and Mr. Shaw, were already leaders of note and influence. All, however, were profoundly devoted to the cause of Ireland, and to this cause every other principle, every other policy, was made subservient.

In the Government, that is, in the Ministry, the Home Rulers had no part or lot. At the first the irrefaction was, as much as possible, ignored by both the dominant parties, but this method of dealing with the men of one idea soon had to be abandoned. A state of affairs

had now supervened in Ireland which could no longer be put aside or hidden under the cloaks of the Ministry. Suffering had come—want, distress, passion, rebellion, hatred, every specter that arises at the conjuration of tyranny, around the huts of the lowly. The celebrated Land League was formed, having for its object the alleviation of the hardships of the Irish ten-

antry, without much regard to the existing laws. Crime began to express the prevailing sense of the people. Outrages were done to life and property, and the Government was obliged, by the mere stress of the existing conditions, to take up the difficulties of Ireland, to present therefor some sort of remedy.

In January, 1881, it was thought necessary to



CHARLES STEWART PARNELL

pass a Coercion Bill against the Irish tenants and members of the League, whose lawless, or at least unlawful, proceedings took constantly a bolder form. The measure proposed was, in its leading principle, a suspension of the *Habeas Corpus*, permitting the officers, in any district designated by the Lord-Lieutenant, to arrest and imprison without judicial

process the disturbers of the peace. At the same time a new Land Bill was announced, which was merely an extension and amendment of the Act of 1870, by which the tenant-right of Ulster had been made the standard for the whole of Ireland. With the introduction of these measures into Parliament, the Home Rulers adopted the policy of Obstruction: that is, they systematically impeded the consideration and passage of the bills by every parliamentary artifice and expedient known to English usage. The Constitution of the House of Commons was such as to give great liberty in this respect. In that body everything had hitherto been conceded to the freedom of debate and the rights of the minority. There was no rule for the "previous question," or other expedient for bringing a pending question to vote, so long as a member continued to debate it or offer amendment thereto. Even the motion for "closing the debate" at a given time was amendable, and might itself be debated.

The Home Rulers in Parliament at this time numbered thirty-seven. They determined that the Coercion Bill should not be brought to a vote, and from the 6th of January to the 2d of March the debate was prolonged. It was seen by the Ministry that some measure, even if it were without precedent and actually unconstitutional, must be adopted in order that the will of the majority might be legally expressed. The method finally employed was found in the prerogative of the Speaker. It was agreed that, on the 2d of March, he should arbitrarily announce that the debate was closed, and that the vote should thereupon be taken. This was accordingly done against the uproarious opposition, the protests, and cries of "privilege," on part of the Home Rulers. The Bill was carried, and measures were at once instituted under its provisions for the suppression of violence in Ireland.

On the day following the passage of the Coercion Bill the leaders of the Irish party were forcibly expelled from the House of Commons, and at length three of the members, including Parnell and O'Brien, were thrown into prison, where they remained until the following year. It is in the nature of British public opinion to undergo reaction, to take on a different complexion under every change of

condition, and to express the altered state of affairs in some new political theory. No sooner had the Government triumphed over the Home Rulers, no sooner were the leaders imprisoned, than sympathy for them and their cause began to be expressed, not only by the public, but in the Ministry itself. The composition of the Liberal party at this time was peculiar. The members composing it were graduated in their political opinions all the way down from a strict conservatism at the one extreme to a rank radicalism at the other. The Liberals of the latter type had all along been in sympathy with the Irish cause. There was danger that Gladstone would lose largely by disintegration on both wings of his army. On the whole, he himself inclined towards the Radical and Reformatory camp; but for a while the exigencies of the Government required of him a prudent conservatism, lest he might lose what may be called the upper division of the Liberal party.

The Government now went on with other legislative enactments bearing on the Irish cause. The Land Bill was passed, by which it was hoped to stop the clamor of the Irish tenantry. It was soon seen, however, that the measure was of little avail. What would at a former period have satisfied the tenants was now, when they were aroused to the point of war, neglected and disregarded by them as a scheme to defraud them of their rights. The cry had now been raised for the absolute nationalization of the Irish lands, which meant, of course, the destruction of the very principle of English landlordism. The foreign landtenure became ever more precarious. Partly by the poverty of the people, and partly by recusancy, the rents fell into arrears. There was almost a universal refusal to pay any longer the immemorial tax which the peasants owed to the landlords. Violence became the order of the day. Outrages against life and property multiplied. Evictions were resisted, and it seemed at times that the foreign domination was about to be ended by a universal insurrection of the peasants against their masters. In a single month, in the summer of 1882, no fewer than five hundred and thirty-one outrages were reported against the system of foreign landlordism and that status in Ireland by which landlordism was upheld.

It was in this condition of affairs that the astute Gladstone perceived the necessity of a change of policy. The Coercion Bill expired in October of 1882. It had proved a signal failure. The Arms Bill, under the provisions of which the Irish people were to be disarmed, and which had resulted in the surrender of their weapons by all the better classes, and in the concealment of arms by the lawless and the criminal, had also completely failed of the intended results. All the measures which the Government had thus far taken to suppress violence, restore order, bring the country again into a state of contentment, or even acquiescence, had proved abortive. The Land League seemed about to triumph over Parliament and the country.

It was at this juncture, that communications were begun between Gladstone and Parnell, who was still in prison. An alleged "treaty" was formed between the two, in which it was understood that the Irish leader would be content with a bill abolishing Arrears of Rent, and with a just extension of tenant rights. These being conceded, the Home Rulers would join the Government in the attempt to restrain the Land League, or rather the lawless adherents of that body, from further violence and crime. It was in April of 1882 that Gladstone threw out the first hints in the House of Commons that a new policy might be expected, and that the release of the Irish prisoners was contemplated as a measure of pacification. By this time the Irish jails were well filled with persons who had been arrested on suspicion under the suspension of Habeas Corpus, and in accordance with the Coercion Bill. More than eight hundred persons, many of them of excellent character, had been imprisoned. It was known to the Government that it was needless to bring the suspected persons to trial before Irish juries. Of a certainty, such juries would never convict their fellow-countrymen of crime for committing acts in which they themselves had either actually participated, or with which they were in sympathy. The law in such cases required that the jury should be drawn from the vicinage, and this assured to the prisoners a trial before their neighbors and friends. The Government, therefore, was obliged to hold the suspected persons by a suspension of the Habeas

Corpus; but this could not continue forever; and now for the first time the policy of conciliation was to be tried.

Unfortunately, at this very juncture, an event occurred which threatened to undo the very history and tendency of the times. In the lawless period, which it was hoped was now about to close, many murders and assassinations had been committed. At the time of which we speak Lord Frederick Cavendish, who was holding the position of Financial Secretary of the Treasury, was appointed Chief Secretary for Ireland, to succeed Mr. Forster, whose antipathy to the Irish cause had been so great as to lead to this change in official relations. With Lord Cavendish as under-Secretary, was appointed Thomas Henry Burke, a man of distinction, who was also supposed to be friendly to Ireland. The new officers were sent out, and arrived in Dublin. On the evening of the 6th of May, 1882, as they were driving in Phoenix Park, in that city, they were attacked by four murderers, partly disguised under slouched hats. It is thought that Mr. Burke was the first to fall under the knives of the assassins. It appeared that Lord Cavendish sought to defend his friend from the assault, and, in doing so, he too was stabbed to death. Many persons were sitting or walking within a few hundred feet of where the crime was committed, and yet the assassins were enabled to mount a car and drive from the park without discovery. A considerable quantity of gold coin, bank-notes, and other valuables were found on the bodies of the murdered men, and it was perceived from the first that the assassination had been for political, and not for mercenary, motives.

A great sensation was produced by this event throughout Ireland and Great Britain. It was natural, inevitable, that the crime should be charged to the Land League, Parnell, Davitt, and others who might speak authoritatively for that association, made haste to deny for it all connection with the murder of Cavendish and Burke, and to denounce the crime in the strongest terms. Nevertheless, the Land Leaguers and the Home Rule party had to bear the odium of the assassination. As a matter of fact, the Land League, as such, was organized on a plane altogether too high for the patronage or justification of such deeds

as that done in Phoenix Park. But the organization had drawn after it the very draft and offal of Irish discontent. Such associations must needs have about them a *penumbra* of crime. They are created for the correction of abuses, the removal of oppression, the attainment of justice. But all this implies that there is abuse, oppression, injustice; and these, in their turn, imply that kind of resistance which, in the hands of the ignorant and vile, takes the form of crime.

The murder of the Irish Secretaries, in the country to which they had been sent, was a great shock to the Government. Parnell had now been liberated from prison, and soon returned to his place in the House of Commons. In that body violent denunciations were poured upon his head, and it was demanded of him and his colleagues that they should wash their hands and the hands of the League of all complicity in the great crime. The course of Parnell was such as might have been expected from a brave, high-spirited man. In his reply he scarcely deigned to disclaim knowledge or participation on the part of himself and his friends in the assassination of Cavendish and Burke, saying that all defense of himself and his party, and of the principles of his party, was impossible in such a court as the English Parliament. His cause was prejudged. His judges were his enemies and the enemies of his people; nor was he anxious under such circumstances to justify himself at the bar of British opinion. At that bar he was condemned already—both he and his cause. He was responsible only to the people of Ireland. It was to the public opinion of that country that he made his appeal. Crime was crime, by whomsoever committed. As for the rest, he stood for the cause of an oppressed people. For that cause he had suffered an unjust imprisonment, and for that cause he and his party were now maligned, slandered, and reduced to the category of criminals.

It could but be that the Irish party suffered greatly in the ordeal through which they now passed. It could but be that the Government was held back from its natural gravitation in the direction of Home Rule, and it could but be that the justice and reasonableness of the position held by Parnell and his associates must become constantly more evident even in

the high places of England. The embarrassment of the Ministerial party was extreme. They had a fair working majority through the whole of 1882, and the same in 1883; but the incidental elections which occurred at intervals in Ireland showed that the Land League was predominant in that country over all other forces combined. The Home Rule party gained at the Irish elections, and their numbers increased to over seventy. It was evident that their strength was likely, ere long, to enable them to hold the balance of power between the two major parties in Parliament, and thus virtually either to direct the course of legislation, or to stop proceedings altogether.

It can not be doubted that in this situation of affairs the Liberal party, though in the majority, had before it the alternative either of depending on the Conservatives for support against the common enemy, or else of entering into combination with that enemy in order to keep the Conservatives from again coming into power. As for the Home Rulers themselves, they had one definite object in view, and that was the nationalization of Ireland. To this, with them, all other questions were subordinate. For this they were willing to enter into combinations with any party soever, so that their one great end might be attained. It could hardly be doubted, however, that Gladstone himself, whose influence over the Liberals was so great as to constitute an authority, would never enter into a treaty with the Conservative leaders against the Irish cause. It became, therefore, a question when and how the Parnellites and the Liberals would combine in the work of a radical reform on behalf of Ireland.

Such, in general, was the aspect of English history from the Parliamentary side in the year 1883. During the session which extended to the beginning of summer in that year, the condition of parties and of policies was not materially altered. The attention of the Home Government began to be drawn to the very serious consideration of the affairs of Egypt. In that country a war had broken out, some account of which will be given near the conclusion of the present chapter. In Ireland the policy of the Government had done something toward the restoration of order. The outrages, for which the preceding year

had been memorable, were in great measure suppressed; but it could not be said that the determination of the Home Rulers was weakened or in any wise diverted from their one great object. Then followed the vacation of Parliament during the summer months, and until the beginning of October.

At the next session the Parnellites were in full force. An element of weakness had, in the meantime, made its appearance in the Society of Orangemen, who, being Protestant, and seeing their Catholic fellow-countrymen wholly given up to the work of land reform and nationalization, naturally fell into their traditional opposition. The Irish leaders sought zealously, during the after part of 1884, to allay the merely religious prejudices of their countrymen, to the end that a united Ireland might compel the English Ministry to the adoption of such measures as the Home Rulers advocated. In the meantime, a serious break had occurred in the Government on the memorial question of the franchise. It had been determined by the Ministry, in answer to the call of the country, that still another effort should be made for the more complete enfranchisement of the English people. It had been found that even the Liberal measures of 1867 required revision and amplification to meet the demands of the working-classes of Englishmen. A new Franchise Bill was accordingly prepared, and passed by a decisive majority through the House of Commons. As has always happened in the case of such legislation, the House of Lords disapproved of the proposed extension of the suffrage, and in this particular case refused their assent to the Bill. The Ministry had to accept the defeat of their measure for the time, and it was only after an additional Act covering the distribution, or, as Americans would say, the reapportionment of the new seats provided for under the Franchise Act had been adopted, that the Lords withdrew their opposition, and assented to the measure as a whole.

But by this time the foreign relations of Great Britain had become so critical as to demand the best skill of the Government in the prevention of great wars. For a season, it appeared that England and Russia were to try their prowess on the side of India. Egypt was in an uproar. Khartoum fell, and Charles

George Gordon went to his death at the hands of the Mahdi's assassins. All these things called for immediate and extraordinary exertions. Armies must be at once equipped and sent to Egypt. The strain upon the Ministry became extreme. The Government was accused of all manner of neglect with respect to British interests in the East, particularly in Egypt. The London *Times* cried out that no words were sufficient to express the disgust of the people at the weakness and folly of the Administration. "The country," said that organ of Conservative opinion, "is obliged to confess that everything has been done that could be done to add to the risks of defeat. Advice has been spurned, time wasted, and opportunity lost."

The Queen, in her speech to Parliament, had indicated the necessity for greatly increased expenses, and, to provide for these, it became necessary to increase the revenues of the Kingdom. A new budget was presented in June of 1885, in which the policy of the Government was defined. It was proposed that the increased expenditure of the ensuing year should be met by placing a duty of a shilling a gallon on beer, to be retained for one year from the date of the Act. The measure was advocated by the Secretary of the Exchequer, but the Conservatives opposed the budget on the ground that all the additional expenditure could have been provided for by a slight increase of the duties on tea and the light wines. It was argued that ale and beer were the drinks of the common people, and that the Ministerial Bill proposed to put on them the expenses of the Egyptian war. The debate on the adoption of the budget was concluded by Gladstone on the evening of the 5th of June, when the Bill was put on its second reading in the House of Commons. Much to the surprise of the country at large, and in all probability to the Government itself, the budget was rejected by a majority of twelve votes. Precedent has established the rule in the British Parliament, that a defeat of the budget signifies the end of the Ministry proposing it. It is not clear that such was the intent of the House of Commons in the present instance; but Gladstone, nevertheless, determined to follow the precedent, and he and his fellow-Ministers accordingly

tendered their resignations to the Queen. The same were accepted by Her Majesty, who immediately sent for the Marquis of Salisbury, and intrusted him with the duty of forming a new Conservative Ministry.

Such was another remarkable example of the vicissitude which may be expected at intervals in the political history of Great Britain. It would have been thought impossible, only a few months before, that the Gladstone Government could be overthrown

fixed upon domestic questions, and, in particular, on the establishment of some satisfactory and permanent policy for the settlement of the difficulties with Ireland. This withdrawal of the attention of the Government from the multifarious foreign complications in which the whole modern history of England is involved, contributed to the disaster of Khartoum, left the public mind uncertain as to the ability of the existing Government to cope with the trouble in Afghanistan, and led to

the withdrawal of the support of thirty or forty members of the Liberal party from the Ministry in the matter of the budget. Though the proposition of the Government to increase the revenues by the taxation of beer and spirits was eminently proper, though the Ministry, with all of its outside difficulties and inside disensions, was still full of vitality and force, the Conservatives and the Parnellites, by combining their cohorts and gaining a modicum of support from disaffected Liberals, succeeded in overwhelming the Government with an adverse vote on the budget, and the Gladstone Ministry was at an end.

The Ministerial crisis in the British system frequently signifies the defeat of the victors. In the present case, the triumph of the Conservative party was of dubious import. The victory was achieved in the very face of impend-

ing measures which threatened to divide and wreck the Liberal party. The time had arrived when it was necessary either to abandon or renew the Suppression of Crimes Act, under the operation of which the peace, or at least the quiet, of Ireland had been for a while secured. It was the disposition of the Gladstonians with respect to reviving this measure that led the Parnellites to vote with the Conservatives against the Ministerial budget. It was clear that the Home Rule

ing measures which threatened to divide and wreck the Liberal party. The time had arrived when it was necessary either to abandon or renew the Suppression of Crimes Act, under the operation of which the peace, or at least the quiet, of Ireland had been for a while secured. It was the disposition of the Gladstonians with respect to reviving this measure that led the Parnellites to vote with the Conservatives against the Ministerial budget. It was clear that the Home Rule



MARQUIS OF SALISBURY.

party would prove to the Salisbury Government a broken reed. Little were the Parnellites concerned about anything except the cause of Ireland, and that was the very issue which the Conservatives, more than the Liberals, would have avoided. The Home Rulers had thus at last worked their way into a position where they could defeat and overthrow a Ministry of either party at will, and it became evident that their political aim was to beat down first one, and then the other, until the cause of Home Rule for Ireland should be at length adopted by one of the parties as a means of keeping itself in power.

There was another reason, also, why the Earl of Salisbury hesitated under such conditions to accept the responsibility of the Government. The Parliament of 1880 had now nearly expired, and a new election was at hand. Gladstone himself had foreseen the impending struggle before the people, and it is not improbable that he was less averse to the adverse vote on his budget than might have been supposed. Be that as it may, it was clear that, during the remainder of the existing Parliament, the Salisbury Ministry must adopt a temporizing and conciliatory policy with the Irish party, and, by vigor abroad and Conservatism at home, win, if possible, from the Gladstonians a victory at the ensuing election. In the canvass that followed, there was a disposition on the part of both Conservatives and Liberals to ignore and gloss over the one great question of the day, namely, the settlement of the issue raised and defended with so much vigor by the Home Rulers. Parnell was now supreme in the management of his party. He passed the word to his following that everywhere and under all circumstances they should strike at the Liberal majorities, and reduce or reverse them wherever they might.

The elections were held for a new House of Commons in December of 1886. The question really was whether the Liberals would be able to obtain a majority of all the seats in the House. Soon after, the elections began; and as the first reports came in from the center of England, the Conservatives gathered a transient hope that they might be victorious, but the news from the country-side destroyed all such expectations. From Wales and Scotland the news came of great Liberal gains, and the

aggregate result in Great Britain showed a majority of about eighty for the Liberal party. But the Irish elections turned everything to confusion. In all that country, *not a single Liberal was elected!* Out of the one hundred and three Irish seats in the Commons, fewer than twenty were won by the Conservatives. Dublin University sent two of these, and nearly all the remainder were from the extreme North, in Ulster. Parnell came out of the battle with a compact body of eighty-five followers.

The politicians and statesmen were now easily able, by a few figures, to count the probabilities. Should the Parnellites, in the new Parliament combine with the Conservatives, they would be able to bear down the Liberals with a small majority of about five votes; but should they combine with the Liberals, the majority over the Conservative party and the Salisbury Ministry would be nearly a hundred and seventy. Such was the situation of affairs at the opening of the Parliamentary session in January of 1886.

It now remained to be seen what course the Earl of Salisbury would take in his endeavor to conduct a minority Government. The development of tendencies at the opening of the session was awaited with intense interest by the nation. It was clear to all that the Irish question could no longer be thrust into the background, except by a coalition of the two dominant parties against the third; and it was equally clear that such a combination could never be effected. The debates began over the answer of the House to the speech of the Queen. Before the discussion was closed, the Prime Minister gave notice of the intention of the Government to introduce, at an early day, a bill for the further repression of the Irish land-troubles on the line of coercion and punishment. It was foreseen by the Liberals that they themselves would be placed at a disadvantage by having either to support or oppose a measure like that suggested by Salisbury. It was therefore deemed expedient to bring the matter to a crisis by immediately overthrowing the Ministry. This was done on a motion to amend the address to the Queen, on which the Parnellites voted to a man with the Liberals, and though the latter lost a few votes from their own calendar

by disaffection the Government was overwhelmed, and the Ministers resigned.

It now remained to be seen whether a new Liberal Ministry could be formed, which should be able to command a majority of the House

of Commons. The Government consisted of: Earl Spencer, President of the Council; H. C. E. Childers, Home Secretary; Earl Rosebery, Secretary for Foreign Affairs; Earl Granville, Secretary for the Colonies; Earl

Timberley, Secretary for India; Campbell-Bannerman, Secretary for War; Sir William Vernon-Harcourt, Chancellor of the Exchequer; the Marquis of Ripon, First Lord of the Admiralty; Joseph Chamberlain, President of the Government Board; George Otto Trevelyan, Secretary for Scotland; A. J. Mundella, President of the Board of Trade; and John Morley, Chief Secretary for Ireland.

But it was not so much with the constitution of the new Ministry as with the Irish policy which was to be proposed thereby, that the public was now concerned. For a considerable period it had been noised abroad that Gladstone was gradually inclining in his sympathies and opinions to the cause of Home Rule in Ireland. It was observed on the first night of the session that Parnell's speech could only be interpreted as signifying the probable support of the Liberals by the Irish party, and the probable support of Home Rule principles by the



WILLIAM E. GLADSTONE.

on matters relating to the Irish question. Gladstone was, as a matter of course, and out of the necessity of the situation, recalled to the place of Prime Minister. Sir Farrer Herschell was made Lord High Chancellor;

formerly. The event justified the anticipation. Gladstone at once devoted himself to the preparation of an elaborate scheme for the establishment of an Irish Parliament, and the virtual concession of nationality to the Irish people. The

plan proposed contemplated the continuance of the National Union of Ireland and Great Britain, under the Government of the Crown and the Imperial Parliament at London. The Prime Minister elaborated a scheme which was perhaps the most extensive, not to say revolutionary, of any single measure proposed in Parliament since the accession of Victoria. The matter came speedily to an issue. In June of 1886 the question was debated before the House of Commons, the speech of Gladstone himself being awaited with the greatest interest, not only by the British public, but by the people of all Western Europe and America. In the latter country, the daily press of the following morning presented American readers with a report verbatim of the Prime Minister's address, in which he defended and advocated with the greatest ability the establishment of Home Rule for Ireland. When the question went to vote, it was not yet certainly known whether or not the Ministerial Bill had carried; but the division showed a negative result. The Ministerial measure was beaten by a small and indecisive majority. This was effected by the combined votes of the Conservatives and those of nearly a hundred Liberals, who refused to follow the majority of their party on the question before the House and the country.

The break in the Liberal party proved to be hopeless, and, since the Irish question was now uppermost in all men's minds, the Gladstone Ministry passed from power. At first, however, Parliament was prorogued, and the question at issue was remanded to the people. It could hardly be hoped that, under existing conditions, the policy of Gladstone could gain from the country a more emphatic indorsement than he and his party had received at the late election. It only remained for the Prime Minister to resign his office. The beginning of 1887 found matters in a condition of chaos. Though the Earl of Salisbury was presently recalled to the head of the Government, though the Conservative party, with the aid of the so-called Liberal-Unionists—a division made up of those who had broken away from their allegiance to the Gladstone Ministry—were able for the next two years to maintain a doubtful ascendancy over the Liberals and Parnellites, yet it was an ascendancy

gained by sufferance rather than by conquest. As to the Irish question, it remained and still remains,¹ unsettled, and the year 1889 witnessed the remarkable maneuver of a negotiation between the Parnellites and the Earl of Salisbury's Government with respect to a proposal by the latter of some measure at the ensuing session of Parliament conceding, in some limited form, the principle of Home Rule for Ireland.

The year 1887 was memorable for the celebration of the jubilee or fiftieth anniversary of the accession of Queen Victoria. It had not been often in the history of England that such an event had been possible. Only in two or three instances had so long a reign occurred, or one on the whole so benign in its character and tendencies. The Queen herself had been a popular sovereign, though this is said rather of English society—by which is meant the upper third of the people—than of the masses at large. The principal day of Her Majesty's Semi-centennial was, of course, the 21st of June—that being the anniversary of the accession—and the principal scene of the home celebration, the Abbey of Westminster. On that day and to that place the Queen was conducted by her sons, her sons-in-law, and her grandsons, as a guard of honor. About ten thousand persons assembled at the Abbey to participate in the ceremonies. Representatives from all the reigning Houses in Europe and from the Governments of the New World. London was splendidly decorated for the occasion, and the other cities of the United Kingdom expressed their loyalty with a variety of festivities and celebrations. The Poet Laureate, now become Baron Tennyson, honored the occasion with a personal poem addressed to Her Majesty. From the center the jubilee spirit extended into all the British colonies of the world; and from the foot-hills of Burmah to where the mountains of British Columbia look down on the Pacific, the Queen's name and reign were remembered with congratulation and festivals.

The present chapter may be appropriately concluded with a sketch of the recent relations of Great Britain and Egypt. At the begin-

¹At the beginning of 1890.

ning of the ninth decade of the century, it might almost be said that Egypt was a foreign dependency of the British Empire. The preponderance of the influence of the English Government in South-eastern Africa at this epoch, and for some time previously, may be referred to two general considerations. The first of these was the long-standing policy of

integral part of the Ottoman dominions; and yet the Egyptian Government had its origin and authority from Constantinople.

The Egyptian Viceroy had no constant rank or power. Sometimes they were merely satraps of the Sultan, and sometimes they reached the condition of semi-independence. But whatever the character of the Govern-

ment might be, Great Britain held to the policy of supporting the existing order, believing, as she did, that this course was conducive to the integrity of her eastern line of defense against the aggressions of Russia.

In the second place, a financial reason existed for the support given by England to Egypt. The latter country had become indebted in several ways to England and to English capitalists. A large part of the bonds representing the Egyptian debt were held in Great Britain, and the revolutionary tendencies in Egypt seemed constantly to threaten the validity of the bonds. The principle of international law which decrees the integrity



ALFRED TENNYSON

of Great Britain in upholding the independence and autonomy of Turkey. This theory carried with it the maintenance of Egypt as a Province of the Turkish Empire. The expression "Province of the Turkish Empire," however, is too exact to express the dependent relations of the different countries under the general sway of the Sultan. In the case of Egypt, it could not be said that the country was an

of a debt through the vicissitudes of revolution, making each successive Government responsible for the valid indebtedness of its predecessor, and which denies the confiscability of national bonds, was not sufficiently well recognized in Egypt to make the obligations of the Government to England perfectly secure; and this fact constituted a powerful reason for upholding the existing status.

Something of the same reasons existed in the case of France. She also had a large fund invested in Egypt. The Suez Canal was the product of French capital. France had in general cooperated with Great Britain, under the theory that the integrity of the Turkish Empire should be maintained in all its parts. Such were the conditions which made it expedient, if not necessary, for England and France to assume a sort of protectorate over Egypt as a part of their international policy, and as a means of protecting their interests in the East. This policy, however, was much more ably and persistently followed by Great Britain than by the French Government; but in course of time the English ascendancy in Egypt aroused the jealousy of France, and led to an effort on her part to regain her relative influence in the Nile Valley. For a considerable period the Egyptian Khedive had had an arrangement with France and England by which the latter countries exercised what was called Financial Control of the affairs of Egypt. This condition remained in force until 1883, when Lord Dufferin, who had been sent from Constantinople to Egypt as the representative of British interests in that country, secured the withdrawal of the "Control," to the end that a greater autonomy might be secured to the local government in the management of its own affairs.

No adequate understanding, however, may be had of the general condition of Egypt in our day, without noting the historical progress of the country during the larger part of the century. At the time of the Napoleonic invasion, Egypt was broken up into petty Muslim principalities, having little coherence or governmental unity. The general consequence of the shock given to the land of the Pharaohs by the impact of Europeanism was to bring about the ascendancy of Mehemet Ali, and the establishment of his house as the reigning dynasty down to our own time. We have seen how nearly, at one or two crises, this able General and statesman succeeded in securing the complete autonomy and independence of his country and people. At the close of the fourth decade he seemed, indeed, on the eve of actually reversing the relative places of Cairo and Constantinople. In 1840 the Turkish Empire was saved from dismem-

berment only by the actual intervention of the Great Powers, staying the progress of Egyptian arms in Syria, and rendering of no avail the great victories of Homs, Konieh, and Nizib, in the latter of which battles Ibrahim Pasha, son of Mehemet Ali, overthrew and dispersed a Turkish army of eighty thousand men.

The veteran Mehemet, already more than seventy years of age, next turned his attention to the revision of the constitution and laws of Egypt, working after models which he had drawn from the great governments of Europe. Nearly all the methods of administration which the inquirer discovers to-day as the springs of civil action in Egypt were devised by Mehemet Ali. He established new systems of taxation, revised the customs-duties, arranged the laws of quarantine, patronized manufactories, planted colleges of languages and of medicine, and introduced printing-presses and journalism as a means of disseminating information and creating a public opinion in a country long dominated by the grossest forms of Orientalism. In the last years of his life he visited Constantinople, was there received with many marks of distinction, and was honored with the title of Vizier.

When the Western Powers came, as we have just seen, to the rescue of Turkey, and forced Egypt back from her course of development, the terms of dependency upon the Porte were made as mild as possible. It was agreed that Mehemet Ali should retain for himself and his successors the Pashalic of Egypt, on the simple condition of the payment of one-fourth of his net revenues to the Sultan. The subordinate conditions of the settlement were that the Turkish fleet, which had been treacherously surrendered to the Egyptians, should be restored; that Syria, which had been gained by conquests, should be given up; and that the standing army of Egypt should be limited to eighteen thousand men. Already, Mehemet and his son Ibrahim had succeeded in reducing the rebellious Egyptian Beys to subjection, and a considerable degree of unity had been attained in the Government.

Ibrahim Pasha acceded to his father's political honors and authority, in 1844, and continued in office until his death, four years afterwards. The veteran Mehemet lived a few

months longer, and the Government of Egypt descended to his nephew, Abbas Pasha, whose character reverted to the Oriental type, with many disastrous consequences to the Egyptian people. His death, in 1854, was hailed as a deliverance, and the reaction which followed brought the fourth son of Mehemet Ali, Said Pasha, to the throne. It was under his reign that the concession was made to France of the right and opportunity to construct the Suez Canal. The abilities of Said were, however, not as great as his political principles were salutary. At his death, in 1863, the crown descended to his nephew Ismail, who, with his title of Khedive, granted to him in 1866 by an Imperial firman, was destined to a long and important reign. Nearly all of the events in the recent history of Egypt, in which European and American readers are likely to find interest and instruction, have happened during the Administration of Ismail Khedive. He continued in power until 1879, when he was deposed by the Porte at the instigation of France and England. This action was deemed essential to the interests of the Western Powers in securing that financial control of the country to which we have referred above. The title of Khedive was transferred to Mohammed Tewfik. A new system of liquidation for the Egyptian creditors was devised on the basis of a four-and-a-half per cent. fund, that rate being agreed to by France and England jointly.

Without pausing to notice in this connection the events of Ismail's reign, we may here refer to the decisive effect of his deposition from power. The foreign intervention was, from the first, hateful to the large and growing class of intelligent Egyptians who desired the freedom and independence of their country. It can not be doubted that the objection to Ismail on the part of England and France was his too great independence of character and his desire that Egypt might be first of all for the Egyptians. On the other hand, Tewfik was thought to be sufficiently subservient. History is not the place for tirade and denunciation, but every calm-minded and just patriot in all the world must be shocked and angered at this spectacle of the suppression and abuse of a helpless country and people by means of the imbecility of the Viceroy, and for merely

mercenary considerations. The Egyptians found themselves subject to a foreign bonded debt, the financial control of their country assumed by the holders of that debt, and themselves reduced to the rank of hewers of wood and drawers of water for capitalists more than three thousand miles away.

It was not long, under these circumstances, until the mutterings of discontent were heard. In February of 1881, some regiments of the Egyptian army stationed at Cairo carried a petition to the Khedive, demanding the dismissal of one of the ministers, justice for the soldiers, and a general reform for the people. This movement was heartily ratified by the Egyptians generally. Other petitions were sent in to the Government, and the army was exhorted to maintain the honor of the country. A leader of both soldiers and people appeared in the person of Ahmed el Arabi, who became at once the recognized chief of what was henceforth known as the National party. The movement resulted in a general uprising of the native Egyptians against all the foreign oppression and distresses under which Egypt had long been groaning. The Khedive at first yielded to the pressure, and in September of 1881 a new Ministry was appointed in harmony with the popular demands. Arabi himself, who had hitherto been a Bey, was raised to the rank of Pasha, and his leading followers received honor and promotion at the hands of the Government.

The next movement was in favor of a revised Constitution. A Chamber, composed of Egyptian notables, was convoked, and it was proposed to reclaim the management of the Egyptian finances in all particulars, except so much as related to the foreign bonded debt. At this juncture it was found that a sort of counter-revolution was making head in the army, the same being fomented by certain Circassian officers, jealous of the influence and growing fame of Arabi. The latter put down the mutiny with a strong hand, and the rebellious officers were condemned to death. The English and French officials representing the Control interfered to prevent the execution of the sentence, and, as a precautionary measure, some iron-clad vessels from the allied squadron were ordered to take station in the Bay of Alexandria. In that city a riot broke

out, induced by a quarrel in the street between an Arab and a Maltese, and followed by a massacre, in which many Europeans, including some of the officers of the city, lost their lives.

Meanwhile, the new Egyptian Constitution was published in England, and popular sympathy in that country was directed strongly to the National party. Up to this time, the revolution had gone no further than a revolt against the foreign, that is, the Circassian, of

Foreign Affairs, and M. Gambetta, at that time in the ascendant in the French Government, determined upon an exactly opposite policy. Instead of supporting Arabi, the statesmen just referred to sent a joint note to the Khedive announcing their intention to uphold the existing order in Egypt, and speaking in a tone of menace and dictation against the popular party. The Khedive was assured, even against what were, perhaps, his own secret wishes in the premises, that his Govern-



PALACE OF THE KHELIVE.

ficials, who, in both the army and civil affairs, had used and abused the authority which they held from the Khedive and the Porte. Arabi and the revolutionists looked to England and France for the support of their cause, and, in the beginning of 1882, there was popular expectation that the Egyptian National party would be upheld by the intervention of the Western Powers. For some reason, however, the nature of which has never been fully divulged, Lord Granville, English Secretary for

ment should be maintained against all revolt and danger, whether from without or within his dominions. The meaning was clear, and it was at once perceived by the National party, that the Khedive himself and his whole officary were in the way of further reform. The anger of the popular leaders was turned especially against Sherif Pasha, the Egyptian Minister, who was believed to be at one with the foreign intervention. That officer was obliged, in February of 1882, to resign his office, and Arabi

was himself put at the head of the Government.

It was on the 17th of May in this year that the English and French fleets were ordered to Alexandria. The representatives of Great Britain demanded the dismissal of the National Ministry and the exile of Arabi Pasha. The

quillity in the country. The Turkish troops, however, were forbidden to land. Dervish Pasha was himself admitted to Cairo with many demonstrations of loyalty, but the whole matter was superficial. Arabi had the hearts and confidence of the people, and they refused absolutely to permit his departure from the country.

It was at this juncture that the Alexandrian riot occurred. About fifty Europeans and nearly four hundred natives lost their lives in the outbreak, the responsibility for which has never been satisfactorily determined. Doubtless the inflamed condition of public opinion in the city, rather than any other patent circumstance, was the efficient cause of the riot. However this may have been, the effect in Western Europe was sufficiently decisive. The *London Times* raised the cry of immediate and active intervention. The Gladstone Ministry wavered for a moment under the combined assaults of the Tory organs and the English bondholders, whose Egyptian securities had fallen to fifty-two cents on the dollar. At this time the Admiral of the English squadron in the Bay of Alexandria was Sir Beauchamp Seymour. On perceiving that the Egyptian Nationalists were repairing and manning certain fortifications in the harbor which bore




AHMED ARABI PASHA.

first clause of this demand was complied with, but it was found impossible to depose Arabi with a mere document. On the contrary, he became practically the dictator of Egypt. In this emergency the Sultan took the matter in hand, and sent out Dervish Pasha as a special commissioner to reestablish order and tran-

upon his position, he sent an ultimatum to the town that the works in question should be abandoned under threat of bombarding the city. Within two days the menace was carried into execution. The English vessels opened fire on Alexandria, and the shot and shell wrought great havoc to property and life. The Egypt-

tians, finding that they were unable to hold out against the rain of death, evacuated Alexandria, setting fire to the city as they withdrew. The European quarter was burned to the ground, and much damage was done in other parts, especially those districts under fire of the British ships. It was estimated that the loss of property amounted to four million pounds sterling. The bombardment resulted in a hopeless break between the two Egyptian parties. Alexandria had been defended by the joint action of the Khedive and Arabi, but the former now went over to the English and put himself under protection of the fleet. Arabi, with the Nationalist army, withdrew from Alexandria to Kafr

command of Sir Garnet Wolseley, was accordingly brought over from India, and pitched against Arabi's forces at Tel el-Kebir. In this vicinity four hard battles were fought before British discipline could overcome the courageous Egyptians, fighting for independence. The decisive engagement occurred on the 9th of September, 1882. Arabi's forces were completely routed, and thrown back on Cairo. The British advance soon reached that city; the provisional Government was overthrown, and Arabi surrendered himself as a prisoner. The Khedive was soon restored to office, but it was evident that the power was in the hands of foreigners. The national army was disorganized. Arabi was about to be put to death,




MODERN LIGHT-HOUSE AT ALEXANDRIA.

Dowar, about twelve miles distant, and there intrenched himself with so much skill that it was found impossible to dislodge him from his position.

Cairo was now made the Nationalist capital. A decree was passed by the provisional Government, deposing Khedive Tewfik from power. The whole public opinion of Egypt, in so far as a public opinion existed, was heartily with Arabi and the revolution. Great Britain, however, was now committed to the cause of Tewfik, or, rather, to the cause of her own inconsistent consistency. It became necessary, therefore, that the British contingent in Egypt should be strongly reinforced. The Anglo-Indian army, thirty thousand strong, under

but a reaction in British public opinion brought about a commutation of his sentence. He and five of his fellow-Nationalists were condemned to perpetual exile, and on the 4th of January, 1883, were carried away for Ceylon.

During the remainder of the year, and until the beginning of 1883, the financial control of Egypt was retained by England and France. This arrangement, however, ceased by the action of the Powers in January, 1883, and a certain degree of autonomy was restored to the Egyptian Government. Later in the same year, a new scheme of government, part English, part American, and part Oriental, was devised under the inspiration of Lord Dufferin, and became the organic law of the country.



CHARGE OF THE HIGHLANDERS AT TEL-EL-KEIR

A general amnesty was granted by the Khedive, and many reforms were introduced into the administration. It could but be noticed, however, by the people who had already been borne down with taxation and other abuses of power, that the new schedule was more excessive than the old. One of the principal changes now introduced was the reorganization of the Egyptian army, which was effected under direction of General Wood, an English officer, and twenty-five other subordinate commanders of the same nationality. The civil police of Egypt was intrusted to a force which was put under command of Baker Pasha. The defense of the Sudan, to which we must now turn our attention, was intrusted to a division of the army under command of

ance as the leader and avenger of his people is, to the present day, some way similar to that of the German peasants, who hold to the tradition that Frederick Barbarossa still sits nodding in the cave of Salzburg, and will come forth whenever Fatherland is endangered. The Mohammedan superstition, however, is religious, Messianic in its character. The Shiites are ever in expectation of the coming of El Mahdi. Throughout the Mohammedan Empire, the ignorant and infatuated are ever ready to say, Lo, here! or, Lo, there! It has frequently happened that several Mahdis have lived at the same time. In 1882 there were at least three pretenders of this character. El-Senusi appeared in Tripoli, another led the ignorant in Adin; and the third, namely the



ON THE WHITE NILE

Hicks Pasha, and that force was obliged, in November of 1883, to confront the hosts of the Mahdi.

Who, then, was the Mahdi? The historical notes of the ninth decade of our century abound with references to his name. At the bottom of the whole question is a profound Mohammedan superstition, running back in its ultimate origin almost to the days of the Prophet. The third Caliph of the House of Abbas was the first to be called El Mahdi, that is, "he who is guided aright." Afterwards, the term was adopted by the Shiite Mohammedans as the name of their expected Messiah. In 879, A. D., the twelfth of the Imams, named Mohammed Abul-Kasim, mysteriously disappeared, but the Shiites never accepted his death as a fact. Their belief in his reappearance

as the leader and avenger of his people is, to the present day, some way similar to that of the German peasants, who hold to the tradition that Frederick Barbarossa still sits nodding in the cave of Salzburg, and will come forth whenever Fatherland is endangered. The Mohammedan superstition, however, is religious, Messianic in its character. The Shiites are ever in expectation of the coming of El Mahdi. Throughout the Mohammedan Empire, the ignorant and infatuated are ever ready to say, Lo, here! or, Lo, there! It has frequently happened that several Mahdis have lived at the same time. In 1882 there were at least three pretenders of this character. El-Senusi appeared in Tripoli, another led the ignorant in Adin; and the third, namely the

Sheikh Mohammed, of Dongola, appeared in the Egyptian Sudan as the true El Mahdi. At the very time when Arabi Pasha was leading what promised to be a successful revolution in Lower Egypt, this Mohammed el Mahdi gained the ascendancy over the wild natives of the Sudan. While Arabi was attempting, by rational means and in a natural manner, to throw off the foreign yoke at Cairo and Alexandria, the Mahdi, with no less enthusiasm, was leading the Sudanese in a wild rebellion against the constituted authority.

The student of history will readily recall the southern limit of ancient Egypt, as fixed by nature at the upper cataract of the Nile; but in modern times the limits of the country in the direction of the equator have been vastly extended. It was in this region that

the explorations of Sir Samuel W. Baker, in the years 1862-64, opened up a new world to geography, and possibly to civilization. The base of his own and of all subsequent movements into the valley of the White Nile, was the town of Khartoum, lying at the junction of the White Nile with the principal river. Sir Samuel W. Baker first made his way among the branching tributaries of the Blue Nile as far as Gondokoro, somewhat south of the fifteenth parallel. From this place his explorations were extended southward to Victoria Nyanza, under the equator, and thence westward to the companion lake, to which he gave the name of Albert Nyanza, in honor of the Prince Consort.

The country thus revealed was of vast extent and importance. In 1869 the Khedive Ismail followed up the work by sending a body of troops with Baker to occupy the country which he had explored, to extend the boundaries of Egypt to the head-waters of the Nile, to suppress the slave-trade, and to introduce the cotton plant into the fertile valleys traversed by the English adventurer. In April of 1871, Baker was again at Gondokoro. He had now, however, excited the animosity of the slave-merchants and the hostility of the ignorant natives. For two years he held his own, penetrating the country as far as Ungoro, and finally, in 1873, falling back to Gondokoro, and thence into Egypt. In withdrawing from the Sudan he left as his successor, and the inheritor of his enterprises, Colonel Charles George Gordon, better known by his title of Chinese Gordon. The latter now became the principal figure of the Sudan. He maintained himself precariously and with insufficient forces during the period of the revolutionary movements in Egypt, keeping at bay, while he was unable to subdue, the hostile Sudanese.

We may now go forward at once to the year 1883. France and England agreed finally to withdraw their "Financial Control" of Egypt, and to leave the Khedive's Government to such a feeble autonomy as it might be able to assume. The overthrow and banishment of Arabi, however, was not sufficient to bring the wild natives of Upper Egypt and the Sudan to a submissive spirit. On the contrary, El Mahdi and his army became, in

that far region, more formidable than before. In 1884 the useless Conference of London was held for a general consideration of the condition of Egyptian affairs. The meeting came to nothing. At that very time Chinese Gordon, with his mixed force of English and Egyptians, was cooped up in Khartoum, and the insurrection which the Mahdi had kindled in the Sudan was spreading down the valley. It now became a question most serious whether the Englishman could any longer hold back the rising tide of revolt which, like the annual inundation of the Nile, threatened to deluge all Egypt.

From this time forth, the insurgent natives, led by the Mahdi, increased in numbers and ferocity. In July, and again in August, of 1884, Gordon fought and won several battles with the Prophet's forces; but it was like beating down the Hydra. During the remainder of the year he continued to hold his place at Khartoum. It can not be doubted that he might well have abandoned the place and retired to safe ground in Middle Egypt; but such a movement was not in Chinese Gordon's nature. His character, indeed, is one of the strangest, and we might almost say most attractive, within the limits of modern biography. While he was willing to receive reinforcements, he was also willing to take his chances single-handed against the armies of the Mahdi. All of his messages in the after part of 1884 continued to give the note of confidence, repeating the assurance that he was able to hold Khartoum against the enemy. But in mid-winter the pressure around the town became constantly greater. The mixed character of the garrison also constituted an element of danger. In fact, it could hardly be expected that the native forces in the Khedive's army should be free from certain sympathies with the Mahdi. We have already said that he represented the ignorant and superstitious side of the very same movement which Arabi had so nearly led to success in Lower Egypt. Gordon's case grew constantly more desperate. He was finally hemmed in, cut off from communications, reduced in supplies, and brought to miserable straits. About the middle of January, 1885, negotiations, partly between Gordon himself and the Mahdi, and partly secret and treacherous between the natives of

the garrison and the enemy outside, were opened, and the result was the admission by night of the Mahdi's host into Khartoum. Gordon was obliged to surrender, borne down as he was by mere stress of numbers. On the 27th of January, when he was standing in the street, giving some directions relative to the capitulation, some of the Mahdi's assassins sprang upon him from behind and stabbed him to death. Such is the current report of the occasion, and the manner of his murder. A considerable part of the garrison shared his

its leaders, and the latter, struggling with the unconquerable Irish disorders, went speedily to their fall. It could of course be only a matter of time when an army would be sent up the Nile, when Khartoum would be retaken, when the Mahdi's barbaric Islamites would be scattered, and Gordon's memory avenged. But for the time being, the shock, having its origin even so far away as the confluence of the White Nile and the Blue, was felt to the bottom of the political order of Great Britain, resulting in a reversal of the Govern-



WARRIORS OF THE MAHDI IN BATTLE WITH THE KHEDIVÉ'S FORCES.

fat; Khartoum fell into the hands of the Mahdi, and the general result was the temporary annihilation of foreign influence on the Upper Nile.

The reader will readily perceive the tremendous effect which the news of this disaster must produce in England. It was the one circumstance which was wanted by the Tories in their assaults on the Gladstone Ministry. The charge that Gordon had been criminally abandoned to his fate was precisely the kind to tell upon the British public. The whole calamitous episode bore hardly on the Liberal Party and

ment and the construction of the Salisbury Ministry.

It was at this latest period in the history of Great Britain that the public mind, and, indeed, the attention of the civilized world, was again turned to African exploration and discovery. The real knowledge of mankind respecting the character of Central Africa had begun with David Livingstone. How that indefatigable explorer made his way into the heart of the Continent, how he disappeared from sight, how he was for some years lost to the civilized nations, and how, at length, the

young American adventurer, Henry M. Stanley, sent out by James Gordon Bennett under the single mandate, "Find Livingstone," succeeded in reaching Victoria Nyanza and in discovering the object of his search, is known to the world. From this date travelers, geographers, explorers, began to penetrate

and thence to the Equatorial Province, as a medical officer on the staff of Charles George Gordon. The career of that brave but eccentric commander down to his death at Khartoum, has already been sketched above.

By this time, Dr. Schnitzer had become first an *Effendi*, then a *Bey*, and finally a



DAVID LIVINGSTONE.

the equatorial regions of the Dark Continent, and to contribute almost yearly to the information of mankind relative to the country and its inhabitants. At length, in 1876, Eduard Schnitzer, a Silesian naturalist of resolute and adventurous spirit, left home, went to Egypt, and took service in the army of the Khelive. He was sent first to Khartoum,

according to the Egyptian military phraseology. He had taken the name of Emin, and is known henceforth as Emin Pasha. He was left in the South when Gordon fell back to Khartoum. With the capture of that place, Emin found himself hemmed in by the forces of the Mahdi on the north, and those of Mwango, King of Uganda, on the south.

Enough was known in Europe of the African situation to excite the keenest interest and the liveliest apprehensions for the safety of Emin Pasha, and plans began to be devised for his relief.

In England an Emin Bey Relief Committee was formed in 1886. Of this body, Sir William Mackinnon, Secretary of the Royal Geographical Society, was chairman. At this time Henry M. Stanley was in the service of the King of the Belgians; but it was felt by the English Relief Committee that no other than Stanley could be intrusted with the expedition in search of Emin. The Belgian monarch had at this time a fleet of transports in the River Congo, and these he cheerfully placed at the disposal of Stanley, to whom the command was given by common consent.

By the beginning of 1887 the expedition had been fully equipped. Stanley was called from New York to London, and on the 27th of January reached Alexandria on his way to Zanzibar. It was finally determined, however, that the best route for penetrating the interior was up the valley of the Congo. This was accordingly taken, and in June of 1887 Stanley and his forces were lost to sight.

More than a year went by, and it was not until September of 1888 that the first authentic information of the progress of the expedition was received in London. Then followed another long period of silence and anxiety; but on the 15th of January, 1889, a letter from Stanley was received at Brussels, and all doubts as to his whereabouts and the success of the expedition were set at rest. Emin Pasha had been found and rescued. The sources of the Nile had been more fully determined than ever before. A fresh-water lake, named Albert Edward Nyanza, nearly thirty thousand miles in extent and nine hundred feet above the level of Victoria Nyanza, had been discovered and explored. The command had suffered untold hardships, had traversed vast stretches of al-

most impassable country, had fought severe and critical battles, had been decimated with fever and famine, but had courageously accomplished its mission and regained the coast, to hear afar off the plaudits of mankind.

We have thus reached the point in the recent annals of Great Britain at which perspective ceases for want of distance. The events to be considered are only of yesterday, disproportioned by their nearness, undetermined in their historical relations. There is a



HENRY M. STANLEY.

point at which the serious and elevated narrative of history descends through contemporary documents and reviews into mere journalism, and is lost in the miscellany of the morning paper. It is inexpedient for the writer to attempt to follow this descent and distribution of the historical lines, from the high plane of judicial and unimpassioned criticism, downward into the malarial region where political prejudice, local passion, and mere obscurity and confusion darken the vision and confound the understanding. Not

without a moment's regret may any serious mind turn from the consideration of so great a fact as the History of the British Empire in the present century. It is doubtless true that the authors and readers of the twentieth century will look back upon a landscape differently adjusted from that which the clearest sight of our own time is able to discover and describe. But much has been already discerned in the dust and distraction of the epoch; much more will soon take its true place and proportion on the historic page. Much which has already arisen in the Victorian Age stands out sublime and tall against the background of revolutionary tumult, of storm and chaos, with which the century was ushered in. Eng-

land abides. The Island-built Empire is unshaken by the tempest.

The Lion has laid his magnificent head
Between his paws; but he is not dead!
The Ocean of Atlas rolls and swells
Upon the shores where the Briton dwells;
The tide is high, and the sea-god sprawls
Against the wave-worn, chalky walls!
The sailors have made the anchors fast,
The crooked flukes are under the sea;
The heaving deep, 'neath the billowy blast
That tosses the sea-mew, surges past—
Britannia, what cares she?
The poet's dust, with the dust of the king,
Is shrined by the Abbey wall;
And the Church of Elizabeth spreads her wing
Above the dome, while the singers sing
In the famous Chapel of Paul!



HOLYHEAD AND ARTHUR'S SEAT.

