







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

















DRAFTING THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE.

# LIBRARY of UNIVERSAL HISTORY AND POPULAR SCIENCE

CONTAINING

A RECORD OF THE HUMAN RACE FROM THE  
EARLIEST HISTORICAL PERIOD TO THE PRESENT TIME;  
EMBRACING A GENERAL SURVEY OF THE PROGRESS OF MANKIND  
IN NATIONAL AND SOCIAL LIFE, CIVIL GOVERNMENT,  
RELIGION, LITERATURE, SCIENCE AND ART

*Complete in Twenty-five Volumes*

THE TEXT SUPPLEMENTED AND EMBELLISHED BY MORE THAN SEVEN HUNDRED  
PORTRAITS AND OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS AND CHARTS

INTRODUCTION BY  
HUBERT HOWE BANCROFT  
HISTORIAN  
GEORGE EDWIN RINES  
MANAGING EDITOR

*Reviewed and Endorsed by Fifteen Professors in History and Educators in  
American Universities, among whom are the following:*

GEORGE EMORY FELLOWS, Ph.D.,  
LL.D.

President, University of Maine

KEMP PLUMMER BATTLE, A.M.,  
LL.D.

Professor of History, University of North Carolina

AMBROSE P. WINSTON, Ph.D.

Assistant Professor of Economics, Washington Uni-  
versity

WILLIAM R. PERKINS

Professor of History, University of Iowa

REV. GEO. M. GRANT, D.D.

Late Principal of Queen's University, Kingston,  
Ontario, Canada

MOSES COIT TYLER, A.M., Ph.D.  
Late Professor of American History, Cornell Uni-  
versity

ELISHA BENJAMIN ANDREWS, LL.D.  
D.D.

Chancellor, University of Nebraska

WILLIAM TORREY HARRIS, Ph.D.  
LL.D.

Formerly United States Commissioner of Education

JOHN HANSON THOMAS McPHER-  
SON, Ph.D.

Professor of History, University of Georgia

RICHARD HEATH DABNEY, A.M.  
Ph.D.

Professor of History, University of Virginia

NEW YORK AND CHICAGO

THE BANCROFT SOCIETY

1910

COPYRIGHT, 1008, BY  
GEORGE EDWIN RINES

# CONTENTS OF VOLUME X.

---

## MODERN HISTORY.—CONTINUED.

---

### CHAPTER XXXVII.—EUROPEAN AND COLONIAL WARS.

Section I.—European States-System from 1714 to 1740.....	3079
Section II.—War of the Austrian Succession.....	3099
Section III.—The Seven Years' War.....	3113

### CHAPTER XXXVIII.—DAWN OF THE AGE OF REVOLUTIONS.

Section I.—French Literature and the Age of Reform.....	3139
Section II.—Partitions of Poland and Russo-Turkish Wars.....	3156

### CHAPTER XXXIX.—ENGLAND AND AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

Section I.—England's Struggle for Freedom of the Press.....	3185
Section II.—Taxation without Representation.....	3197
Section III.—War of American Independence.....	3226
Section IV.—Birth of the United States Constitution.....	3292
Section V.—Great Britain and Her Empire.....	3312
Section VI.—Great Britain and Revolutionary France.....	3331



## CHAPTER XXXVII.

# EUROPEAN AND COLONIAL WARS.

### SECTION I.—EUROPEAN STATES—SYSTEM FROM 1714 TO 1740.

THE death of the Princess Sophia of Hanover made her son, the Elector George Louis of Hanover, the heir to the throne of Great Britain and Ireland by the terms of the Act of Settlement passed by the English Parliament in 1701 and accepted by Scotland upon her Constitutional, or Parliamentary Union with England in 1707. Upon Queen Anne's death, August 1, 1714, this German prince was instantly proclaimed King of Great Britain by the queen's counselors, with the title of GEORGE I.; thus beginning the reign of the present House of Brunswick, or Hanover, or Guelph.

Great Britain under the House of Brunswick.

George I., A. D. 1714-1727.

It was believed that the Jacobites would endeavor to offer a forcible opposition to the accession of George I.; but they were taken by surprise by Queen Anne's death, and were therefore unprepared to make any resistance.

Jacobite Situation.

George I. made no haste to take possession of his new kingdom, and did not arrive in England until six weeks after Queen Anne's death, when he and his eldest son landed at Greenwich. He was well received by his new subjects, but he utterly lacked the qualities essential to arouse the loyalty of the English people. Being a thorough German, he could not speak a word of English, and was obliged to learn by rote a few English words in which to reply to the addresses of his new subjects. He was fifty-four years of age when he ascended the British throne, and was small of stature, awkward in manner and insignificant in appearance. His private life was scandalous; and when he came to England he left his wife, Sophia of Zell, behind him in Germany, a prisoner in one of his castles in his Electorate of Hanover. He was honest and well intentioned in his treatment of his new subjects, but could never learn to be an Englishman. He preferred his native Hanover as a residence and visited that country yearly, thus causing constant annoyance and embarrassment to his Ministers in

George I. and the English People.

His Private Life and Character.

England. The English nation cordially disliked him, and tolerated him only because he was a constitutional monarch and the only Protestant heir to the British crown, and because he did not interfere with their liberties.

**New Whig Ministry.** George I. began his reign as King of Great Britain and Ireland by excluding the Tories from the government and forming a new Ministry consisting almost exclusively of Whigs, who were his natural supporters. He took no part in the government of his new kingdom, leaving the affairs of state entirely to his Ministers.

**Tory Unpopularity.** Queen Anne's Tory Ministers had disgusted the English nation by their plots for the restoration of the Stuarts to the British throne, and had thus made their party odious to the great majority of Englishmen. The restoration of the Stuarts would have been simply the undoing of the work of the Revolution of 1688, the repudiation of the national debt and the reestablishment of Roman Catholicism by force.

**Whig Popularity.** The Whigs were pledged to sustain the result of the Revolution of 1688, and could not be suspected of disloyalty to the system which they had established, whatever their faults as a party. The confidence of the English nation in the Whig party was not misplaced; as the plots of the Tory leaders, the Earl of Oxford and Lord Bolingbroke, had left the Whigs as the sole representatives of the principles of the Revolution of 1688, and of constitutional liberty and religious freedom.

**Whigs in Power.** So overwhelmingly Whig was the first House of Commons summoned by George I. soon after his accession that it had less than fifty Tory members, and the Jacobite sympathies of these were so well understood that they had no influence in the government. In the new Whig Ministry, Lord Townshend was appointed Secretary of State; and his brother-in-law, Sir Robert Walpole, became successively Paymaster of the Forces, Chancellor of the Exchequer and First Lord of the Treasury.

**Impeachment of Tory Leaders.** One of the first acts of the new Whig Parliament was to impeach Lord Bolingbroke, the Earl of Oxford and the Duke of Ormond for misconduct in the negotiations which resulted in the Treaty of Utrecht and for intriguing with the Pretender James Stuart. At the beginning of these proceedings Lord Bolingbroke fled to France, and was followed by the Duke of Ormond. The Earl of Oxford remained at home to face his Whig enemies, and was sent a prisoner of state to the Tower, but was acquitted and released two years afterward. Parliament passed Acts of Attainder against Lord Bolingbroke and the Duke of Ormond.

**Riots and the Riot Act.** These proceedings of the Whig Parliament exasperated the Tory party, thus causing riots in various parts of England. These dis-



turbances became so numerous and so serious that Parliament passed the *Riot Act*, making it a felony for members of an unlawful assembly to refuse to disperse when commanded by a magistrate to do so.

The Pretender James Stuart was then residing in France, and the Tory disaffection and disturbances in England encouraged him to hope that he could succeed in an effort to recover his ill-fated father's throne. Lord Bolingbroke, who fully understood English public sentiment, urged the Pretender not to make the attempt, assuring him that it would certainly end in failure; but young James Stuart was as insensible to reason as his father had been, and ordered the Earl of Mar, the Jacobite leader in Scotland, to raise the standard of the Stuarts in that country. The Earl of Mar obeyed the Pretender's order by raising the standard of the young Stuart in the Highlands, September 6, 1715. The Earl of Mar believed that his revolt in Scotland would be followed by a Jacobite rising in the West of England, but he soon discovered his mistake. He was joined by a few Englishmen from the northern counties; but the vigorous measures of the government deprived him of material aid from England, where the leading Jacobites were arrested, thus depriving their party of its leaders.

The Earl of Mar was incompetent and cowardly. He advanced southward into the Lowlands, and was joined at Perth by six thousand Highlanders. On the royal side the Duke of Argyle summoned his clansmen, the numerous and powerful Campbells, to take up arms for King George I. The hostile forces encountered each other at Sheriff-Muir, near Dumblain, November 6, 1715. The troops of the Earl of Mar were successful at the first onset; and General Whetham, the commander of a division in the army of the Duke of Argyle, fled in full gallop to Stirling, exclaiming that the king's Scotch army had been utterly beaten. However, in the meantime, the Duke of Argyle's own division had defeated the body of the Earl of Mar's troops confronting them, but upon returning to the field met the victorious insurgents. As neither party seemed inclined to renew the struggle, they stood looking at each other for several hours, after which they withdrew in different directions, each claiming the victory. One of the Jacobite songs alluding to this drawn battle begun thus:

“There's some say that we won,  
Some say that they won,  
Some say that none won  
At a', man.

“But one thing I'm sure,  
That at Sheriff-Muir  
A battle there was,  
Which I saw, man.

**The Pretender and the Jacobite Rising in Scotland.**

**Battle of Sheriff-Muir.**

“ And we ran, and they ran,  
And they ran, and we ran,  
And we ran, and they ran,  
Awa', man.”

The Pre-  
tender's  
Arrival in  
Scotland.

Though the fight at Sheriff-Muir was a drawn battle, the Duke of Argyle had all the fruits of a victory, as the effect of the conflict was to check the progress of the Jacobite rebels and thus practically to give the triumph to the royal side. The Pretender arrived in Scotland, December 22, 1715, attended by only six gentlemen. Expecting the whole Scotch nation to rise in his cause, he fixed January 16, 1716, as the day for his coronation at Scone, where his ancestors for centuries had been crowned Kings of Scotland; but before the arrival of the appointed day he was so closely pursued by the Duke of Argyle that he was glad to relinquish his enterprise and return to France, taking the Earl of Mar with him, and leaving the rest of his partisans to their fate.

Over-  
throw  
of the  
Jacobites  
in  
England.

On the very day of the battle of Sheriff-Muir, November 6, 1715, the Jacobite rebels in the North of England under the Earl of Derwentwater and Mr. Forster, aided by Lords Kenmuir and Nithisdale and other Scotch gentlemen, were defeated at Preston by the royal troops and forced to surrender, thus practically ending the Jacobite revolt of 1715. The Earl of Derwentwater, Lords Kenmuir and Nithisdale and the other prisoners were treated with great cruelty. The leaders were sent to London and led through the streets to various prisons, pinioned like common malefactors. The Earl of Derwentwater and Lords Kenmuir and Nithisdale were condemned to be beheaded, and the former two were executed in that manner, but Lord Nithisdale effected his escape from prison and from the country in disguise and in a very romantic manner through the aid of his devoted wife. About thirty other Jacobite rebels were hung, and more than one thousand were exiled to America.

Lord  
Nithis-  
dale's  
Escape.

Septen-  
nial Act.

In 1716 Lord Townshend and Sir Robert Walpole retired from the Ministry, which then passed entirely under the control of Lord Stanhope. The House of Commons had now become the ruling power in Great Britain; and, in order to establish a proper basis for its influence, Parliament passed the *Septennial Act* in 1716, making seven years the longest period for which a British Parliament could sit.

Louis  
XV. of  
France,  
A. D.  
1715-  
1774.

As we have seen, Louis XV. was a child of five years when he became King of France upon the death of his great-grandfather, Louis XIV., September 1, 1715. The profligate Philip, Duke of Orleans, at once violated the will of Louis XIV. by setting aside the Council of Regency and usurping all the powers of government, thus making himself sole regent. Though possessing some good qualities, he was

on the whole a bold, bad man; and his regency was one of the most corrupt periods in the history of France. Like his former preceptor, the Abbé Dubois, whom he now made his Prime Minister, he was a man of intellect and talent, but of most profligate morals, despising religion and virtue, outraging decency and morality by his dissolute and voluptuous life, and most extravagantly squandering the revenues of the state.

**Philip, Duke of Orleans, and the Abbe Dubois.**

The Duke of Orleans and the Abbé Dubois adopted arbitrary measures to improve the financial condition of France, but these measures failed to produce the desired effect. The profligate Abbé Dubois was in the pay of Great Britain, and induced the Duke of Orleans to reverse the foreign policy of Louis XIV. by discountenancing the Pretender and cultivating the friendship of Great Britain as an offset to the ambition of Spain under her Bourbon king. The Whig Ministry of Great Britain was pledged to a peace policy in its relations with foreign powers, and sought to carry out its pledges by a faithful observance of the Treaty of Utrecht.

**Friendly Relations of France and Great Britain.**

In 1714 Sultan ACHMET III. of Turkey, the successor of Mustapha II., who had been deposed by a revolt of the Janizaries in 1703, began a war against the Republic of Venice for the purpose of regaining possession of the Morea. In 1716 Austria joined Venice in the war for the purpose of maintaining the conditions of the Peace of Carlowitz; and the Austrian army, under the great Prince Eugene, defeated the immense hosts of the Turks at Peterwardin, August 5, 1716, and, laying siege to Belgrade, annihilated a Turkish army of two hundred thousand men that had advanced to the relief of the garrison, August 17, 1717, and forced Belgrade to surrender. By the Peace of Passarowitz, in 1718, the Porte surrendered Belgrade and Temesvar to Austria; but Venice ceded the Morea to the Sultan.

**War of Venice and Austria against Turkey.**

**Fall of Belgrade.**

**Peace of Passarowitz.**

Notwithstanding the pacific disposition of the governments of France and Great Britain, the peace of Europe was disturbed in 1717 by the mad ambition of Charles XII. of Sweden and by the intrigues of Cardinal Alberoni, the Prime Minister of Philip V. of Spain, for the aggrandizement of the Spanish Bourbon dynasty.

**Menaces to European Peace.**

Charles XII. of Sweden coveted the duchies of Bremen and Verden, in the North of Germany, which King George I., as Elector of Hanover, had purchased from Denmark and annexed to his Electorate. The Swedish king designed to revenge himself for the loss of the two duchies by invading Scotland in the interest of the Pretender and in connection with a Jacobite rising in that country. The conspiracy was promptly detected and frustrated; and the projected Swedish invasion was prevented by the death of Charles XII. in the siege of Frederickshall, in Norway, December 11, 1718.

**Threatened Invasion of Scotland by Charles XII. of Sweden.**

Cardinal  
Alberoni's  
Intrigues.

The intriguing efforts of the able but unprincipled Cardinal Alberoni, the Prime Minister of Philip V. of Spain, for placing the Pretender on the throne of Great Britain, for obtaining the regency and succession to the throne of France for the King of Spain, and for wresting Sicily from the House of Hapsburg, to which that island had been assigned by the Treaty of Rastadt, produced, in 1717, a *Triple Alliance* of Great Britain, France and Holland for the purpose of compelling Spain to observe the stipulations of the Treaty of Utrecht. This coalition became the *Quadruple Alliance* by being joined by the Emperor Charles VI. of Germany in 1718.

Alliances  
against  
Spain.

Plot  
against  
the Duke  
of  
Orleans.

War between France and Spain was hastened by the discovery of a plot in France under the leadership of the Marquis of Cellemare, the Cardinal de Polignac, the Duchess of Maine and the Spanish ambassador at Paris; the object of the conspiracy being the seizure of the Duke of Orleans and the elevation of Philip V. of Spain to the regency of France. The papers of the conspirators were artfully stolen from a young Spanish abbot, who was secretary to the Spanish embassy at Paris, thus disclosing the entire plot. The Spanish ambassador and his secretary were seized, their French accomplices were sent to the Bastille, and many of them were executed.

War of  
the Quad-  
ruple  
Alliance  
against  
Spain.

France declared war against Spain, January 10, 1719; and the other members of the Quadruple Alliance also proclaimed war against Spain. A British squadron under Admiral Byng defeated and destroyed the Spanish fleet in the Mediterranean, taking twenty-three ships. A German imperial force defeated the Spanish troops in Sicily and drove them from that island in 1720. A French force under the Duke of Berwick invaded the North of Spain, took several fortresses, destroyed some magazines and burned sixteen newly-built ships of war; while the British fleet carried destruction into the Spanish port of Vigo. The Duke of Ormond failed in his attempt to land a Spanish army in Great Britain in the interest of the Pretender. The successes of the allies alarmed the weak and imbecile Philip V. of Spain, who accepted the terms of the Quadruple Alliance by dismissing and banishing the ambitious and intriguing Cardinal Alberoni as the price of peace, February, 1720.

Spain's  
Submission.

Kingdom  
of  
Sardinia.

The Duchy of Savoy became the *Kingdom of Sardinia* by a treaty in 1720, in which the Emperor Charles VI., as head of the Austrian House of Hapsburg, recognized Duke Victor Amadeus II. of Savoy as King of Sardinia, ceding to him the island of Sardinia in exchange for Sicily.

Bourbon  
Mar-  
riages.

The queen of King Philip V. of Spain, Elizabeth of Parma, was conciliated by the betrothal of her daughter, then only three years old, to King Louis XV. of France. As she was the second wife of Philip

V., her controlling motive was her desire to make some royal provision for her own sons. She was descended from the almost-extinct family of the Medici; and the imperial fiefs of Tuscany, Parma and Piacenza were promised to her son Don Carlos, who married one daughter of the Duke of Orleans, while his half-brother, the heir to the Spanish throne, espoused the other. The transient cordiality between France and Spain greatly increased the influence of the Jesuits in France. Philip V. was as bigoted as his predecessors, the Hapsburg Philips who had occupied the throne of Spain; and during his reign two thousand three hundred and forty-six persons were burned at the stake for their religious convictions.

**Religious  
Persecu-  
tion in  
Spain.**

Louis XIV. had left France burdened with a debt exceeding the sum of four hundred million dollars of our money, the annual interest upon which amounted to almost nine times the surplus revenues of the kingdom, thus being a terrible drain upon the resources of the nation. Various expedients of relief were proposed, and the Duke of Orleans sought to utilize the immense but still-undeveloped wealth of the French possessions in North America as a means of relief from the existing embarrassments of the kingdom. In this emergency John Law, a Scotch banker, proposed the famous *Mississippi Scheme*, by which the public credit was to be retrieved by an enormous issue of paper money secured by shares in the *Mississippi Company*, and based upon a monopoly of trade with the French American colonies of Louisiana and Canada.

**Missis-  
sippi  
Scheme  
of John  
Law in  
France.**

The Mississippi Scheme became very popular, and for a year speculation raged with full sway throughout France. All classes of the people, seized with one impulse of avarice, bought shares of stock in the Mississippi Company; and the shares could not be sold fast enough to supply the demand for them. The bonds of the government were readily exchanged for paper money of large denominations, which was preferred to gold because it could be counted more readily. Thus the people had exchanged their gold and silver coin for paper money, and the notes that were issued soon arose to eighty per cent. of the value of the current coin. In this way the national debt of France disappeared, its bonds having been exchanged by their holders for shares of stock in the Mississippi Company.

**Its Tem-  
porary  
Success  
and Pop-  
ularity.**

The transient excitement gave a great impulse to colonization; and eight hundred French emigrants under Bienville, the Governor of Louisiana appointed by the Mississippi Company, founded New Orleans in 1718. John Law himself was granted immense territories in the present Arkansas, and poured out wealth in transporting thither French and German settlers and negro slaves, who were expected to make that prairie land blossom as the rose.

**French  
Coloniza-  
tion of  
Louis-  
iana.**

Failure  
and Wide-  
spread  
Ruin in  
France.

But the bubble finally burst. In May, 1720, Law's bank failed, the notes being found irredeemable in specie. All the gold and silver had disappeared, and only the worthless paper money remained. The stock of the Mississippi Company was worthless, having more than a thousand times outrun the available value of its possessions, so that thousands of families who had once rolled in affluence and luxury were reduced to poverty. It is possible that the managers of this delusive scheme were ignorant of the true principles of finance, and that they did not intend to perpetrate a deliberate fraud; but this ill-judged effort to restore the public credit was almost as disastrous to the French nation as the costly wars which had burdened the nation with its vast debt. The popular indignation finally compelled John Law to leave France.

South  
Sea  
Scheme  
of Sir  
George  
Blount in  
England.

A project similar to that of the Mississippi Scheme was undertaken in England about the same time, with like results. England was rapidly growing in wealth and prosperity, and the sudden expansion of her commerce excited a desire for speculative ventures among her people which promised no good to the nation. This speculative feeling was strikingly manifested in the celebrated project known the *South Sea Scheme*, proposed by Sir George Blount, by which the famous *South Sea Company* was organized for an exclusive right to trade with the Spanish American colonies. The South Sea Company bought up the government annuities with the privilege of paying the holders in its own stock, and in this way to reduce the national debt of Great Britain, which had been contracted chiefly by William III. in carrying on his wars against France, and which already amounted to an enormous sum. Those who bought annuities were to receive shares of stock in the South Sea Company as a substitute for their claims upon the government.

Its Tem-  
porary  
Success  
and Pop-  
ularity.

The South Sea Scheme became immensely popular; and all classes of people throughout England, rich and poor, seized with an insatiable avarice, went wild with a rage for speculation, and exchanged their entire fortunes and their savings for shares of stock in the South Sea Company, fancying that the scrip of this Company was a sure passport to wealth. The days were too short and the counting-houses too small to accommodate the eager multitudes; and desks were therefore ranged along the streets, and lined with a host of clerks to receive subscriptions. The scheme was at first successful, and the stock of the South Sea Company arose to ten times the value for which it was subscribed.

Sir Robert Walpole, who was a practical financier, vainly warned the Ministry and the nation of the fictitious nature of the South Sea Scheme. The English people went wild with this rage for speculation

until 1720, when the bubble burst, as the South Sea Company was found unable to fulfill more than a very small fraction of its promises; and thousands of families who had rolled in affluence and luxury, and thousands of others who had saved their hard earnings, were involved in utter financial ruin. A general panic followed, and kindred schemes that had sprung up during this rage for speculation also exploded. A storm of popular indignation manifested itself against the contrivers of the South Sea Scheme, and Parliament confiscated the estates of the directors of the South Sea Company for the benefit of the sufferers, but the infuriated people denounced the punishment as too mild.

**Failure  
and  
Wide-  
spread  
Ruin in  
England.**

The explosion of the South Sea Scheme drove Lord Stanhope's Ministry from power. In this emergency King George I. summoned Sir Robert Walpole to the direction of public affairs as Prime Minister, or First Lord of the Treasury. Walpole was the ablest financier of his time, and his wise warnings against the ill-judged South Sea Scheme had acquired for him the confidence of the British nation.

**Ministry  
of Sir  
Robert  
Walpole.**

Walpole's administration is the longest in English history since the Revolution of 1688, and lasted twenty-one years, A. D., 1721-1742. As King George I. could not speak English, and as Sir Robert Walpole did not understand German or French, the intercourse between them was carried on in Latin. Walpole's policy was to discourage political activity and to hold aloof from all Continental questions that might involve England in a war with any of the other European powers. He devoted all his great talents to the promotion of England's material prosperity, and also maintained British honor and influence abroad by his skill and firmness in diplomacy.

**His  
Peace  
Policy.**

Walpole's measures were generally acceptable to the British nation, and were productive of the happiest results, which the king thus summed up in 1724: "Peace with all powers abroad; at home perfect tranquillity, plenty, and an uninterrupted enjoyment of all civil and religious rights."

**Its  
Happy  
Result.**

Says John Richard Green: "Population was growing fast; that of Manchester and Birmingham doubled in thirty years. The rise of manufactures was accompanied by a sudden increase of commerce, which was due mainly to the rapid development of the colonies. Liverpool, which owes its creation to the new trade with the West, sprang up from a little country town to the third port in the kingdom. With peace and security, the value of land, and with it the rental of every country gentleman, tripled; while the introduction of winter roots, of artificial grasses, of the system of rotation of crops, changed the whole character of agriculture and spread wealth through the farming classes. The wealth around him never made Walpole swerve from a rigid economy, from the steady reduction of the debt

**Green's  
Remark.**

or the diminution of fiscal duties. Even before the death of George the First the public burdens were reduced by twenty millions. But he had the sense to see that the wisest course a statesman can take in presence of a great increase in national industry and national wealth is to look quietly on and let it alone."

Walpole's  
Corruption.

Sir Robert Walpole did not rely upon the force of his genius for the success of his public measures. Although he was personally honest, he introduced a general and most disgraceful system of corruption into the management of British politics. Parliament had its price, and it was regularly bought by Walpole whenever he regarded bribery essential to the success of his plans.

Louis  
XV.  
and the  
Duke of  
Orleans.

As Louis XV. had attained his legal majority in February, 1723, he assumed the government of France himself, and the Duke of Orleans resigned the regency. The duke retained his place in the government of France as President of the Council of State, and secured a seat in that body for the Abbé Dubois, who, through his exertions and influence, was created a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church by the Pope some time before. The Infanta of Spain, to whom Louis XV. was betrothed, was brought to France to be educated.

Ministry  
of the  
Duke of  
Bourbon  
in France.

Cardinal Dubois died during the first year of the king's personal reign, and his death was followed by that of the Duke of Orleans on December 2d of the same year, both being the victims of their debaucheries. The Duke of Bourbon, the first prince of the blood royal of France, succeeded the Duke of Orleans as Prime Minister of the kingdom. This prince was dull and indolent, and was entirely under the influence of his mistress, the Marchioness of Prie, who is said to have been in the pay of the British Ministry of Sir Robert Walpole, and who was in her turn under the influence of a clever and unscrupulous financier named Paris Duvernay.

Tempo-  
rary  
Abdica-  
tion of  
Philip V.  
of Spain.

As the health of Louis XV. was feeble, King Philip V. of Spain abdicated his crown in favor of his eldest son, Don Luis, in order to clear his way to the throne of France, thus surprising all Europe; but when, contrary to all expectations, Louis XV. recovered and Don Luis died suddenly, Philip V. resumed the Spanish crown, A. D. 1724.

Polish  
Marriage  
of Louis  
XV.

Philip V. of Spain had offended the Marchioness of Prie, the mistress of the Duke of Bourbon; and she now had her revenge upon him. When Louis XV. was in feeble health it was considered best to provide for the succession to the French crown in case of his death. The Spanish Infanta being too young to be married, she was therefore sent back to Madrid in the bluntest manner and with scarcely an explanation, in January, 1725. The Duke of Bourbon next unsuccessfully sought the espousal of Louis XV. to a princess of the royal



family of Great Britain. The Duke of Bourbon and his mistress then selected the amiable Marie Leczinski, the daughter of the de-throned Polish king, Stanislas Leczinski, who was then living in retirement in Alsace, as a bride for the young French king; and the marriage took place at Fontainebleau, September 4, 1725. The object of the Duke of Bourbon and Madame de Prie in negotiating this marriage was to retain their influence at court by securing the attachment of the queen in consequence of the gratitude she would naturally feel toward those to whom she owed her elevation.

Philip V. of Spain naturally and intensely resented the insult put upon him by the French court's action in thus breaking off the marriage contract of his daughter with the young King of France; and in revenge he changed his foreign policy by forming an offensive and defensive alliance, known as the *League of Vienna*, with the Emperor Charles VI. of Germany, his competitor in the War of the Spanish Succession for the crown of Spain, thus openly taking sides against France.

**League of  
Vienna.**

The Emperor Charles VI., having no sons, desired to secure his hereditary Austrian dominions to his daughter Maria Theresa; though his father's will had bequeathed the Austrian territories to the daughters of his eldest brother and predecessor, the Emperor Joseph I., in such a case. By the *Pragmatic Sanction*, in 1713, the Emperor Charles VI. had declared his own will concerning the Austrian inheritance; and this had been confirmed by the Estates of Austria, Silesia, Bohemia, Hungary and the Austrian Netherlands; while imperial diplomacy was mainly directed toward obtaining the guarantee of the *Pragmatic Sanction* by the other powers of Europe.

**Prag-  
matic  
Sanction.**

It was believed that a secret article of the Treaty of Vienna, which united the German Empire and Spain in a close alliance, provided for a marriage between the Infant Don Carlos, the son of King Philip V. of Spain, and the Emperor's daughter Maria Theresa, with the object of an ultimate reunion of all the dominions of the Emperor Charles V. To prevent such a consummation, France, Great Britain, Holland, Prussia, Denmark and Sweden formed the *League of Herrnhausen* in opposition to the League of Vienna. But the League of Vienna was joined by the Empress Catharine I. of Russia, the widow and successor of Peter the Great, and eventually by King Frederick William I. of Prussia, who deserted the League of Herrnhausen in order to form an alliance with the Emperor Charles VI.

**League of  
Herrn-  
hausen.**

Europe was threatened with the outbreak of another great war; but, fortunately for the general peace, the Duke of Bourbon fell into disgrace in 1726, and was ordered to leave the French court; and with him passed away Madame de Prie and Paris Duverney, the last of

**Ministry  
of  
Cardinal  
Fleury in  
France.**

whom had inflicted much injury upon the finances of France. The venerable Cardinal Fleury, the preceptor of King Louis XV., then became Prime Minister of France. He was then over seventy years of age, and was a man of upright and noble character. His wise and peaceful policy averted the threatened European war, and restored order to the finances of France and revived the confidence of the French nation. He remained at the head of affairs in France for seventeen years, during which period he contrived to preserve tranquillity in the kingdom, thus giving France an opportunity to repair the losses occasioned by the wars of Louis XIV., and greatly increasing her commerce and wealth, while England was at the same time prospering under Walpole's wise and peaceful administration.

**Spanish  
Siege of  
Gibraltar.**

The general tranquillity of Europe was threatened by the action of Philip V. of Spain, whose army and navy laid siege to Gibraltar in February, 1727; but the peaceful Prime Ministers of Great Britain and France contrived to confine the struggle to the Spanish peninsula. The deaths of the Empress Catharine I. of Russia and King George I. of Great Britain, in 1727, also contributed to the preservation of peace.

**Treaty of  
Seville.**

Spain was the only great European power that had lately encouraged the attempts of the Pretender James Stuart to recover the British throne; and by the Treaty of Seville, in 1729, Spain made peace with Great Britain, France and Holland. The Second Treaty of Vienna, in 1731, reconciled France and Holland with the Emperor Charles VI. of Germany; and Spain also acceded to this treaty within a month. A family convention, by which the last Grand Duke of Tuscany belonging to the House of Medici appointed Don Carlos, the second son of Philip V. of Spain, as his heir, completed the pacification of Europe.

**George II.  
of Great  
Britain,  
A. D.  
1727-  
1760.**

George I. died of apoplexy in his carriage during his annual visit to his German Electorate of Hanover, June 10, 1727, in the sixty-eighth year of his age and the thirteenth of his reign over Great Britain, and was succeeded as Elector of Hanover and as King of Great Britain and Ireland by his son George Augustus, Prince of Wales, who assumed the title of GEORGE II. The new king was forty-four years of age at the time of his accession. Like his father, he was a German by birth and in feeling, being attached to his native German dominions, and caring little for England—a partiality which led him to consider the interests of Hanover in preference to those of Great Britain, and which therefore induced him to interfere in the politics of Continental Europe when British interests did not demand such interference.

**His Bad  
Character.**

Being able to speak English, George II. was more popular with his English subjects than his father had been. He was a dull, conceited despot, very methodical, obstinate, passionate and penurious, but fond

of war and possessed of unquestioned courage. He had no more taste for art, science or literature than his father, and was occasionally heard to growl, in his German-English, that he saw no use in "bainting and boetry." He was devoted to his beautiful wife, Caroline of Brandenburg; but, in spite of this feeling, his private character was notoriously bad.

George II., while Prince of Wales, had hated his father and his father's friends, and had a great dislike for Sir Robert Walpole; but he was entirely influenced by his clever wife, Queen Carolina, who was resolved that Walpole should continue to direct the policy of the British government. Strong in the queen's favor, Walpole remained in power as Prime Minister fifteen years longer, during which period he exerted himself to keep Great Britain at peace. He had little to do at home for some time; as the Jacobites did not disturb the government, while the Dissenters, or Nonconformists, who demanded the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, were pacified by the annual passage of an *Act of Indemnity* for any breaches of those penal statutes. During this period Parliament passed an act requiring all proceedings in British courts of justice to be conducted in the English language, some of the proceedings having been in Latin.

**Walpole's  
Long  
Ministry.**

**Act of  
Indem-  
nity.**

The excise duties were the most unpopular taxes in England. In 1733 Walpole proposed to extend those duties; but his scheme aroused a bitter and resolute opposition on the part of the Tories and the discontented Whigs, the latter of whom were called the "Patriots." These parties contrived to make this opposition assume the proportions of almost a revolt. Riots were frequent throughout the kingdom, and Queen Carolina urged Walpole to crush the resistance by force. The Prime Minister was confident that his measures would result in benefit to the British nation; but he withdrew the bill, saying: "I will not be the Minister to enforce taxes at the expense of blood."

**Excise  
Duties  
and  
Riots.**

King FREDERICK WILLIAM I. of Prussia, who succeeded his father, Frederick I., in 1713, as already noticed, was the opposite of his father in everything. He sold the jewels and the costly furniture that his father had collected, paid his debts with the proceeds, banished everything in the nature of luxury from the Prussian royal court, dismissed all the attendants who were not absolutely necessary, and avoided every superfluous expense. Frederick William I. and his court lived like citizens, their meals consisting of household fare, and his queen and her daughter being obliged to occupy themselves in domestic duties. The clothing and furniture of the royal family were simple.

**Frederick  
William  
I. of  
Prussia,  
A. D.  
1713-  
1740.**

The smoking-club, in which Frederick William I. and his "good friends" practiced coarse jests at the expense of the simple or good-natured, and where every one was obliged to have a pipe in his mouth,

**His  
Low  
Tastes  
and  
Habits.**

took the place of the intellectual circle with which his father and mother had surrounded themselves. The opera-singers and actors were dispensed with. French *beaux esprits* and teachers of language and dancing were banished from court; while poets, artists and scholars were deprived of their pensions wholly or partially. Wolff, whose free-thinking philosophy offended the pious and the orthodox, was ordered to leave the University of Halle within twenty-four hours, "under penalty of the rope."

**His  
Beneficial  
Rule.**

Notwithstanding the offensiveness of the king's coarseness and severity, and his contempt for all learning, culture and refinement, it must be acknowledged that his powerful nature, his sound judgment and his sparing economy added strength and firmness to the young Kingdom of Prussia. Frederick William I. relieved the peasants for the purpose of improving agriculture. He encouraged internal industry and forbade the importation of foreign manufactures. He caused the Protestants who had been driven from their homes by the Bishop of Salzburg to settle in his kingdom. His severity, though occasionally exercised at the expense of personal freedom, forced judges and officials to an efficient discharge of their functions.

**His  
Frugality  
and  
Economy.**

Frederick William's own example furnishes evidence of what can be accomplished by frugality and good management. Although he expended vast sums of money upon his Potsdam guards, for which he caused "tall fellows" to be enlisted or kidnapped from all European countries, and although he founded many useful institutions, he left at his death a sum equal to eight million thalers, an immense quantity of silver plate, a regulated revenue and an admirably-organized and splendidly-disciplined army of eighty thousand men.

**His Son  
Frederick.**

Frederick William's son—who succeeded his father and became the illustrious Frederick the Great—did not follow in his father's footsteps. While Frederick William I. was engaged in his wild hunting parties or pursuing his coarse amusements with his companions, his talented and intellectual son was diligently occupied with the works of French writers and with his flute, for which he had a passionate fondness. Their different dispositions had a tendency to estrange them from each other.

**Fred-  
erick's  
Quarrel  
with His  
Father  
and Im-  
prison-  
ment.**

Frederick was offended by his father's harshness; while the father was angry with his son for pursuing a different course, and would have willingly compelled him to abandon his course by severe treatment. This coldness and aversion increased as years rolled by; so that, when Frederick William I. capriciously opposed his son's intended marriage with a princess of the royal family of Great Britain, Frederick resolved to flee to England with a few young friends in 1730. The secret was revealed by an intercepted letter from the young prince to

his confidant, the Lieutenant von Katte. King Frederick William I. foamed with rage. He ordered his son to be imprisoned in a fortress, and Katte to be executed before the windows of the prince's prison; while all those who were suspected of complicity in the plot were severely punished by the infuriated sovereign. Frederick was released from his imprisonment only when he penitently implored his father's pardon, and only then were his sword and his uniform restored to him.

Soon afterward, in 1734, Frederick was married to a daughter of the princely House of Brunswick-Bevern; but the crown prince found little enjoyment in the narrow circles of domestic life, and he seldom visited his wife, especially after his father conferred the little town of Rheinsberg upon him, where he thenceforth led a cheerful life in the midst of a circle of intellectual, accomplished and free-thinking friends, in which grave and diversified studies were alternated with wit, jest and lively conversation.

Crown Prince Frederick read the works of the writers of ancient Greece and Rome in French translations, and derived therefrom a noble ambition to emulate the ancient Grecian and Roman heroes in their great achievements and their intellectual culture. He admired French literature and conceived such a veneration for Voltaire that he addressed the most flattering letters to that great French philosopher and satirist, and at a later period invited him to his presence. But both soon perceived that no personal intercourse could long endure between two persons of such similarly-sarcastic natures; and they separated from each other in anger, but still kept up a correspondence in writing.

Crown Prince Frederick exhibited his free way of thinking by receiving a number of French authors who had been banished from France because of the hostility of their writings to the Church; and after he became King of Prussia he showed the liberality of his views concerning religion by recalling Wolff to Halle, with the well-known declaration that in his kingdom every man might be happy in his own way.

Upon the death of Peter the Great, in 1725, his widow, the Empress CATHARINE I., became his successor on the throne of Russia, having been crowned during the life of her renowned husband. This remarkable woman had been a Swedish peasant girl, and was one of the many prisoners taken by the Russians at the capture of Marienburg from the Swedes; after which she became a servant in the house of Prince Menschikoff, who, as we have seen, himself had risen from the humble condition of a baker-boy to be the Prime Minister of Peter the Great. It was while Catharine was in Prince Menschikoff's service that Peter the Great first saw her. Struck with her beauty and with her quickness and firmness of mind, he married her. She aided her

**Frederick's Marriage.**

**His Relations with Voltaire.**

**His Religious Liberality.**

**Catharine I. of Russia, A. D. 1725-1727.**

illustrious husband in all his plans, and her even temper was able to soothe his frequent and violent fits of anger. After succeeding her husband as sole sovereign of Russia she continued his policy, with the support of the new Russian party, under the guidance of her former master, Prince Menschikoff.

**Peter II.,**  
A. D.  
1727-  
1730.  
Catharine I. died in 1727, after a brief reign, and was succeeded on the throne of all the Russias by her grandson **PETER II.**, the son of Alexis. Peter II. had married a daughter of Prince Menschikoff, whose insolence became so unendurable that his imperial son-in-law banished him to Siberia in the course of a few months.

**Anna,**  
A. D.  
1730-  
1740.  
**Ostermann, Munnich and Biron.**  
Peter II. died in 1730, after a reign of a few years; whereupon **ANNA**, Duchess of Courland, the niece of Peter the Great, became Empress of all the Russias. One of her first acts was to make peace with Nadir Shah of Persia and to restore most of the territory which Peter the Great had wrested from that Oriental monarchy. Anna reposed her confidence in two energetic and enterprising Germans, Ostermann and Münnich; the former of whom was her Prime Minister, while the latter was the commander-in-chief of her army. Her other favorite, Biron, ruled the Empress and the Empire with despotic sway, and banished twenty thousand persons to Siberia. Her reign of ten years, A. D. 1730-1740, was signalized by wars with the Crim Tartars and the Turks, which will be noticed hereafter.

**The Polish Succession.**  
**Frederick Augustus III. of Saxony.**  
The general peace of Europe was next disturbed by a contest over the Polish succession. On the death of King Frederick Augustus I. of Poland, the Elector Frederick Augustus II. of Saxony, in 1733, his son Frederick Augustus succeeded him as Elector of Saxony by hereditary right, with the title of Frederick Augustus III., and also appeared as a candidate for the elective crown of Poland. His candidacy was supported by the Empress Anna of Russia and by the Emperor Charles VI. of Germany, whose niece he had married, but whose support he had gained only by renouncing the claims of the Electoral dynasty of Saxony to the Austrian succession and giving his guarantee to the Pragmatic Sanction.

**Stanislas Leczinski.**  
The deposed Stanislas Leczinski also became a candidate for the Polish crown, with the support of his son-in-law, King Louis XV. of France; and, as he was a native Pole, he was preferred by the great majority of the Polish people. The defects of the constitution of Poland placed that unhappy country at the disposal of foreign powers. A pretense respecting the freedom of election was made; but both parties lavishly used money to secure votes in the Polish Diet, while a Russian army was quartered in Poland and an Austrian army in Silesia, both ready to take the field to support the claims of the Elector Frederick Augustus III. of Saxony to the crown of Poland.

Stanislas Leczinski, as the more popular candidate, was elected King of Poland by a large majority of the Polish nobles on the great plain of Wola, September 12, 1733; but a small minority of the Polish Diet crossed the Vistula to Praga and gave their votes to the Saxon Elector, whom they immediately proclaimed King of Poland with the title of FREDERICK AUGUSTUS II., and who was recognized by the Emperor Charles VI. of Germany and the Empress Anna of Russia.

**His Election.**

**Frederick Augustus II.**

As Stanislas Leczinski was not supported by his Polish partisans or by his father-in-law, King Louis XV. of France, he became a fugitive from his native land a second time, fleeing from Warsaw and seeking refuge at Dantzic, which was besieged and taken by a Russian army in 1734, whereupon the refugee Stanislas Leczinski fled in the disguise of a peasant to the court of King Frederick William I. of Prussia, who protected his person, but who furnished a contingent of ten thousand Prussian soldiers to aid the Russians and the Austrians in opposing his cause. Thus began the *War of the Polish Succession*.

**Flight of Stanislas Leczinski.**

The other powers of Europe availed themselves of the War of the Polish Succession to fight out their own quarrels, while the unhappy people of Poland suffered all the injury of a struggle in which they had no voice. France began hostilities in 1733 by seizing the German imperial province of Loraine, while Philip V. of Spain formed an alliance with Louis XV. for the purpose of recovering the Italian possessions of his predecessors which he had relinquished to the Austrian Hapsburgs by the Treaties of Utrecht and Rastadt. King Charles Emmanuel III. of Sardinia, the son and successor of Victor Amadeus II., who died in 1730, promised an alliance with the House of Hapsburg; and so well did he deceive the Emperor Charles VI. that the latter was totally taken unawares when the Sardinian, or Piedmontese army was mowing down his own troops on the plains of Lombardy.

**War of the Polish Succession.**

A French and Piedmontese army under Marshal Villars conquered the Duchy of Milan. The French army of the Rhine commanded by the Duke of Berwick, the son of the ill-fated James II. of England, took Kehl, Treves and Trarbach, and besieged Philipsburg, where he was killed June 12, 1734. Marshal Villars died several days afterward at Turin. These were the last of the great generals of Louis XIV. The German imperial forces on the Rhine were under the command of Prince Eugene, who was unable to check the victorious course of the French. After the death of Villars the French and Sardinian armies defeated the German imperial forces at Parma, June 29, 1734, and at Guastalla, September 17, 1734, thus gaining full possession of all Austrian Lombardy after two bloody campaigns.

**Operations in Italy and on the Rhine.**

In the meantime a Spanish army under Don Carlos, the second son of King Philip V., invaded Naples, where the Austrian rule was uni-

**Spanish  
Conquest  
of Naples  
and  
Sicily.**

versally detested. The victory of the Spaniards over the German imperial troops at Bitonto, in May, 1734, completed the Spanish conquest of the mainland of the Kingdom of Naples; and a few months later the island of Sicily was also reduced under the Spanish dominion. Don Carlos was crowned at Palermo as King of Naples and Sicily under the title of Charles IV., thus beginning the rule of the Spanish Bourbons in Southern Italy. The mild disposition of the young king, and the wisdom of his Minister, Bernardo Tanucci, who had formerly been a professor of law at Pisa, made the beginning of this Spanish Bourbon dynasty in Naples and Sicily far more beneficent than its later years.

**Neutral-  
ity of  
Great  
Britain  
and  
Holland.**

Thus defeated on the Rhine and in Italy, the Emperor Charles VI. solicited the aid of Great Britain and Holland. King George II. of Great Britain and his wife, Queen Carolina, were both anxious to take part in the War of the Polish Succession, but the firmness of Prime Minister Sir Robert Walpole kept Great Britain out of this war, and in 1736 the joint intervention of Great Britain and Holland restored peace to Europe.

**Third  
Treaty  
of Vienna.**

As the imperial House of Hapsburg had lost all its possessions in Italy, the Emperor Charles VI. became anxious for peace; and this desire was shared by all the belligerent powers. Hostilities ended in 1735; but the Third Treaty of Vienna, which ended the War of the Polish Succession, was not signed by the belligerent powers until November 8, 1738.

**Lorraine  
Annexed  
to France.**

By this treaty Stanislas Leczinski renounced his claims to the crown of Poland, and received in exchange the German duchies of Lorraine and Bar, which had already been acquired by France, and which, as the dowry of his daughter, the wife of King Louis XV., were to revert to France, to which they were to be permanently annexed on the death of Stanislas. Francis Stephen, the former Duke of Lorraine, who was affianced to the Austrian Archduchess Maria Theresa, the daughter of the Emperor Charles VI. of Germany, was indemnified for his loss of Lorraine by the Italian Grand Duchy of Tuscany, which he received on the death of the last of the famous House of Medici, which occurred before the treaty was signed. Francis Stephen was very reluctant to part with his duchy of Lorraine, but when the Emperor Charles VI. told him that only on that condition could he have the Archduchess Maria Theresa he yielded. France withdrew her protest against his marriage with the Emperor's daughter. A small portion of Lorraine was secured to him in order that he might remain a prince of the German Empire, and that he might thus have a better prospect of election to the imperial throne of Germany upon the death of his father-in-law.



By this treaty the Spanish Bourbon prince Don Carlos was acknowledged as King of Naples and Sicily, and he relinquished to the Emperor Charles VI. his fiefs in Northern Italy; while France, Spain and Sardinia confirmed the Pragmatic Sanction, which, as already noticed, the Emperor Charles VI. had framed for the purpose of securing the peaceable succession to his hereditary Austrian territories to his daughter Maria Theresa.

**Pragmatic Sanction Confirmed.**

In 1735 the Empress Anna of Russia had commenced a war against the Tartars of the Crimea, who were tributary to the Ottoman Porte; and soon afterward she began hostilities against Sultan MAHMOUD, I., the successor of Achmet III., who had been hurled from his throne in 1730 by a revolt of the Janizaries. Münnich, the Empress Anna's commander-in-chief, the founder of the Russian military system, reconquered Azov, which the Turks had recovered, and gained brilliant victories by his masterly tactics, capturing Oczakoff in 1737 and Kozim in 1739, and thus conquering the principality of Moldavia.

**War between Russia and Turkey.**

**Münnich's Victories.**

In 1737 Austria took part in the war as an ally of Russia; but, as Prince Eugene had died April 21, 1736, the Austrian troops had no great general to lead them to victory; and, after a disastrous defeat at Krotzka, July 21, 1738, they were forced to a disgraceful retreat, being thus driven from Servia, Bosnia and Wallachia; while the victorious Turks retook Orsova and besieged Belgrade. The Emperor Charles VI. of Germany was greatly alarmed by the disasters to his arms; and in 1739 the Peace of Belgrade put an end to hostilities between Austria and Turkey, Austria surrendering the fortresses of Belgrade, Sabatz and Orsova to the Turks. Peace was also soon made between Russia and the Porte, Russia retaining Azov and extending her frontier in the Ukraine, but agreeing to keep no fleet in the Black Sea.

**Austria's Alliance with Russia.**

**Austrian Defeats.**

**Peace of Belgrade.**

In the very year of the Peace of Belgrade a colonial and maritime war broke out between Spain and Great Britain. On the death of Queen Caroline, in 1737, Sir Robert Walpole's power in England commenced to decline. Frederick, Prince of Wales, hated his father, and openly supported the "Patriots," or discontented Whigs, who were the avowed enemies of the able Prime Minister who had so long wielded the destinies of Great Britain. The English people were tired of the long peace which they had enjoyed under Walpole's wise administration, and the British mercantile class was resolved upon pushing its contraband trade with Spain's South American colonies.

**War Feeling in England against Spain.**

The Treaty of Utrecht had restricted this trade to the traffic in negro slaves and to the yearly visit of but one ship, but a large and steady smuggling trade with these colonies had been carried on for some years. King Philip V. was very hostile to this traffic, and after

**Great Britain's Contraband Traffic.**

his accession Spain redoubled her exertions to end it. The Englishmen who were taken captive while engaged in this trade were rigorously punished by imprisonment or by the loss of a nose or an ear, and when they returned home they aroused the indignation of their countrymen by their stories of the cruelties which they had suffered from the Spaniards. The English people considered them martyrs for the freedom of commerce, and Walpole was unable to control the fury which the accounts of these outrages aroused.

Colonial  
Boundary  
Disputes.

Besides the privilege claimed by the English of supplying the Spanish American colonies with African slaves, and the right claimed by the Spaniards of searching British vessels for contraband goods, the boundaries between the new English colony of Georgia and the Spanish colony of Florida were in dispute. In 1735 Philip V. of Spain had strengthened himself by a *Family Compact* with King Louis XV., a treaty which bound these two Bourbon kings to unite in an effort to recover Gibraltar for Spain and to harass English commerce by a swarm of French privateers as well as by the French national fleet.

Family  
Compact.

Jenkins's  
Ear.

In exercising the right to search English vessels upon the high seas for contraband goods, a Spanish captain who found nothing to seize wantonly tore off the ear of the English ship-master Jenkins, and told him to carry it to King George II. with the message that if the Spaniards had caught His Majesty they would have treated him in the same manner. The account of this outrage aroused a storm of indignation in England, thus forcing Sir Robert Walpole against his will into war with Spain, which was declared in 1739. The popular joy was expressed in London by the ringing of bells; whereupon Walpole remarked, with wise forethought: "They may ring their bells now. Before long they will be wringing their hands."

Walpole  
Forced  
into War  
with  
Spain.

Spanish  
Prizes.

Capture  
of Porto  
Bello.

Attack on  
Carta-  
gena.

The colonial and maritime war thus commenced was not on the whole either successful or profitable to Great Britain. During the first three months of hostilities the Spaniards took prizes amounting to more than a million dollars. In 1739 a British fleet under Admiral Vernon stormed and captured Porto Bello, a rich Spanish town on the Isthmus of Panama; but in 1740 Admiral Vernon and General Wentworth were repulsed in an assault upon Cartagena, a still more important town on the northern coast of South America.

Anson's  
Voyage  
around  
the Globe.

In the meantime a British naval expedition under Commodore Anson sailed to the South American waters with the design of attacking the Spanish colonies of Chili and Peru. This expedition crossed the Pacific to China in search of a rich Spanish galleon, which was finally captured, June 9, 1743; after which Anson completed his voyage around the globe, returning to England by way of the Cape of Good Hope, after an absence of almost four years; but the expedition suf-



MARIA THERESA

From the Painting by W. Camphausen



ferred terrible hardships, and was reduced by scurvy, so that Anson's flag-ship was the only vessel that returned home.

Walpole's reluctance to engage in this war had made him very unpopular among his countrymen, and his political enemies took advantage of this feeling to hold him responsible for the ill success of the British in the struggle; but the Prime Minister held his ground firmly for several years longer. The Anglo-Spanish war became merged in that general European contest known as the War of the Austrian Succession, which began in 1740 and lasted eight years, and the details of which will be narrated fully in the next section.

**Walpole's  
Unpopu-  
larity.**

## SECTION II.—WAR OF THE AUSTRIAN SUCCESSION (A. D. 1740–1748.)

THREE of the leading sovereigns of Europe died in 1740—King Frederick William I. of Prussia, May 31; the Empress Anna of Russia, October 17; and the Emperor Charles VI. of Germany, October 21.

**Deaths of  
Sover-  
eigns.**

Frederick William I. was succeeded as King of Prussia by his son FREDERICK II., who afterward became so illustrious in history as FREDERICK THE GREAT. Frederick II. was twenty-eight years of age at his accession, and was in vigorous health. He was endowed with great natural abilities, and was destined to become one of the greatest characters of history—a great warrior and a great sovereign. Upon his accession he at once devoted himself with diligence to the government of his kingdom; and his subjects soon perceived that he was as much a king as his father had been, but that he was a more enlightened monarch. He took all branches of the government into his own hands, and administered each according to his own will, asking advice from no one, and requiring his Ministers simply to record his decisions and to execute his orders. His kingdom at once felt the impulse of his vigorous policy. On his accession to the throne he received a well-provided treasury and a powerful, well-organized and strictly-disciplined army. By his abilities as a general and a statesman, Frederick II. raised Prussia to a front rank in the list of nations, thus preparing that great German kingdom for the eventual leadership of Germany.

**Frederick  
the  
Great of  
Prussia,  
A. D.  
1740–  
1786.**

**His  
Vigorous  
Policy.**

Having no male heirs, the Emperor Charles VI. of Germany had obtained, by great concessions, among which was the cession of the German dukedom of Lorraine to France, the agreement of all the leading European powers to the famous Pragmatic Sanction, by which he left the succession to his hereditary Austrian dominions to his only daughter, MARIA THERESA, Queen of Hungary, wife of Francis Stephen of Lorraine, Grand Duke of Tuscany.

**Maria  
Theresa  
and the  
Austrian  
Succes-  
sion.**

Rival  
Claim-  
ants  
for the  
Austrian  
Domin-  
ions.

No sooner had the Emperor Charles VI. descended to his grave than a host of claimants appeared for various portions of the hereditary Austrian estates and endeavored to make good their pretensions by force of arms. The Elector of Bavaria, Charles Albert, laid claim to the hereditary states of Austria, Bohemia and Hungary, as a descendant of the eldest daughter of the Emperor Ferdinand II. Frederick Augustus III., Elector of Saxony, King Frederick Augustus II. of Poland, raised claims to Moravia. Frederick II., the young King of Prussia, revived some old pretensions of the House of Hohenzollern to Silesia. Philip V. of Spain cast a longing eye on some of the Italian possessions of the House of Hapsburg. France, regarding the opportunity auspicious for the humiliation of the proud House of Hapsburg, readily violated the Pragmatic Sanction by supporting the claims of the Elector of Bavaria to the Austrian succession, against the judgment of Cardinal Fleury, who desired peace. Great Britain, under Sir Robert Walpole, alone at first espoused the cause of Maria Theresa, furnishing her with large subsidies, and afterward offering her military aid; and Holland and Sardinia finally took up arms in her favor. A secret alliance called the *League of Nymphenburg* was concluded between the Kings of France, Spain, Prussia and Sardinia, and the Electors of Saxony, Bavaria, Cologne and the Palatinate. This contest, which convulsed Europe for eight years, is known as the *War of the Austrian Succession*, A. D. 1740-1748.

League of  
Nymph-  
enburg.

First  
Silesian  
War.

Soon after the death of the Emperor Charles VI., Frederick II. of Prussia made a sudden irruption into Silesia at the head of thirty thousand men. Frederick speedily conquered Silesia, and offered to enter into an alliance with Maria Theresa if she confirmed him in the possession of his new conquest; but the young Queen of Bohemia and Hungary declared her determination to uphold the integrity of her hereditary dominions, and thus gave occasion to the *First Silesian War*.

Battle of  
Molwitz.

On April 10, 1741, hostilities were commenced by the battle of Molwitz, in which the King of Prussia, by the skill and bravery of his two leading generals, Prince Leopold of Dessau and Marshal Schwerin, gained a complete victory over the Austrians, and was thus enabled to hold possession of Silesia.

Ivan VI.  
of Russia,  
Biron and  
Munnich.

Before her death in October, 1740, the Empress Anna of Russia had appointed her tyrannical favorite, Biron, regent for her grand-nephew and successor, the infant IVAN VI., the son of Prince Anthony Ulrich of Brunswick and his wife, Anne of Mecklenburg; but Biron, who during Anna's reign had banished twenty thousand persons to Siberia, was now exiled to the same inhospitable region by Field-Marshal Münnich, through the machinations of the infant Czar's mother, who then became regent.

As the party which favored an alliance with Maria Theresa controlled the regent's Ministry, France instigated Sweden to make war on Russia; the party of the *Hats*, the partisans of France, then prevailing in Sweden over the faction of the *Caps*, the adherents of Russia. Sweden accordingly concluded an alliance with France, from which she received a subsidy. The Swedish Diet declared war against Russia, August, 1741. The Russians invaded the Swedish province of Finland, defeated the Swedes at Wilmanstrand, September 3, 1741, and took that town by storm.

War  
between  
Sweden  
and  
Russia.

In the meantime another revolution took place in the palace of St. Petersburg. With the support of the French ambassador and a company of the regent's guards, the Princess ELIZABETH, daughter of Peter the Great and Catharine I., caused herself to be proclaimed Empress of all the Russias, consigning the little Czar Ivan VI. to life-long imprisonment. The Swedes entered into peace negotiations with Elizabeth, but as their pretensions were too extravagant hostilities were renewed. In 1742 the Swedes were driven from all their posts in Finland and retired to Helsingfors, where they were besieged by the Russian army and navy and forced to surrender, thus placing all Finland in the possession of the Russians. By the Peace of Abo, in July, 1743, Sweden recovered a portion of Finland, but ceded to Russia the remainder of that province, including the towns and fortresses of Nyslott, Frederiksham and Wilmanstrand.

Elizabeth  
of Russia,  
A. D.  
1741-  
1762.

Capture  
of Hel-  
singfors.

Peace  
of Abo.

France having determined to support the cause of the Elector of Bavaria, a powerful French army under the command of Marshal Belleisle marched into Germany, and, after having been joined by the Bavarians and the Saxons, invaded the Archduchy of Austria, captured Linz, menaced Vienna, compelled Maria Theresa to flee from her capital, and then marched into Bohemia and took possession of Prague.

French  
Invasion  
of  
Austria.

The Elector Charles Albert of Bavaria was crowned at Linz as Archduke of Austria, and at Prague as King of Bohemia; and, through the influence of France and Prussia, the German Electoral Princes, in the Diet at Frankfort-on-the-Main, elected him to the imperial throne of Germany with the title of CHARLES VII., in January, 1742.

Emperor  
Charles  
VII.,  
A. D.  
1742-  
1745.

With her infant son Joseph in her arms, Maria Theresa appeared in the Diet of the Hungarian nobles at Pressburg, and sympathetically appealed to them to aid her in her distressed condition. The hearts of the Hungarians were touched, and they unanimously exclaimed: "*Moriamur pro rege nostro Maria Theresa!*" "Let us die for our king, Maria Theresa!"

Maria  
Theresa  
and the  
Hunga-  
rian Diet.

Troops of Croats, Pandours and Slavs, wild and warlike races of Southern Hungary, under the conduct of Khevenhüller and Bärenklau, to the number of one hundred thousand, now flocked to the standard of

Hungarian  
Expulsion  
of the  
French  
and  
Invasion  
of  
Bavaria.

Maria Theresa, and, after driving the French and the Bavarians out of the Austrian territories, entered Bavaria, and took possession of Munich on the very day that the Elector of Bavaria was crowned Emperor at Frankfort. The new Emperor was obliged to live in retirement from his hereditary Bavarian dominions, which were frightfully plundered and devastated by the Austrians and the Hungarians, who in the meantime had been joined by the Tyrolese.

Great  
Britain's  
Interven-  
tion.

In the meantime Great Britain sent one fleet which blockaded Cadiz, and another against Naples which compelled Charles IV., the Spanish Bourbon King of Naples, to conclude a treaty of neutrality by threatening to bombard his capital. By means of liberal subsidies Great Britain induced the King of Sardinia to renounce his alliance with France. These results were mainly achieved during the Ministry of Sir Robert Walpole, who aimed at the preservation of the House of Hapsburg.

Walpole's  
Resignation.

Early in 1742 Sir Robert Walpole was able only to command a bare majority of three in Parliament in favor of his measures; whereupon he resigned the office of Prime Minister, and was succeeded by a new Whig Ministry under Lord Carteret. King George II. at once created Walpole Earl of Orford, and continued to consult him on public affairs in preference to Lord Carteret's new Ministry. As Earl of Orford, Walpole took his seat in the House of Lords, and devoted himself to restoring the unity of the Whig party and breaking up the opposition.

William  
Pitt's  
Opposition  
to  
Lord  
Carteret.

Lord Carteret's Ministry went farther than Walpole, and aimed at the ruin of the House of Bourbon. The policy of the new Ministry encountered a determined opposition in England, particularly the employment of Hanoverian and Hessian troops by King George II. William Pitt, the ablest leader and the most gifted orator of the "Patriots," or discontented Whigs, declared in a speech in the House of Commons: "It is now too apparent that this powerful, this great, this mighty nation is considered only as a province to a despicable Electorate."

Frederick  
in  
Bohemia.

In the meantime the King of Prussia had invaded Bohemia with a powerful army; and on May 17, 1742, he was fiercely attacked near Czaslau by the Austrians under Prince Charles of Lorraine and Field-Marshal Königseg. By the irresistible impetuosity of the Prussian cavalry under Field-Marshal Buddenbrock, and a dashing charge by the Prussian infantry headed by Frederick in person, the Austrians were repulsed with heavy loss. This victory gave Frederick full possession of Silesia.

Battle of  
Czaslau.

Peace of  
Breslau.

On July 28, 1742, Frederick concluded with Maria Theresa the Peace of Breslau, by which he was left in possession of Silesia.



After the Peace of Breslau with the King of Prussia, the Austrians recovered the greater part of Bohemia from the French. The French army under Marshal Belleisle was besieged in Prague, and at length compelled to evacuate that city and to retreat in the midst of winter to Eger, and thence through Germany to the Rhine, after immense losses, only thirteen thousand men of Belleisle's once-splendid army surviving.

**French  
Retreat  
from  
Bohemia.**

This terrible French disaster hurried Cardinal Fleury to his grave. He died January 29, 1743, at the age of ninety. For some time after his death, King Louis XV., who was naturally indolent and indisposed to attend to his royal duties, left the affairs of his kingdom to the various Ministers at the head of the different branches of the public service. The real ruler of France at this period was the king's mistress, the Duchess de Chateauroux, a talented and ambitious woman, who exerted herself to rouse Louis XV. to a sense of his royal duties.

**Louis XV.  
and the  
Duchess  
de Cha-  
teauroux.**

The Emperor Charles VII. found himself deserted by the French and disastrously defeated by the Austrians, while his capital was again occupied by Maria Theresa's troops. In these humiliating circumstances, he consented to abandon Bavaria on condition that the remnant of his army might be quartered in some neutral state of the German Empire. Maria Theresa received the allegiance of the Bavarian Estates.

**Austrian  
Occupation  
of  
Bavaria.**

In 1743 Great Britain, under Lord Carteret's Ministry, began to take an active part in the war against France, as an ally of Maria Theresa. A British army of forty thousand men, under King George II. and the Earl of Stair, having advanced into Germany, was attacked by a French army of sixty thousand men, under Marshal de Noailles, at the village of Dettingen, near Aschaffenburg, June 27, 1743. Brought by the excellent arrangements of the French marshal into a perilous position, where advance or retreat was impossible without being exposed to attack at the greatest disadvantage, the whole British army with the king would have become prisoners to the French but for the impetuosity of one of the French commanders, who attacked the British in a narrow defile, where his troops, becoming entangled, were fiercely assailed by the Earl of Stair, and all the plans of Noailles were disconcerted. A general engagement ensued, and the French were disastrously defeated and compelled to retreat. The British, however, neglected to follow up their victory.

**British  
Invasion  
of  
Germany.**

**Battle of  
Det-  
tingen.**

After withdrawing from the League of Nymphenburg, King Charles Emmanuel of Sardinia entered into a close alliance with Maria Theresa, engaging to keep forty-five thousand troops in the field on condition of receiving an annual subsidy from Great Britain and some accessions of territory in Northern Italy. At the same time a second *Family*

**Austro-  
Sardinian  
Alliance.**

- Family Compact.** *Compact* of the Bourbon dynasties of France and Spain united those two kingdoms in war against Great Britain and Sardinia.
- French Invasion of the Austrian Netherlands.** In March, 1744, a French army of eighty thousand men took the field, under the nominal leadership of King Louis XV., but under the real command of Marshal de Noailles and Count Maurice of Saxony, better known as Marshal Saxe, an illegitimate son of the Elector Frederick Augustus III. of Saxony, King Frederick Augustus II. of Poland. This formidable French army invaded the Austrian Netherlands and captured many towns; but, in the midst of his victorious career, the King of France was obliged to return, to defend his own dominions against the Austrians, who, under Prince Charles of Lorraine, crossed the Rhine and conquered the greater portion of Alsace. The Austrians were, however, soon recalled to operate against the King of Prussia, who had again taken up arms against Maria Theresa.
- Austrian Invasion of France.** In August, 1744, the Emperor Charles VII., the Kings of Prussia, and Sweden and the Elector-Palatine concluded the *League of Frankfurt* against Maria Theresa. Fearing that Maria Theresa, encouraged by her successes against the French and the Bavarians, would make an attempt to reconquer Silesia, Frederick II. of Prussia commenced the *Second Silesian War* by invading Bohemia with seventy thousand troops. In September, 1744, Frederick laid siege to Prague, which was soon compelled to surrender with its garrison of eighteen thousand Austrian troops. Frederick was, however, soon compelled to retreat with the loss of twenty thousand men; as the promised diversion of the French on the side of the Rhine was prevented by the illness of Louis XV. at Metz—an illness which imperilled the life of the French king, who, upon his recovery, received the undeserved title of *the Well-beloved* from his overjoyed subjects.
- League of Frankfurt.**
- Second Silesian War.**
- Capture of Prague.**
- Austrian Reverses in Bavaria and Italy.** In the meantime the Emperor Charles VII. took advantage of the Second Silesian War to recover his hereditary dominions and to re-establish himself at Munich. The Austrian army in Italy, which had advanced almost to the Kingdom of Naples in 1743, was driven northward nearly to the Po in 1744.
- Great Britain's Warm Side for Prussia.** Great Britain, which thus far had so enthusiastically sustained the cause of Maria Theresa, was now startled by her scheme for the dismemberment of the Kingdom of Prussia. Even Lord Carteret was astounded thereby. As we shall presently observe, Protestant Great Britain, menaced by a Catholic Pretender, could not for a moment entertain the idea of destroying the leading Protestant power of Continental Europe. The more moderate Whigs determined upon peace and a treaty with Frederick the Great of Prussia.
- Pelham's Ministry.** In pursuance of this policy, Lord Carteret was forced to resign in 1744; whereupon Henry Pelham, the brother of the Duke of Newcastle,

became Prime Minister and directed the policy of Great Britain. Under Pelham's guidance Great Britain and Prussia concluded the *Convention of Hanover*, in accordance with which Great Britain withdrew from the war so far as her participation in German affairs was concerned, August, 1745.

**Conven-  
tion of  
Hanover.**

In January, 1745, a *Quadruple Alliance* united more closely the interests of Maria Theresa, the Elector of Saxony, the Dutch Republic and Great Britain. The Emperor Charles VII. of Germany died January 20, 1745; and his son Maximilian Joseph, who succeeded him as Elector of Bavaria, made peace with Maria Theresa, renouncing all claims to the Austrian dominions by the Treaty of Füssen, April, 1745, by which he also promised his Electoral vote to her husband on condition of their retrospective acknowledgment of his father's imperial title and their guarantee of his own undisturbed possession of Bavaria. In spite of the protests of the King of Prussia as Elector of Brandenburg and of the Elector-Palatine, Maria Theresa's husband, Francis Stephen of Lorraine, Grand Duke of Tuscany, was elected Emperor of Germany with the title of FRANCIS I.; thus founding the new imperial House of Austria—the House of Hapsburg-Lorraine. Although the original cause of the war was now removed, the national animosity which animated Great Britain and France prevented the restoration of a general peace.

**Quad-  
ruple  
Alliance.**

**Treaty of  
Fussen.**

**Emperor  
Francis  
I., A. D.  
1745-  
1765.**

In the meantime the Austrians, under the able Field-Marshal Traun, had reconquered Silesia from the Prussians. But the Prussians soon regained the supremacy by some splendid triumphs. Frederick II. won a brilliant victory over the Austrians among the hills of Hohenfriedberg, June 4, 1745. A Prussian force under Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick gained a victory at Sorr, September 30, 1745. Prince Leopold of Dessau, with Prussian troops, defeated the Saxons under General Rutowski, who were now the allies of the Austrians, in a bloody engagement at Kesselsdorf, December 15, 1745; and the King of Prussia entered Dresden, the Saxon capital, in triumph. The Second Silesian War was ended by the Peace of Dresden, by which Maria Theresa consented to leave Silesia in the possession of Frederick, who in turn recognized her husband as Emperor, December, 1745. The Elector of Saxony recovered his hereditary dominions by the payment of a large ransom.

**Battles of  
Hohen-  
friedberg,  
Sorr and  
Kessels-  
dorf.**

**Peace of  
Dresden.**

The Austrian Netherlands were now the theater of some severe struggles on the part of the French against the united armies of Great Britain, Holland and Austria. On May 11, 1745, was fought the great battle of Fontenoy, in which the combined British, Dutch and Austrian forces, commanded by the Duke of Cumberland, son of George II. of Great Britain, were thoroughly defeated, with the loss of seven

**French  
Successes  
in the  
Austrian  
Nether-  
lands.**

**Battle of  
Fontenoy.**

thousand men, by the French army, numbering fifty thousand men, under the command of Marshal Saxe; in consequence of which Tournay, Ghent, Bruges, Oudenarde, Nieupoort and Ath were occupied by the French. Louis XV. returned to Paris and was received like a conqueror.

**Jacobite  
Rising  
in Great  
Britain.**

The danger to Great Britain at home had already vindicated the wisdom of Sir Robert Walpole's peace policy and his prudence in foiling the Pretender's hopes by his steady friendship for France. The Jacobites could expect aid only from France, and the war with France at once revived their hopes. Early in the war France endeavored to weaken Great Britain by inciting a civil war in that kingdom. Charles Edward Stuart, the grandson of the ill-fated James II.—called the *Young Pretender* and the *Young Chevalier*—received an invitation from the French government to return to France, and was placed in command of a formidable armament for the invasion of Great Britain in 1744; but his effort for a descent upon the coast of Scotland was frustrated by a storm which wrecked his fleet, thus compelling him to relinquish his enterprise.

**The  
Young  
Pre-  
tender's  
Invasion  
of  
Scotland.**

In 1745 the Young Pretender, encouraged by the British defeat at Fontenoy, again embarked with seven followers in a small vessel, and landed on one of the islands of the Hebrides, whence he made his way to the Highlands, and set up his standard at Glenfinnan, August 29, 1745, being there joined by fifteen hundred clansmen. With these Highlanders he marched through Blair Athol on Perth, his army increasing on the march. He entered Edinburgh in triumph, September 16, 1745, and proclaimed his father King of Scotland with the title of James VIII. at the Town Cross.

**Battle of  
Preston  
Pans.**

Two thousand English troops under Sir John Cope who marched against Charles Edward Stuart were defeated and cut to pieces by a wild charge of the Highland clansmen at Preston Pans, September 21, 1745. This victory greatly elated the Young Pretender and his followers, and at once doubled his forces, so that he now had six thousand men, all of whom were Highlanders, as the Lowlanders held aloof from his standard.

**The  
Young  
Pre-  
tender's  
Invasion  
of  
England.**

It was only after the greatest difficulty that the Young Pretender finally persuaded his Highlanders to follow him southward in an invasion of England. After crossing the border into England, he skillfully evaded the royal army at Newcastle and marched through Cumberland and Lancashire toward London, reaching Derby by December 4, 1745, and creating the greatest consternation throughout England. Although he marched through the English counties in which Jacobitism boasted of its strength, only a solitary squire and less than two hundred men of the lower class joined his army as he marched from Carlisle to



BATTLE OF FONTENOY



Derby. Although Catholics and Tories abounded in Lancashire, the people simply flocked to see his march as if they were going to see a show. Manchester, the very stronghold of Jacobitism, only gave him an illumination and two thousand pounds. Sir Robert Walpole's peace policy, which had made England wealthy and prosperous, had won the nation to the House of Brunswick. Jacobitism as a fighting force was dead, existing simply as a matter of tradition and as a means of expressing political opposition to the government; and Charles Edward Stuart himself saw that it was impossible to conquer rich and powerful England with five thousand barbarous Highlanders.

The Young Pretender also soon ascertained that forces twice the size of his own were closing in on each side of him, while a third English army under King George II. and the Earl of Stair covered London. While Charles Edward's Highlanders were in England, the Scots of the Lowlands quietly renewed their allegiance to the House of Brunswick. Even in the Highlands the clan of the MacLeods took up arms for King George II.; while the clan of the Gordons refused to stir, though roused by a small French force which landed at Montrose.

The Young Pretender's officers were now thoroughly alarmed, and refused to continue their advance, urging him to retreat into Scotland. The young Stuart consented very reluctantly and fell back on Glasgow. The reinforcements which he received there increased his army to nine thousand men; whereupon he marched against the English army under General Hawley, which had pursued him in his retreat from England. The English were defeated at Falkirk by a wild charge of the Highlanders, January 23, 1746. But this victory was as fatal to the Young Pretender as a defeat would have been, as the bulk of his army dispersed to the mountains with their booty; and Charles Edward was obliged to retreat into the Highlands, pursued by the royal army under the Duke of Cumberland, that son of King George II. who was so signally defeated by the French at Fontenoy.

In the memorable battle of Culloden Moor, a few miles east of Inverness, April 16, 1746, the Young Pretender with his six thousand starving and dispirited Highlanders was hopelessly defeated; and there the cause of the Stuarts received its death-blow. The royal army under the Duke of Cumberland was almost twice as large as the Pretender's force. The royal artillery broke the ranks of the Highlanders, whereupon the clansmen flung themselves in their usual style upon the English front, but were received with a dreadful fire of musketry. The few Highlanders who broke through the front line of the royal army found themselves confronted by a second line. In a few moments the battle was decided, and the Highlanders became a mass of hunted fugitives. The triumphant English massacred the wounded High-

**His  
Failure.**

**Scottish  
Submission  
to the  
House of  
Brunswick.**

**The Pre-  
tender's  
Retreat to  
Scotland.**

**Battle of  
Falkirk.**

**Battle of  
Culloden  
Moor.**

Desolation  
of the  
High-  
lands.

landers on the field; and the Duke of Cumberland tarnished the glory of his victory by acts of cruelty and by a savage desolation of the country around Culloden, thus acquiring the unenviable name of "the Butcher." So complete was the desolation that in a district of fifty miles around Lochiel neither house nor cottage, neither man nor beast, were to be seen. The battle of Culloden was the last fought on the island of Great Britain.

Execution  
of  
Jacobite  
Leaders.

In the meantime the headsman and the hangman had been kept busy. Four Scotch nobles—Lords Lovat and Balmerino and the Earls of Kilmarnock and Cromartie—were tried and convicted by the House of Lords on charges of high treason, as was also Charles Radcliffe, brother of the Earl of Derwentwater, who had been beheaded for his efforts in behalf of the old Pretender; and all were beheaded on Tower Hill, except the Earl of Cromartie, who was pardoned. Fifty of the Young Pretender's followers were hanged, drawn and quartered in England—seventeen at Kennington Common, in the vicinity of London; nine at Carlisle and eleven at York; and the rest at other places. A few were pardoned, and hundreds were banished to the English colonies in North America.

Suppres-  
sion  
of the  
Highland  
Clans.

More heroic measures of repression were adopted for the Highlands. The feudal tenures were there abolished, and the hereditary jurisdictions of the chiefs of the clans were bought up and transferred to the British crown. The *tartan*, or dress of the Highland clansmen, was forbidden by Act of Parliament. These severe measures, followed by a general *Act of Indemnity*, accomplished their purpose; and the dread of the Highlanders passed away forever. The sheriff's writ was soon executed in the Highlands with no more resistance than in the streets of Edinburgh.

The  
Young  
Pre-  
tender's  
Romantic  
Escape to  
France.

The Young Pretender escaped from the battlefield of Culloden, and wandered about the wilds of the Highlands, a hunted fugitive, in hardship and peril and in various disguises. His romantic adventures and narrow escapes remind us of the perilous wanderings of his grand-uncle, Charles II., after the battle of Worcester. With English dragoons patrolling all the roads and English cruisers closely watching the coast, it appeared utterly impossible for this unfortunate descendant of a renowned royal race to escape. With the assistance of the young Highland maiden, Miss Flora Macdonald, he found refuge among the rough but devoted Highlanders for five months. On one occasion he was thrown upon the mercy of a band of robbers, living with them in a cave near the coast. But neither Highlander nor robber was tempted to betray him for the reward of thirty thousand pounds, the price set upon his head by King George II. With Cameron of Lochiel and his brother, along with two Irish adherents, Sulli-



van and Sheridan, and a few other exiles, the Young Pretender finally boarded a French privateer which arrived in Lochnanach, and sailed for France, arriving safely at Roseau, near Morlaix, in Brittany, September 29, 1746, after being chased by two British men-of-war; and the royal family of Stuart then disappeared forever from the pages of British history.

The following is the original of the famous British patriotic song of "*God Save the King*," as composed in 1745:

"God  
Save the  
King."

"God save great George our king!  
Long live our noble king;  
God save the king.  
Send him victorious,  
Happy and glorious,  
Long to reign over us;  
God save the king!

"O Lord our God, arise!  
Scatter his enemies,  
And make them fall;  
Confound their politics,  
Frustrate their knavish tricks;  
On him our hopes we fix,  
O, save us all!

"Thy choicest gifts in store  
On George be pleased to pour;  
Long may he reign.  
May he defend our laws,  
And ever give us cause  
To say, with heart and voice,  
God save the king!"

The other popular British patriotic song—the one in which Great Britain's dominion of the seas is boldly asserted—was also written about this time, and is as follows:

"Rule,  
Brit-  
annia."

"When Britain first at Heaven's command  
Arose from out the azure main, arose, arose, arose from out the azure main;  
This was the charter, the charter of the land,  
And guardian angels sung this strain:  
Rule, Britannia; Britannia, rule the waves;  
Britons never will be slaves!

"The nations not so blest as thee  
Must in their turn to tyrants fall, must in their turn, must in their turn to  
tyrants fall;  
While thou shalt flourish, shalt flourish, great and free,  
The dread and envy of them all.  
Rule, Britannia; Britannia, rule the waves;  
Britons never will be slaves!

“Still more majestic shalt thou rise,  
 More dreadful, dreadful, dreadful from each **foreign stroke**;  
 And as the loud blast that tears the skies  
 Serves but to root thy native oak.  
 Rule, Britannia; Britannia, rule the waves;  
 Britons never will be slaves!

“The haughty tyrants ne'er shall tame,  
 All their attempts, all their attempts to **bend thee down**  
 Will but arouse thy generous flame;  
 But work their woe, and thy renown.  
 Rule, Britannia; Britannia, rule the waves;  
 Britons never will be slaves!

“To thee belongs the rural reign;  
 Thy cities shall, they cities shall with **commerce shine**;  
 All thine shall be the subject main,  
 And every shore it circles, thine.  
 Rule, Britannia; Britannia, rule the waves;  
 Britons never will be slaves!

“The Muses, still with freedom found,  
 Shall to thy happy, happy, happy coast **repair**;  
 Blest Isle! with matchless beauty crowned,  
 And manly hearts to guard the fair.  
 Rule, Britannia; Britannia, rule the waves;  
 Britons never will be slaves!”

**New  
 Bourbon  
 Alliance.**

In May, 1745, the three Bourbon courts—those of France, Spain and Naples—concluded a new alliance with the Republic of Genoa; and their united armies took Tortona, Piacenza, Parma and Pavia, defeated King Charles Emmanuel III. of Sardinia at Bassignano, and also captured Alessandria, Asti and Casale. Don Philip, the son of King Philip V. of Spain, entered Naples in triumph. But in the following year the Austrians and Sardinians gained a decisive victory over the French and the Spaniards in the battle of Piacenza, June 16, 1746, compelling them to retreat across the Alps and thus to abandon Italy.

**Battle of  
 Piacenza.**

**Ferdi-  
 nand VI.  
 of Spain.**

Philip V. of Spain died suddenly in 1746, and was succeeded on his throne by his son FERDINAND VI., who did not share his ambitious stepmother's desire for conquest in Italy, and therefore withdrew from the war, recalling his armies from Italy so precipitately that all Northern Italy at once fell into the possession of the Austrians. The conquering Austrians treated the city of Genoa with the greatest inhumanity, and even attempted to harness the people in the streets to their heavy artillery, thus causing a revolt which ended in the expulsion of the Austrians with the loss of five thousand men.

**Austrian  
 Occupa-  
 tion of  
 Genoa.**

In the Austrian Netherlands the French under Marshal Saxe were as successful in the campaigns of 1746 and 1747 as they had been in

the campaign of 1745. In 1746 Marshal Saxe captured Brussels, Antwerp, Mons, Namur and other towns, and won a decisive victory over the Austrians under Prince Charles of Lorraine at Raucoux, on the Meuse, near Liege, October 11, 1746. In 1747 the French army under Marshal Saxe invaded Holland, and captured the whole line of fortresses on the Scheldt, from Antwerp to the sea, in less than a month. Great Britain, still under Pelham's administration, now induced the Empress Elizabeth of Russia to join the enemies of France; but, before anything could result from this accession, the French under Marshal Saxe defeated the allied British, Dutch and Hanoverian forces under the Duke of Cumberland at Laffeld, July 2, 1747, and drove them behind the Meuse.

**French  
Successes  
in the  
Austrian  
Nether-  
lands.**

**Battles of  
Raucoux  
and  
Laffeld.**

The French invasion of Holland created alarm among the Dutch, and led to a revolution which overthrew the republican party in the Dutch Republic and restored the office of hereditary Stadtholder in the person of William IV. of Nassau-Diez, a son-in-law of King George II. of Great Britain.

**Revolu-  
tion  
in the  
Dutch  
Republic.**

In the meantime the French suffered many disasters at sea, and the British navy held almost undisputed dominion of the seas. Hostilities between Great Britain and France extended to their respective possessions in other parts of the world. In North America the almost impregnable French fortress of Louisburg, on the island of Cape Breton, surrendered to a British fleet under Admiral Warren and a land force furnished by Governor Shirley of the English colony of Massachusetts Bay and commanded by General William Pepperell, June 28, 1745, after a month's siege. A powerful French fleet under the Duke d'Anville, sent in 1746 to recover Louisburg, was destroyed by storms. In India, however, the French besieged and took Madras from the English in 1746.

**English  
and  
French  
in North  
America.**

**Capture  
of Louis-  
burg.**

The allies made extraordinary efforts for the campaign of 1748; and Great Britain, Holland, Austria and Sardinia engaged to arm two hundred and eighty thousand men; but these gigantic military preparations resulted in peace rather than in a continuance of the war, as France and Spain were exhausted, and Great Britain and Holland had sustained great burdens with little compensating advantages from the great struggle.

**Military  
Prepara-  
tions.**

The capture of Maestricht by the French army under Marshal Saxe, in April, 1748, led to an armistice; and, after six months of negotiation, the Peace of Aix la Chapelle, signed by France, Great Britain, Holland, Austria, Spain, Genoa and Sardinia, in October, 1748, ended the War of the Austrian Succession on the basis of a mutual restitution of all conquests made during the war, while France recognized the succession of the House of Brunswick to the throne of Great

**Peace of  
Aix la  
Chapelle.**

Britain, and Maria Theresa was left in possession of all the hereditary Austrian territories, except Silesia, which remained with the King of Prussia, while she also ceded the Italian duchies of Parma, Piacenza and Guastalla to Don Philip of Spain. The Treaty of Madrid in 1750 restored amicable commercial relations between Great Britain and Spain.

End  
of the  
Stuarts.

By the terms of the Treaty of Aix la Chapelle the Young Pretender was forbidden to reside in France. He passed the rest of his life in wandering over Europe, endeavoring to raise money for another invasion of Great Britain. At length he became a confirmed drunkard and eked out a wretched existence at Rome, where he died a miserable death, January 30, 1788, leaving no legitimate children. His younger brother, Henry Benedict, who was raised by the Pope to the dignity of Cardinal of York, died at Rome in 1807, thus ending forever the once-renowned royal race of Stuart, which had reigned over Scotland almost three and a half centuries and over England a little more than one century. A monument erected by the great Italian sculptor, Antonio Canova, in St. Peter's at Rome, in 1816, bears three empty titles—James III., Charles III. and Henry IX.

Position  
of Austria  
and  
France.

The eight years' War of the Austrian Succession left Austria still one of the great powers of Europe, though she had been deprived of Silesia and her Italian duchies. France, the principal instigator of the war, had gained absolutely nothing by the struggle, notwithstanding the brilliant victories of the great foreigner in her service, Marshal Saxe, the greatest general of his time; while her national debt was almost doubled by the addition of a sum equal to two hundred and fifty million dollars, her commerce was nearly ruined and her navy was well-nigh destroyed. Besides these material disadvantages, France had lost her cherished position as arbitress of the affairs of Europe. Already did the gay and frivolous courtiers of Louis XV. congratulate each other that the world would last *their* day; and a current motto among these thoughtless courtiers was: "*Après moi le déluge*"—"After us the deluge."

Position  
of Great  
Britain  
and  
Prussia.

Great Britain, by subsidizing all her allies, had vastly increased her influence in European politics. The same series of events which had undermined the unsubstantial prosperity of France had elevated Prussia to the rank of a leading European power, through the energy and military genius of her king, the period of whose reign is frequently mentioned even in universal history as the *Age of Frederick the Great*. Frederick employed the eight years of peace which followed the War of the Austrian Succession in improving the resources of his vigorous young kingdom and in strengthening his military establishment, in anticipation of another great struggle.



FREDERICK THE GREAT

From the Painting by G. Meyn



## SECTION III.—THE SEVEN YEARS' WAR (A. D. 1756–1763).

AFTER the War of the Austrian Succession the nations of Europe enjoyed eight years of rest, which may be considered one of the most prosperous periods of European history. Commerce flourished and the arts of life reached a degree of elegance and refinement hitherto seldom attained. But, unhappily, causes of discord still existed. The Peace of Aix la Chapelle proved to be nothing more than a hollow truce. Many of the questions at issue between France and Great Britain were left unsettled, and thus grounds were furnished for a renewal of hostilities. The limits of the English colony of Nova Scotia, in North America; the right claimed by the French to connect their settlements in Louisiana and Canada by a line of forts in the rear of the English colonies on the Atlantic coast of North America, and the desire of both nations to obtain a political preponderance in India—all these led to protracted disputes which soon resulted in another war, fraught with results most momentous for the destiny of the human race in the Old World and in the New.

**Eight  
Years of  
European  
Peace.**

**Anglo-  
French  
Colonial  
Rivalry  
in North  
America.**

The *English East India Company*—chartered by Queen Elizabeth, December 31, 1600—was granted the exclusive privilege of trading to the East Indies. This great company of English merchants obtained valuable privileges from the native sovereigns of India, and succeeded in building up an immense trade between that Oriental land and England. For a century the Company confined itself to legitimate acts of commerce and was satisfied simply with obtaining sites for its forts and warehouses, which it defended against the hostile Mahrattas by small military forces. The Company established a factory at Surat in 1612 and obtained Madras from its native sovereign in 1639, Bombay from the Portuguese in 1662 and Calcutta from Aurungzebe in 1699.

**English  
East  
India  
Company  
and Its  
Stations  
in India.**

By the close of the seventeenth century the territory of the English East India Company had attained such dimensions that the three presidencies of Bombay, Madras and Calcutta were organized. Calcutta, the chief of these, was presented to the Company by Aurungzebe, and was then a small village; but under the Company it grew to be a splendid city, and ultimately became the capital of the British possessions in India.

**English  
Presiden-  
cies in  
India.**

The success of the English encouraged the French to endeavor to secure a footing in India, under the auspices of the French East India Company, which during the seventeenth century acquired Pondicherry, Chandernagore and Mahé, and organized the two presidencies of Pondicherry and the Isle de France.

**The  
French  
in India.**

The Dutch in the East Indies.

The Dutch had two posts on the mainland of India, and had exclusive possession of most of the island of Ceylon and of the Spice Islands, Java, Celebes, Borneo, Sumatra and the peninsula of Malaca. The English gradually absorbed the Dutch and Portuguese possessions in India, so that the French were left as their only European rivals in the East Indies.

English and French Meddling in the Native Quarrels in India.

When the English East India Company had grown rich and powerful it became ambitious of extending its dominion in India, and participated in the quarrels of the Great Mogul Empire, the ruling race of which was Mohammedan, while the great mass of Hindoos held fast to Brahmanism. This difference of religion caused increasing quarrels between the native Hindoo chiefs, who sought the alliance of the English and the French, who thus became involved in the quarrels of the Hindoo princes on opposite sides. Both English and French desired to profit by these alliances with the native princes, and the French conceived the design of conquering India by means of native Hindoo troops under French officers. These native troops were called *Sipahis*, or *Sepoys*. The English afterward adopted the same system. Both English and French were obliged to employ these native troops, as it was impossible to transport to India large bodies of European troops or to maintain them there.

The Sepoys.

English and French Hostilities in India.

During the War of the Austrian Succession the English and French colonists interfered on opposite sides in the quarrels of the native Hindoo princes, and in 1746 the Governor of the Isle de France captured Madras from the English. Although peace had been made between Great Britain and France in 1748, the English and French colonists in India continued hostilities; and the French under Dupleix, Governor of Pondicherry, besieged Trichinopoly after obtaining the Coromandel coast from the Viceroy of the Deccan, and were on the point of expelling the English from Hindoostan and founding a French empire in India, when Robert Clive, a poor clerk in the counting-house of the English East India Company at Madras, pushing forward in the midst of a severe thunder-storm, with only five hundred men, surprised Arcot, the capital of the Nabob of the Carnatic, in 1751, and defended that place against the French and their Hindoo allies, numbering ten thousand men, whom he defeated in two battles, thus establishing the British supremacy in India.

Robert Clive's Defense of Arcot.

Black Hole of Calcutta.

Surajah Dowlah, the Viceroy of Bengal, attacked the English in 1756, took Calcutta and confined one hundred and forty-six English prisoners in the *Black Hole of Calcutta*—a small prison eighteen feet square—where all but twenty-three died before morning; but in 1757 the illustrious Colonel Clive retook Calcutta, and with only three thousand men, less than a third of whom were Englishmen, the rest being



Sepoys, Clive defeated Surajah Dowlah, at the head of sixty-four thousand men, in the decisive battle of Plassey, June 23, 1757, which established the British Empire in India. Bengal had been famous in European markets for its rice, its sugar, its silks and the products of its looms. During the same year the rich city of Hoogly was taken and plundered by an expedition sent by Clive.

**Battle of Plassey.**

**Capture of Hoogly.**

**Clive as the Founder of the British Empire in India.**

Thus the poor boy-clerk whom the English historian Green describes as "an idle dare-devil of a boy whom his friends had been glad to get rid of by packing him off in the Company's service as a writer at Madras"—this poor clerk who, in despair at his early poverty, tired of desk-work and afflicted with homesickness and despondency, twice attempted suicide with his pistol—became the founder of the British dominion in India, a dominion which now embraces almost all of Hindoostan and contains a population of two hundred and fifty millions, and is the brightest jewel in the British crown, being the most extensive territorial dominion ever established in India.

In the meantime, during the wars between Great Britain and France, the English and French colonies in North America became engaged in hostilities. During *King William's War*, A. D. 1689–1697—the War of the Grand Alliance in Europe—the French and Indians committed dreadful massacres upon the New England and New York frontiers, destroying Dover, in New Hampshire, in July, 1689, and burning Schenectady, in New York, in February, 1690, and massacring sixty of its inhabitants; and in 1690 the New Englanders sent a land force under a son of Governor Winthrop of Connecticut against Montreal, and a naval expedition under Sir William Phipps against Quebec, both expeditions being failures. During *Queen Anne's War*, A. D. 1702–1713—the War of the Spanish Succession in Europe—the French and Indians again spread desolation among the English frontier settlements, burning Deerfield, in Massachusetts, and massacring its inhabitants; but in 1710 an English fleet and a New England land force captured Port Royal, which was thereafter called *Annapolis*, after Queen Anne, and the French colony of *Acadia* became a British province under the name of *Nova Scotia*, or New Scotland; and in 1711 a fleet and army from England under Sir Hovenden Walker, aided by New Englanders, the whole expedition consisting of seven thousand men, proceeded against Quebec, but the vessels were wrecked at the mouth of the St. Lawrence and one thousand men perished, whereupon the expedition was abandoned. During *King George's War*, A. D. 1744–1748—the War of the Austrian Succession in Europe—an English fleet under Admiral Warren and an English colonial land force under General William Pepperell captured Louisburg, in Nova Scotia, as already noticed.

**Wars between the English and French in North America.**

Fourth  
and Last  
Anglo-  
French  
Colonial  
War.

The three wars between the English and the French in North America, the accounts of which we have just considered, had their origin in the European disputes of France and Great Britain. The fourth and last war—the one which ended in the overthrow of the French power in North America—originated in disputes about the boundaries between the French and English colonial possessions. After the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1748, the English built forts in the rear of the English colonies, for the purpose of confining the English to the country east of the Allegheny mountains. The French claimed the Ohio Valley as a part of Louisiana, while the English claimed it as a part of Virginia.

Rival  
Claims.

The Ohio  
Company.

In 1749 the King of Great Britain granted six hundred thousand acres of land on the south side of the Ohio river to an association of English and Virginia speculators, called the *Ohio Company*. The surveyors and traders sent out by the Company were made prisoners by the French. This aggressive conduct led to open hostilities.

French  
Forts.

The French under St. Pierre built three forts in North-western Pennsylvania—one at Presque Isle, now Erie; another at La Bœuf, now Waterford, and a third at the site of the present town of Franklin. Governor Dinwiddie, of Virginia, sent George Washington, a young Virginian, twenty-one years of age, with a remonstrance to St. Pierre, the French commander. St. Pierre, who said that he acted under the orders of Duquesne, Governor of Canada, refused to withdraw his troops from the domain of the Ohio Company, as requested by Dinwiddie.

Wash-  
ington's  
Mission.

His Ex-  
pedition.

When it was known in Virginia that St. Pierre refused to withdraw his troops from the territory granted to the Ohio Company a body of Virginians under Major George Washington was sent to expel the invaders. Washington moved toward the Ohio; and in the present Fayette county, in Pennsylvania, he built Fort Necessity. At length, on May 28, 1754, he defeated the French and killed their leader, Jumonville, in the battle of the Great Meadows. This was the first bloodshed in the long and distressing *French and Indian War*.

Battle of  
the Great  
Meadows.

Fort Du-  
quesne.

Capitula-  
tion of  
Fort  
Necessity.

Already the French had seized a fort which the English had been engaged in building at the junction of the Allegheny and Monongahela rivers, and named it *Fort Duquesne*, in honor of the Governor of Canada. Washington was at length besieged by the French at Fort Necessity. On the 4th of July, 1754, he surrendered to the French, who allowed him and all his troops to march back to Virginia.

English  
Colonial  
Congress  
at Albany.

On the day of the capitulation of Fort Necessity, July 4, 1754, a congress composed of delegates from six of the Anglo-American colonies convened at Albany, in the province of New York, for the purpose of devising measures for protection against the encroachments



WASHINGTON AND HIS MOTHER



of the French. A plan of union drawn up by Dr. Benjamin Franklin was rejected by both the British imperial government and the colonial assemblies.

In 1755 Edward Braddock, a distinguished Irish officer, was sent to America as commander-in-chief of the British forces there. Three expeditions against the French were projected. One was to proceed against the French forts in Nova Scotia; another under Braddock was to drive the French from Fort Duquesne, and a third under Governor Shirley of Massachusetts was to move against Fort Niagara.

**English  
Expeditions in  
1755.**

A British force of three thousand men, under General Winslow, landed at the head of the Bay of Fundy, in June, 1755, where they were joined by three hundred regulars, under Colonel Monckton, who assumed the chief command. The expedition took Fort Beausejour from the French on the 16th of June and Fort Gaspereau on the 17th. The British disgraced themselves by their cruel treatment of the Acadians, many of whom they sent away and distributed among the English colonists.

**English  
Conquest  
and Deso-  
lation of  
Acadia.**

In June, 1755, General Braddock, with two thousand men, marched against the French at Fort Duquesne. On the 9th of July, when within twelve miles of Fort Duquesne, the British were attacked by the French and the Indians. Braddock was killed and his troops were completely defeated. Of all the mounted officers on the side of the British, Major Washington alone remained unhurt. After the fall of Braddock, Washington assumed the command of the British troops and conducted them back to Virginia. Thus the expedition against Fort Duquesne was a total failure.

**Brad-  
dock's  
Defeat  
and  
Death.**

The expedition under Shirley against Fort Niagara was also a complete failure. The expedition went only as far as Oswego, where Shirley built a new fort; and storms, sickness and desertions of his Indian allies caused him to abandon the object of the expedition.

**Shirley's  
Expedi-  
tion**

In August, 1755, a British army under Sir William Johnson marched against Forts Ticonderoga and Crown Point, which the French had erected on the western shores of Lake Champlain. A part of Johnson's force, under Colonel Williams, was defeated on the 8th of September by the French under Baron Dieskau. After this fight, in which Williams was killed, Dieskau moved forward and fought with Johnson the battle of Lake George. In this battle Dieskau was defeated, wounded and taken prisoner. After the battle, Johnson built Fort William Henry, and garrisoned it, as well as Fort Edward, with some of his troops; after which he returned to Albany and dispersed his army. The inefficient Lord London was sent to America to take the chief command of the British forces there, being also appointed Governor of Virginia.

**Johnson's  
Expedi-  
tion.**

**Battle of  
Lake  
George.**

French  
Capture  
of  
Oswego.

In August, 1756, the Marquis de Montcalm, with a body of French and Indians, crossed Lake Ontario from Canada, and captured the British forts at Oswego with fourteen hundred prisoners. The only thing accomplished by the British in 1756 was the chastisement of the Indians in Western Pennsylvania. On the 8th of September, Colonel John Armstrong fell upon the savages at Kittanning, their chief town on the Allegheny river, killed their principal chiefs and destroyed their village.

French  
Capture  
of Fort  
William  
Henry.

In Northern New York a force of French and Indians, under Montcalm, marched against Fort William Henry in August, 1757. Colonel Monro, who commanded the small British force which garrisoned the fort, called upon General Webb, the British commander at Fort Edward, for assistance. The cowardly Webb refused any aid; and the gallant Monro was compelled to surrender, after a brave defense. After their surrender, the British troops were allowed to march out with the honors of war; but no sooner had they left the fort, under a promise of protection, than, despite the efforts of Montcalm to prevent it, many of them were massacred by the Indians in the French army. Montcalm expressed great sorrow for this sad occurrence.

Maria  
Theresa  
and Her  
Determination  
to Recover  
Silesia.

It was very evident that Austria and Prussia could not long remain at peace; as the Empress Maria Theresa, who could not forget the loss of Silesia, was determined to recover that province. She spent the eight years after the Peace of Axi-la-Chapelle in forming alliances with the other courts of Europe against the great Frederick II. of Prussia, for the purpose of realizing her determination. Her resentment toward Great Britain, her best ally, which had advised her to yield that province, was almost as great as that against the King of Prussia for seizing it by force in the time of her humiliation and distress. Her great Minister, Kaunitz, had spent five years at Paris as Austrian ambassador, and had confided to her a scheme for ultimately uniting France and Austria against Prussia.

Coalition  
of  
Austria,  
France,  
Russia,  
Saxony  
and  
Sweden  
against  
Frederick  
the Great.

The two causes of dispute already mentioned had no direct connection with each other, yet mutual interests led to the formation of alliances. The strangest feature of all was the alliance of Austria and France, nations that had been enemies for three centuries; and the coalition of Prussia and Great Britain, nations that had hitherto appeared extremely jealous of each other. This change of policy on the part of France was brought about by Madame de Pompadour, the favorite mistress of the dissolute Louis XV., who, captivated by a flattering letter from the Empress Maria Theresa, and angry at the sarcasm which the King of Prussia had uttered against her, was easily won to the side of the Austrian empress. The profligate Empress Elizabeth of Russia, affronted at the sarcastic manner in which Fred-

erick spoke of her, was easily induced by her Prime Minister, Bestucheff, to conclude an alliance with Maria Theresa against Prussia. Augustus III., Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, who was also offended at Frederick's sarcasm, formed an alliance with the Austrian empress-queen. Sweden, through the influence of the French court, joined the coalition against the Prussian monarch. Thus Austria, France, Russia, Saxony and Sweden were united against Prussia and Great Britain. The British carried on a successful war against the French on the ocean, in North America and in the East and West Indies; but they could give little effective aid to the Prussian king against the powerful enemies who threatened to wrest from him a large portion of his dominions and reduce him to the condition of only an Elector of Brandenburg. But the great military ability of Frederick and the splendid discipline of the Prussian army enabled Prussia to come forth from the gigantic struggle powerful and victorious. Although Maria Theresa concluded an alliance with France, she bound herself by two treaties to observe neutrality in the war between Great Britain and France. The great *Seven Years' War* extended around the world, and involved the English and French colonies in America, Asia and Africa; and thenceforth the history of England was largely the history of the civilized world.

**World-wide  
Extent  
of the  
Seven  
Years'  
War.**

The war opened in Europe with a series of disasters for the British, the most serious of which was the capture of the island of Minorca by a French expedition under the Duke de Richelieu. A British fleet under Admiral Byng was sent from Gibraltar to the relief of the garrison of Minorca, but Byng returned after a partial and indecisive engagement with the French fleet, June, 1756. He was court-martialed for cowardice the next year, and was shot in the presence of his whole fleet, but he showed that he was no coward by giving the command to fire. The public indignation caused by Byng's failure soon turned to pity, and when passion had cooled it was felt that the brave admiral had suffered for the fault of the Ministry, whose negligence and inefficiency was responsible for the loss of Minorca.

**French  
Capture  
of  
Minorca.**

**Admiral  
Byng's  
Failure  
and Exe-  
cution.**

The British disasters in Europe and America forced the Duke of Newcastle to resign; whereupon King George II. appointed William Pitt, the "Great Commoner," to the head of the Ministry. Pitt was the son of a wealthy Governor of Madras, and had been in Parliament since 1734. He was the first great statesman that had controlled the destinies of Great Britain since the death of Sir Robert Walpole, and like Walpole he was a Whig in politics. He was created Secretary of State in 1756, but the failure of the early expeditions forced him to resign four months afterward, and the Duke of Newcastle was recalled.

**William  
Pitt, the  
"Great  
Com-  
moner."**

**Fred-  
erick's  
Invasion  
of  
Saxony.**

The King of Prussia did not wait to be attacked; but, resolving to surprise his enemies by an unexpected blow, he was first in the field. In August, 1756, he suddenly burst into Saxony with an army of seventy thousand men, took possession of Leipsic, Wittenberg and Dresden, and blockaded the Saxony army, which had established a strongly-fortified camp at Pirna, on the Elbe. At Dresden he seized the government papers, and caused the secret dispatches of his enemies proving their designs against him to be published in order to justify his conduct before the world. At the head of only twenty-five thousand men, Frederick the Great, in the battle of Lowositz, defeated fifty thousand Austrians under General Brown, who were marching to the relief of the Saxons; after which he compelled the Saxon forces, reduced by hunger to fourteen thousand men, to surrender themselves prisoners of war, and forced them into the Prussian service. The Elector Frederick Augustus III. now abandoned Saxony, and retired into his kingdom of Poland, where he remained until the end of the war. Thus Frederick the Great conquered Saxony in his first campaign in the Seven Years' War.

**Battle of  
Lowositz.**

**Fred-  
erick's  
Conquest  
of  
Saxony.**

**Imperial  
German  
Diet and  
Frederick.**

Frederick remained in possession of Saxony; but the armies of the allies had now taken the field against him, and the Diet of the German Empire declared war against him for violating the Land Peace. The northern states of Germany protested against this proceeding of the Diet, and their sovereigns hired out their subjects to serve in the British armies in preference to furnishing the contingents demanded by the Emperor Francis I.

**Immense  
Armies  
of Fred-  
erick's  
Enemies.**

The enemies of Frederick the Great assembled immense armies for the campaign of 1757. A Russian army of one hundred and thirty thousand men entered Prussia on the east; a Swedish force of twenty thousand men was preparing to march into the Prussian province of Pomerania; eighty thousand French troops were advancing from the west; and one hundred and eighty thousand Austrians were in the field.

**Three  
French  
Armies in  
Germany.**

The French invaders were divided into three armies—the army of the Upper Rhine under the Duke de Richelieu, who had gained a brilliant reputation by the conquest of Minorca, and was the most popular general of the time; the army of the Main under the Prince of Soubise, Madame de Pompadour's favorite; and the army of the Lower Rhine under Marshal d'Estrées.

**Prussian  
and Han-  
overian  
Armies.**

While the allied armies numbered more than four hundred thousand men, the combined Prussian and Hanoverian troops did not amount to two hundred thousand. The Hanoverian troops were under the command of the Duke of Cumberland, the eldest surviving son of King George II. of Great Britain.



After some maneuvering by which he completely deceived the Austrians, the King of Prussia began the campaign of 1757 by invading Bohemia. At the head of seventy thousand men, Frederick attacked seventy-five thousand Austrians at Prague, May 6, 1757. The assaults of the Prussians were at first repulsed, and the old Prussian Marshal Schwerin fell fighting at the head of his regiment; but the fall of the brave Austrian Marshal Brown finally decided the battle, which ended in a glorious victory for the Prussians. Frederick, however, purchased his triumph at a heavy cost, as twelve thousand five hundred of his brave troops lay dead or wounded on the field of battle. Seeking to follow up his victory at Prague, Frederick the Great attacked the Austrians under Count Daun, who occupied a strong position at Kolin, June 18, 1757. After a bloody battle, in which the Austrians at first gave way, the Prussian king was so badly defeated that he was obliged to raise the siege of Prague and to evacuate Bohemia as speedily as possible.

**Battle of Prague.**

**Battle of Kolin.**

The disastrous result of the battle of Kolin deprived Frederick the Great of the fruits of his former victories; and it seemed as though he must fall before the overwhelming power of his numerous enemies, who now threatened him on all sides. Through the mediation of Denmark, his English and Hanoverian allies, under the Duke of Cumberland, after having been defeated by the French army commanded by Marshal d'Estrées at Hastenbeck, were compelled by the disgraceful Convention of Klosterseven to lay down their arms, thus securing the neutrality of Hanover and Brunswick and leaving the French at liberty to operate against Frederick in Saxony. A Russian army of one hundred thousand men, under Apraxin, invaded Prussia on the east, defeated twenty-four thousand Prussians under Lehwald at Gross Jägerndorf and advanced against Frederick. Twenty thousand Swedish troops entered Pomerania and advanced toward the Prussian capital. An Austrian army invaded Silesia and besieged Schweidnitz, while another Austrian force made its way through Lusatia and laid Berlin under contribution. A Russian fleet captured Memel.

**Frederick's Desperate Situation.**

**Prussia Invaded on all Sides.**

**Occupation of Berlin.**

In his momentary despair, Frederick the Great even meditated suicide; but he took braver counsel, and roused himself to collect the forces which still remained to him. Though the dissolute Empress Elizabeth of Russia was in arms against him, her heir was an ardent admirer and friend of Prussia's warrior-king. The Duke de Richelieu, the French commander, inherited the anti-Austrian policy of his grand-uncle, the renowned cardinal-statesman, and opposed extreme measures against the King of Prussia; while the national enmities between the German imperial troops and their French allies seriously weakened their efficiency.

**Dissensions among the Allies.**

**Battle of  
Rossbach.**

In his desperate situation Frederick the Great saw that he must strike a decisive blow in order to save himself from utter ruin. He accordingly marched into Saxony for the purpose of expelling the French from that country. With only twenty thousand men, Frederick occupied a height at the little village of Rossbach, where he was soon confronted by seventy thousand French and German imperial troops, under the Prince of Soubise, a favorite of Madame de Pompadour. The object of the French and their German imperial allies was to see whether the King of Prussia would venture to attack them. They resolved to surround Frederick, take him and his whole army prisoners, and thus put an end to the war at once. At length, at two o'clock in the afternoon of November 5, 1757, Frederick gave his orders to attack, and immediately his troops fell so suddenly and irresistibly, and with such rapidity of movement, upon the enemy that in less than half an hour the French and their allies fled from the field in dismay, and Frederick won a glorious victory. Some of the French troops fled into the middle of Germany, while many did not stop in their flight until they had crossed the Rhine. On this memorable field Frederick lost only five hundred and fifteen men in killed and wounded. He took seven thousand prisoners, among whom were eleven generals. He invited the most distinguished of his prisoners to sup with him; and, after expressing his regret at not being able to afford them a better entertainment, he said: "Gentlemen, I did not expect you so soon, nor in such large numbers."

**Battle of  
Leuthen.**

By his victory at Rossbach, Frederick the Great recovered the whole of Saxony. He next marched into Silesia, which province had been taken possession of by a large Austrian army under Prince Charles of Lorraine. On December 5, 1757, exactly one month after the battle of Rossbach, Frederick, with only thirty thousand men, met ninety thousand Austrians under Charles of Lorraine at Leuthen. Frederick immediately took possession of some heights near by, which masked the movements of his troops; and then, deceiving the Austrians by a false attack upon their right wing, he suddenly turned and attacked their left so fiercely that it was routed before the right could render it any assistance; and, after a conflict of three hours, Frederick won one of the most brilliant victories of modern times. In the midst of the battle, all along the Prussian lines was sung the hymn: "*Nun danket alle Gott*"—"Now thank we all our God." The entire Prussian loss was only five thousand men; while the Austrian loss was over twenty-eight thousand in killed, wounded and prisoners. Prince Charles of Lorraine at once resigned his command, and was appointed Governor of the Austrian Netherlands.

In July, 1757, King George II. of Great Britain found it necessary to recall Pitt to the direction of the foreign policy of the British gov-



EVENING AFTER THE BATTLE OF LEUTHEN



ernment. A compromise was effected between Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Newcastle, by which Pitt obtained control of the foreign policy of the government, which was all he cared for, and left to the Duke of Newcastle the management of the home politics of England, a task in which the latter was without a rival.

Pitt entered office with the full determination to restore the former power of Great Britain. Said he: "I want to call England out of that enervate state in which twenty thousand men from France can shake her." Energy and forecast marked every movement of Mr. Pitt's administration; and thenceforth the war was favorable to the British, who, after a series of brilliant victories, were finally enabled to effect the conquest of the French American possessions. Pitt's spirit seemed to be breathed into the British fleets in all the seas and into the British armies in all parts of the world. "With one hand he smote the House of Bourbon, and wielded in the other the democracy of England."

Frederick the Great recognized in Mr. Pitt a kindred spirit, and said: "England has been a long time in labor, but she has at last brought forth a man." Pitt had a great advantage over other English statesmen in knowing himself to be honest and believing in the truth of the principles which he advocated. His strong, earnest nature, his scorn of the corruption around him, and in which he disdained to engage, aroused the surprise and animosity of all his contemporaries, who were both corrupt and insincere. He scorned to stoop to their level, and his self-respect kept him in the path of rectitude.

William Pitt was the greatest orator of modern times, and his matchless eloquence gave him such a control over the House of Commons as no other British Minister had ever enjoyed. His unflinching courage in denouncing the shams and hypocrisy of his time gained for him the confidence and affection of the English people, who called him the "Great Commoner." He did not seek the popularity which his great services acquired for him. He stood alone at the zenith of his popularity, with scarcely half a dozen personal followers. In that corrupt age of British politics, Mr. Pitt was a pure as well as a great man. "The Secretary stood alone. Modern degeneracy had not reached him." He always kept in view the fact that he was the leader of the English *people*, and he was true to the trust which they reposed in him. He began his administration by giving a firm and hearty support to Prussia's great warrior-king; and the results amply vindicated this policy, as we shall presently see.

The brilliant achievements of Frederick the Great at Rossbach and Leuthen astonished the world and at once ranked him as the greatest general of the age, while they aroused the greatest enthusiasm in England for the King of Prussia and his army. London was brilliantly

Pitt and the Duke of Newcastle.

Happy Results of Pitt's Recall.

His Honesty.

His Greatness as an Orator and a Statesman.

His Popularity and Patriotism.

British Enthusiasm for Frederick the Great.

illuminated in his honor, and Mr. Pitt declared in the House of Commons that the American colonies of the French were to be conquered through Germany. Under the direction of that great statesman, the British government furnished a subsidy of seven hundred thousand pounds sterling to the King of Prussia, and sent another army into Germany. The Convention of Klosterseven was repudiated, and the King of Prussia was requested to name the commander of the British and Hanoverian forces in Germany. Frederick selected Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, brother of the reigning Duke of Brunswick. After reassembling his army, Ferdinand announced to the Duke de Richelieu the renewal of hostilities by Great Britain and Hanover.

Ferdi-  
nand of  
Brun-  
swick.

British-  
French  
Campaign  
in  
Germany  
in 1758.

The campaign of 1758 was commenced by Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, the commander of the British and Hanoverian army, numbering only thirty thousand men. With this inferior force Ferdinand drove the French army of ninety thousand men from Hanover, Brunswick, East Friesland and Hesse across the Rhine early in the spring with heavy loss; the French troops having entirely lost their efficiency in living by plunder. Ferdinand routed the Count de Clermont, the successor of the Duke de Richelieu, at Krefeld with heavy loss. The victorious Hanoverians took Ruremond and Düsseldorf, and their scouting parties penetrated into the Austrian Netherlands as far as Brussels. The French retrieved some of their losses by a victory at Cassel, but nothing more of any importance transpired in that quarter during 1758.

Battles of  
Krefeld  
and  
Cassel.

Russian  
Invasion  
of Bran-  
denburg.

After some important movements against the Austrians in Silesia and Moravia, Frederick the Great marched against the Russians, who were perpetrating the most barbarous atrocities in the Prussian province of Brandenburg, sparing neither age nor sex. The regular forces of Russia were accompanied by a barbarous horde of Cossacks and Kal-muck Tartars; and these invaded the province of Pomerania and besieged and burned the town of Küstrin, while the fortress still held out. Frederick, at the head of thirty thousand men, met sixty thousand Russians under Fermor near the village of Zorndorf, not far from Frankfort-on-the-Oder. Here was fought one of the bloodiest battles of the Seven Years' War, August 24, 1758. It began at nine o'clock in the morning and ended at ten in the evening, when nineteen thousand Russians and eleven thousand Prussians lay dead or wounded on the sanguinary field. Frederick was victorious and captured one hundred and three cannon, and the Russians were obliged to evacuate the Prussian dominions and to retreat into Poland.

Battle of  
Zorndorf.

Battle of  
Hoch-  
kirchen.

After the battle of Zorndorf, Frederick the Great marched into Saxony to the assistance of his brother Henry, who was hard pressed by the Austrians. Frederick was surprised and disastrously defeated at Hochkirchen by the Austrians under Count Daun, October 14, 1758.

In this bloody engagement Frederick lost all his artillery and baggage and nine thousand men. This Austrian victory caused great rejoicing in Vienna, and that city was brilliantly illuminated. But the tide of war soon turned. The King of Prussia was not discouraged by his disaster at Hochkirchen. Daun was foiled in all attempts to follow up his victory; and Frederick again expelled the Austrians from Silesia, and then returned to Saxony, and, after compelling Daun to raise the sieges of Dresden and Leipsic, drove him into Bohemia.

**Sieges of Dresden and Leipsic.**

Pitt's enterprising spirit animated the officers of the British army and navy. Several French ships-of-war were captured by the British navy. Admiral Sir Edward Hawke dispersed and drove on shore a French armament destined for North America, and his fleet held command of the English Channel. Two successive British naval expeditions proceeded to the French coast; but the only thing thus accomplished was the destruction of Cherbourg—a triumph dearly purchased by the subsequent loss of some of the best troops in the hasty embarkation.

**British Naval Successes in the English Channel.**

France, Great Britain and Prussia now signified their readiness to treat for peace; but Maria Theresa, whose finances were in a more prosperous condition than those of Frederick the Great, and whose resentment was not yet appeased, refused to listen to any peace proposals. The Duke de Choiseul, who had been recently appointed to the head of the French Ministry, thus failing in his more pacific overtures, concluded a new treaty with Maria Theresa less favorable to Austria than the former treaty; in consequence of which the French prosecuted the war with less vigor.

**Maria Theresa's Rejection of Peace Propositions.**

Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, the commander of the British and Hanoverian army, conducted a successful campaign against the French during the year 1759. The campaign opened in favor of the French, who repulsed Ferdinand's attack on their camp at Bergen, near Frankfort-on-the-Main, April 13, 1759, and captured Münster in July of the same year; but in the sanguinary battle of Minden, August 1, 1759, Ferdinand defeated the French with the loss of eight thousand men, chiefly through the valor of his six regiments of British infantry, and thus compelled them to abandon Hanover and Westphalia and to make a hasty retreat across the Rhine.

**British-French Campaign in Germany in 1759.**

**Battle of Minden.**

At the opening of the campaign of 1759 the Austrians overran Saxony and threatened Berlin; while the Russians under Soltikoff defeated the Prussian detachments on the Oder, menaced Silesia and at length effected a junction with the Austrians under Laudon. Frederick the Great was in a most perilous situation. In the midst of these accumulating dangers he resolved upon striking an effective blow. He at length set his army in motion; and, with only fifty thousand men, he attacked the united Austrian and Russian armies under Laudon and

**Austro-Russian Menace to Frederick.**

**Battle of Kunersdorf.** Soltikoff, numbering one hundred thousand men, at Kunersdorf, near Frankfort-on-the-Oder, August 12, 1759. Frederick was at first successful, and the enemy were driven from the field; but the stubborn Russians rallied and renewed the fight; and a terrific charge of the Austrian cavalry, headed by Laudon in person, put the entire Prussian army to rout. This disaster was a grievous blow to Frederick the Great. The Prussian loss was more than eighteen thousand men, and the total Austrian and Russian loss amounted to almost sixteen thousand men. Berlin was in danger of falling into the hands of the enemy, and Frederick's cause seemed ruined; but, instead of following up their victory, the Austrian and Russian generals, who were jealous of each other, spent so much time in quarreling that the King of Prussia was enabled to collect another army; and Berlin was again safe.

**Frederick's Desperate Situation.**

**Prussian Disasters.**

At this unfortunate period of his military career Frederick the Great was constantly receiving intelligence of defeats sustained by his detachments, and his situation was extremely dangerous. One of the Prussian generals was defeated at Maxen and another at Meissen. Dresden fell into the hands of the Austrians, and Marshal Daun established his winter-quarters at that city. Though Frederick the Great had re-entered Saxony and driven out the German imperial army which had captured Leipsic, Torgau and Wittenberg, the cold weather finally drove him into winter-quarters.

**Austrian Capture of Dresden.**

**British Blockade of French Ports.**

In the meantime France sought revenge for the destruction of Cherbourg, but the vigilant activity of the British navy frustrated the projected invasion of Great Britain by a French armament under the Young Pretender Charles Edward Stuart. British fleets blockaded the French ports of Dunkirk, Brest and Toulon; and one of these fleets under Admiral Sir George Rodney bombarded Havre and destroyed a part of the magazines and transports which there lay ready for the intended invading expedition. A French squadron which contrived to escape from Toulon and slip through the Straits of Gibraltar into the Atlantic was pursued and defeated by the British fleet under Admiral Boscawen off Cape Lagos, in Portugal, August 18, 1759.

**Admiral Boscawen's Victory.**

**Admiral Hawke's Victory in Quiberon Bay.**

A large French fleet under Admiral Conflans, which sailed from Brest during an easterly gale which drove the British blockading squadron under Admiral Sir Edward Hawke from the coast, was encountered and dispersed by Hawke's fleet among the rocks and shoals of Quiberon Bay, November 20, 1759. The pilot on board Hawke's flag-ship remonstrated against the daring admiral's decision to attack the French fleet on so dangerous a coast and in the midst of a severe gale. Said the brave Hawke: "You have done your duty in this remonstrance. Now let me alongside the French admiral." And the gallant mariners of England won imperishable renown there, amid the



rocks and shoals, in the darkness and the tempest. The French fleet was destroyed or dispersed, thus saving England from all danger of a French invasion in the interest of the Young Pretender.

Though Admiral Hawke's great victory delivered the English from all fears of a French invasion, some alarm was excited by the enterprises of Commodore Thurot, a French seaman, who escaped from Dunkirk with five frigates and hovered along the coast of Scotland. After failing to make any impression on Scotland, this intrepid French seaman entered the Irish Sea and landed a force on the Irish coast at Carrickfergus, which was stormed and plundered by the French invaders. Upon receiving intelligence of the defeat of Admiral Conflans by Hawke's fleet, Thurot steered for the shores of his own country, but was swiftly pursued by a British squadron under Commodore Elliot, and was overtaken near the Isle of Man, where he was defeated and killed, while all his vessels were taken by the victorious British, February 28, 1760.

**French Depredations on the Coasts of Scotland and Ireland.**

Great Britain had never yet played so great a part in the great drama of the world's history as during the Seven Years' War. The year 1759 was one of brilliant triumphs for the British in all parts of the world, and is one of the proudest in the annals of British warfare. The news of the victories at Minden and off Cape Lagos arrived in September. The tidings of the capture of Quebec reached England in October. Intelligence of Hawke's victory in Quiberon Bay arrived before the end of November. Said Horace Walpole, the distinguished son of Sir Robert Walpole, laughing: "We are forced to ask every morning what victory there is, for fear of missing one."

**Great Year in British Warfare.**

It was no so much in the number, as in the importance, of the victories that the Seven Years' War was without an example. Many of these British and Prussian victories determined the destinies of the world for ages. With the victories of Frederick the Great at Prague, Rossbach, Leuthen, Zorndorf, Liegnitz and Torgau began the regeneration of Germany, her intellectual supremacy over Europe and her political union under the leadership of Prussia. With Clive's victory at Plassey began Great Britain's empire in the East and the influence of Europe in the land of the Ganges and the Indus for the first time since its invasion by Alexander the Great. Wolfe's victory at Quebec assigned North America forever to the Anglo-Saxon race, and laid the foundations of the Republic of the United States of America.

**Importance of the British and Prussian Victories.**

In 1759 Russia, Sweden and Denmark entered into an alliance for mutual defense and to maintain the commercial neutrality of the Baltic. All the belligerent powers made vigorous preparations for the campaign of 1760 in Germany, although the English people had become weary of the war in Continental Europe, and the finances of France had

**Preparations for the Campaign of 1760.**

fallen into a state of lamentable disorder. The French people exhibited a truly generous conduct toward their sovereign. The chief nobility and gentry sent their plate to the national treasury to be coined into money for the public service.

**French Invasion of Hanover.**

For the campaign of 1760 in Germany, a French army of almost a hundred thousand men was assembled in Westphalia under the command of the Duke de Broglio, while an inferior French army was formed on the Rhine under the leadership of the Count de St. Germain. The French occupied Hanover and Hesse, defeated the British and Hanoverian forces under Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick at Corbach and at Kloster, and maintained their possession of Hanover during the winter; but the French generals wasted their strength and energies in quarreling with each other.

**Battles of Corbach and Kloster.**

The campaign of 1760 opened most disastrously for the King of Prussia. His general, Fouquet, after gallantly maintaining himself for some time in Silesia against a superior Austrian force under Laudon, was defeated at Landshut, June 24, 1760, with the loss of ten thousand men killed, wounded and made prisoners. Frederick himself afterward besieged Dresden; but he was obliged to retire, on the approach of Laudon with a strong Austrian force for the relief of the garrison. Laudon, however, failed in the siege of Breslau.

**Battle of Landshut.**

**Sieges of Dresden and Breslau.**

Frederick now marched into Silesia to recover that province from the Austrians. While the Austrians and Russians, in number one hundred and eighty thousand, were preparing to surround the King of Prussia, and his complete overthrow appeared certain, he suddenly and furiously assailed the astonished Laudon, at the head of the Austrian detachment, at Liegnitz, August 16, 1760. Laudon's force was terribly defeated, with the loss of ten thousand men in killed and wounded, before the reinforcement under Daun could come to the scene of action. Both Laudon and Daun fled to the Katzbach, and Frederick the Great was again master of Silesia; but Berlin was taken possession of by Austrian and Russian troops, its arsenals and founderies were destroyed, and the hereditary dominions of Frederick were plundered and frightfully devastated.

**Battle of Liegnitz.**

**Occupation of Berlin.**

**Battle of Torgau.**

Frederick next marched into Saxony with the view of expelling the Austrians from that country. On November 3, 1760, he fiercely attacked the intrenched position of the Austrians under Daun at Torgau. After a day of the most frightful carnage, Frederick gained a complete victory, but at the cost of fourteen thousand of his gallant troops, who lay dead on the field of battle. The consequence of this battle was that all of Saxony, except Dresden, was again in the hands of the King of Prussia; and the Austrian, Russian and Swedish forces were obliged to evacuate the Prussian dominions.

In the meantime, while the Seven Years' War had thus been raging in Europe, hostilities had been prosecuted between the British and the French in North America. As we have seen, the first four years of the French and Indian War had been one continuous series of disasters to the British, while the corrupt and inefficient Ministry of the Duke of Newcastle sent its incompetent favorites to manage the British interests in the New World. But after William Pitt had become Prime Minister of Great Britain, in July, 1757, conquest shone upon the British arms in North America; and the campaigns of the next three years were a series of brilliant triumphs which were signalized by the total subversion of French power in North America. In 1757 General Abercrombie was sent to North America to take the chief command of the British forces there.

**William Pitt and the War in North America.**

Early in July, 1758, Generals Amherst and Wolfe with British troops, and Admiral Boscawen with a British squadron, laid siege to Louisburg, on the island of Cape Breton. After a vigorous siege, Louisburg and the island of Cape Breton were surrendered to the British, July 26, 1758.

**Capture of Louisburg.**

At the beginning of July, 1758, a British force of fifteen thousand men under General Abercrombie moved against Ticonderoga. On the 6th a part of this force, under Lord Howe, defeated the French, but Lord Howe was among the slain. Abercrombie continued his advance, and attacked Ticonderoga on July 8th, but met with a disastrous repulse. He then fell back and abandoned the object of the expedition. On August 27, 1758, Fort Frontenac, on the site of the present city of Kingston, in Canada, was captured by Colonel Bradstreet, at the head of a British force which had been sent against it by Abercrombie.

**Expedition against Ticonderoga.**

**Capture of Fort Frontenac.**

In 1758 a British force under General John Forbes proceeded against Fort Duquesne. When within fifty miles of the fort a council of war decided to abandon the enterprise, but when prisoners who were brought in at this moment gave every assurance that the garrison of Fort Duquesne was weak it was resolved to move forward. A part of the expedition, under Major Grant, had been defeated by the French and Indians on September 21, 1758. Washington and his Virginians led the advance against Fort Duquesne. The French evacuated the fort on the approach of the English, and fled down the Ohio in boats; and late in November, 1758, the British flag waved over Fort Duquesne, the name of which was changed to Fort Pitt, in honor of the great English statesman. The flourishing city of Pittsburg now occupies the site of the fort.

**Capture of Fort Duquesne.**

The British planned three expeditions for the campaign of 1759. One, under Generals Prideaux and Johnson, was to attempt the capture of Fort Niagara; another, under Lord Amherst, was to take possession

**British Expeditions in 1759.**

of Forts Ticonderoga and Crown Point; and a third, under General James Wolfe, was designed for the reduction of Quebec, the strongest French fortress in America.

Capture  
of Fort  
Niagara.

In July, 1759, the British under Generals Prideaux and Johnson commenced the siege of Fort Niagara. On the 15th Prideaux was killed by the bursting of a mortar; and the command of the British army devolved upon Johnson, who continued the siege until the 25th, when the French surrendered the fort.

Ticonderoga and  
Crown  
Point.

On the approach of the British army under Lord Amherst, in July, 1759, Forts Ticonderoga and Crown Point were evacuated by their French garrisons, and were immediately taken possession of by the British.

Wolfe's  
Siege of  
Quebec.

In June, 1759, a British force of eight thousand men under General Wolfe arrived before Quebec. For two months the British besieged the city and destroyed a large part of it by means of hot shot. On July 31, 1759, in the midst of a terrific thunder-storm, a portion of the British army, under Colonel Monckton, fought with the French the battle of Montmorenci. At length a council of war was held by the British officers and it was resolved to storm the French camp. Accordingly, on the night of September 12, 1759, the British army, led by Wolfe in person, scaled the Heights of Abraham, in the rear of Quebec.

Battle of  
Mont-  
morenci.

Wolfe and  
Gray's  
"Elegy."

The only voice that broke the silence of the night was the voice of Wolfe himself, as he repeated the following stanza of Gray's *Elegy in a Country Churchyard*:

"The boast of heraldry, the pomp of power,  
All that beauty, and all that wealth e'er gave,  
Await alike the inevitable hour.  
The paths of glory lead but to the grave."

As Wolfe closed this stanza he remarked: "I had rather be the author of that poem than take Quebec."

Battle of  
Quebec.

On the following morning, September 13, 1759, a furious battle ensued on the Plains of Abraham. The commanders of both armies fell mortally wounded while fighting bravely at the head of their respective forces. As Wolfe lay dying on the ground he heard an officer exclaim: "They run! They run!" The dying general raised himself on his elbow, and asked: "Who run?" The officer replied: "The enemy, the enemy." Thereupon Wolfe murmured, as his soul passed away from earth: "Then I die happy." When Montcalm, conscious that his wound was fatal, asked the surgeon how long he had to live, the surgeon replied: "Perhaps a day, perhaps less." The gallant French commander replied: "So much the better. I shall not live to see the surrender of Quebec." Thus died both commanders, the one rejoicing

Death of  
Wolfe  
and  
Mont-  
calm.

in his country's victory, and the other unwilling to survive his country's defeat. In the city of Quebec stands a fine monument erected to the memory of both, having the name of Wolfe on one side and that of Montcalm on the other—a noble tribute of a nation, grateful to a patriot son and generous to a manly foe. Five days after the battle, September 18, 1759, Quebec was surrendered to the victorious British.

Fall of  
Quebec.

In the spring of 1760 a French force under M. Levi, Montcalm's successor, attempted to recover Quebec, and defeated the British army commanded by General Murray in the bloody battle of Sillery, three miles below Quebec, April 28, 1760. The British fell back to Quebec, where they were besieged; but the French, becoming alarmed at the supposed approach of a large British fleet, hastily abandoned the siege and retired.

Battle of  
Sillery.

On September 8, 1760, Montreal, the last stronghold of the French in America, surrendered to the British army under General Murray, who had collected eighteen thousand men for the reduction of the city. The fall of Montreal was the death-blow to French power in North America, and the conquest of Canada by the British was complete.

Fall of  
Montreal  
and Con-  
quest of  
Canada.

In 1759 the Cherokee Indians in Georgia began a war against the white people of Georgia and the Carolinas. After a war of two years, the Indians were subdued by Colonel Grant. In 1763 Pontiac, a famous Ottawa chief, secretly formed a confederacy of Indian tribes to expel the British from the country west of the Allegheny mountains. Within a fortnight this sagacious chief seized all the British posts west of the Alleghenies, except Detroit, Niagara and Fort Pitt. Colonel Bouquet cleared Western Pennsylvania of the Indians by his victory at Bushy Run in 1764, compelling them to withdraw from Pennsylvania and retire westward. The Indians were soon subdued, and in 1765 Pontiac was killed by an Illinois Indian on the Mississippi river.

Cherokee  
War.

Pontiac's  
War.

Bouquet's  
Victory.

Pennsylvania suffered greatly from Indian depredation in Pontiac's War, which led to bloody reprisals on the part of the Scotch-Irish Pennsylvanians, who vented their rage upon innocent and inoffensive Indians. Thus the *Paxton Boys*, organized by the Rev. John Elder, of the Paxtang Church, exterminated the remnant of the Conestoga Indians by massacring them at the Conestoga Indian Town and in the workhouse at Lancaster, in December, 1763, after which they marched to Philadelphia and defied the colonial authorities to punish them for their brutal massacres. The Christianized Indians were brought to Philadelphia for protection. In October, 1763, occurred the *First Massacre of Wyoming*, when about twenty Connecticut settlers in the Wyoming Valley were slaughtered by the Delaware Indians. Logan, the famous Indian chief, removed to the Ohio river; and in 1774 some of his Indians were defeated by the Virginians sent by Governor Lord

Indian  
Atrocities  
and  
Reprisals  
in Penn-  
sylvania.

First  
Massacre  
of Wyo-  
ming.

Chief  
Logan.

Dunmore, at Point Pleasant, on the Ohio river. On July 13, 1782, the Indians completely destroyed Hannastown, near the site of the present Greensburg, in Pennsylvania, massacring the inhabitants.

End of  
French  
Power in  
India.

The year 1760—which witnessed the complete overthrow of the French dominion in North America—was also signalized by the total subversion of the French power in India, through the genius of Clive and other British officers. M. Lally, the French Governor of Pondicherry, attacked Madras, but was thoroughly defeated by the British under Colonel Coote in a decisive battle at Wandewash, January 21, 1760, which utterly destroyed the French influence in the Carnatic. During this campaign in the Carnatic a British fleet under Admiral Pococke defeated a French fleet off the coast of the island of Ceylon, thus establishing the British naval supremacy in the Indian seas and raising hopes for the expulsion of the French from Hindoostan.

Battle of  
Wandewash.

French  
Naval  
Defeat.

British  
Capture  
of a  
Dutch  
Arma-  
ment.

A Dutch armament arrived in Bengal under circumstances which aroused the suspicions of Colonel Clive, who ordered that it should be attacked immediately by land and sea. Clive was engaged in a rubber of whist when an express from Colonel Forde brought him the news of the advance of the Dutch. He replied by the following pencil-note on a slip of paper torn from Colonel Forde's letter: "Dear Forde, fight them immediately, and I'll send you an order of council to-morrow." Colonel Forde followed Clive's instructions, and the Dutch were compelled to surrender. The authorities of Holland made ample apologies to Great Britain for this infraction of treaties.

British  
Conquest  
in India.

Conquest still shone on the British arms in India during 1761, when Colonel Coote reduced Pondicherry and Mahé, thus completely shattering the French power in India and giving full control of the commerce of that vast Oriental peninsula to the English East India Company.

English  
Desire for  
Peace.

The British conquests in North America and India made the English people extremely tired of the war in Germany. They complained loudly of the inactivity of their navy, and asserted that the French islands in the West Indies, which were far more valuable to a great commercial nation than half the German Empire, might have been acquired with far less risk and loss than that caused by the protection given to the useless Electorate of Hanover. In the midst of the political disputes in England arising from the growth of this peace sentiment, King George II. died in the seventy-seventh year of his age and the thirty-fourth of his reign, October 25, 1760. He was succeeded as King of Great Britain and Ireland, and Elector of Hanover, by his grandson GEORGE III., a young prince in his twenty-third year, whose father, Frederick, Prince of Wales, had died several years before. Unlike his two predecessors of the same dynasty, George III. was born and educated in England; and in his opening address to the British Parlia-

George  
III. of  
Great  
Britain,  
A. D.  
1760-  
1820.

ment he said: "Born and educated in this country, I glory in the name of Briton." The bitter feelings between Hanoverians and Jacobites had become a thing of the past, and some of the leading partisans of the Stuarts accepted places in the young king's household.

The death of George II. produced little change in European politics; but that of the peaceful Ferdinand VI. of Spain the year before, A. D. 1759, had important consequences. Ferdinand VI. was succeeded on the throne of Spain by his brother Charles IV. of Naples and Sicily, who resigned his Italian kingdom when he thus became King CHARLES III. of Spain. His abdication of the crown of Naples and Sicily was in accordance with the terms of the Treaty of Aix la Chapelle, in 1748, by which it was agreed that when he became King of Spain he should abdicate his Neapolitan crown in favor of his brother Don Philip, Duke of Parma and Piacenza, and that those Italian duchies should be relinquished to the German Emperor. By the mediation of France with Austria, Charles III. was enabled to procure the Neapolitan throne for his third son, Ferdinand IV., while Don Philip was allowed to retain Parma and Piacenza.

In gratitude for the interest which the French court manifested in his brother, King Charles III. of Spain signed a third *Family Compact*, which bound the French and Spanish Bourbons to afford each other mutual aid, and secretly prepared to unite with France in the war against Great Britain. The haughty conduct of the British diplomatists, which justly offended Spanish pride, contributed greatly to strengthen the resolution of the court of Madrid, especially as the naval superiority of the British menaced Spain's communication with her American colonies.

Negotiations for peace were begun by the courts of Versailles and St. James early in 1761, but with little sincerity on either side. The Duke de Choiseul, the French Prime Minister, relied on the secret promises of assistance from Spain, thus making it impossible to arrange preliminaries; while Mr. Pitt was fully determined to humble the House of Bourbon.

The campaign of 1761 in Germany was carried on languidly by all parties. Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick, in command of the British and Hanoverian forces, was defeated by the French at Grünsberg and driven out of Hesse; but he afterward drove the French from their strong position at Wellinghausen. The King of Prussia, exhausted by his very victories in the preceding campaigns, was obliged to act on the defensive; and, though he lost no important battle, the Austrians under Laudon took Schweidnitz by surprise, making prisoners of its garrison of three thousand six hundred men, and thus regaining possession of Silesia, which enabled them to establish their winter-quarters

**Charles III. of Spain, A. D. 1759-1788.**

**Family Compact of the Bourbons.**

**Peace Negotiations.**

**French, Austrian and Russian Successes in Germany in 1761.**

in that province; while the Russians besieged and took Colberg, thus making themselves masters of Pomerania, which enabled them to fix their winter-quarters in that province.

French  
Defeats  
at Sea.

Capture  
of  
Belleisle.

George  
III. and  
William  
Pitt.

The British navy still maintained its supremacy at sea in actions with single French ships and small French squadrons; while Belleisle, on the very coast of France, was captured by a British armament under Admiral Keppel and General Hodgson. Terrified by these disasters, the French court made an ineffectual effort for peace; after which it applied to King Charles III. of Spain for assistance, in accordance with the provisions of the Family Compact.

King George III.—who had married the Princess Charlotte of Mecklenburg-Strelitz, September 8, 1761, and whose coronation was performed with great pomp and magnificence, September 22, 1761—was anxious to bring the Seven Years' War to a close. The chief obstacle in the way of the king's peace-at-any-price policy was his great Prime Minister, William Pitt, whom he hated. Pitt would not consent to desert the King of Prussia, although such a step would have brought about an immediate settlement with France, and thus paved the way for a general peace.

Pitt's  
Resignation.

Mr. Pitt had the earliest information of the Family Compact, and he wished to strike the first blow against Spain by siezing her supplies of gold and silver on their way from her American colonies. Pitt's proposal was received very coldly by the other members of the British Ministry. They were not in possession of all the information which their illustrious colleague had obtained, and they were also jealous of Pitt's superior influence and his superior popularity. His plan was firmly opposed by the king, and was finally rejected by his colleagues, whereupon he immediately resigned office. As a mark of gratitude for his eminent public services, a pension of three thousand pounds annually was conferred on him for three lives, and his wife was created Baroness of Chatham.

His  
Pension.

Ministry  
of the  
Earl of  
Bute.

His  
Unpopularity.

Pitt's resignation was generally attributed to the secret influence of his successor, the Scotch lord, William Stuart, Earl of Bute, who was supposed to have obtained a complete ascendancy over the king's mind. This suspicion aroused great popular dissatisfaction, which was openly expressed on the Lord Mayor's Day, when His Majesty and his retinue proceeded to dine in London. The king and the queen were received with extreme coldness and silence, and the Earl of Bute was grossly insulted by the populace, but Mr. Pitt was welcomed with the loudest acclamations. The fierce political disputes which Pitt's resignation caused in England produced effects which were felt throughout Europe. The hopes of the French court were revived, and Great Britain's German allies were greatly dispirited.





GEORGE I



GEORGE II



GEORGE III



GEORGE IV



Early in 1762 King George III., who, unlike the first two Georges, was a Tory in politics, drove the Duke of Newcastle from the Ministry, in which he had held the management of home affairs since the death of his brother, Henry Pelham, in 1754. For the first time since the accession of the House of Brunswick the Whigs were driven from power, and a purely Tory Ministry under the leadership of the Earl of Bute was formed.

**Full Tory  
Ministry.**

But the new Tory Ministry showed great alacrity in maintaining the honor of Great Britain abroad, and one of its first acts fully justified Pitt's foresight. When the hostile designs of Spain could no longer be concealed the British ambassador at Madrid remonstrated, but received nothing but evasive answers or flat refusals to all his demands. He was therefore recalled by his government, and soon afterward Great Britain declared war against Spain, January, 1762.

**War  
between  
Spain and  
Great  
Britain.**

Unable to oppose the British at sea, the Spaniards resolved to attack their ally, King Joseph of Portugal. The French and Spanish ambassadors at Lisbon presented a joint demand to the Portuguese king that he should instantly renounce his alliance with Great Britain, under penalty of incurring the resentment of their respective sovereigns, and allowing him but four days to deliberate on his answer. King Joseph at once replied by a declaration of war against France and Spain, and appealed to Great Britain for aid; whereupon a Spanish army invaded Portugal and captured Miranda, Braganza and several other towns; but eight thousand British troops under Generals John Burgoyne and Charles Lee, who afterward became generals on opposite sides in the War of American Independence, were sent to the assistance of the Portuguese, along with a German force under the Count of Lippe-Schaumburg, who had already distinguished himself in the war in Germany, and who was intrusted by King Joseph with the command of the Portuguese army. The skill of the Count of Lippe-Schaumburg and of the British generals, along with the valor of their respective troops, soon forced the Spaniards to evacuate Portugal. The allied British and Portuguese armies then invaded Spain and took several towns by way of reprisal.

**Portu-  
gal's  
Alliance  
with  
Great  
Britain.**

**Spanish  
Invasion  
of  
Portugal  
and Its  
Failure.**

While the Spanish invasion of Portugal in 1762 thus failed, the French arms met with ill success in Germany; as the British and Hanoverian forces under Prince Ferdinand of Brunswick and the Marquis of Granby protected Hanover against French invasion, and even recovered most of Hesse.

**French  
Failure in  
Hanover.**

The retirement of Mr. Pitt from the British Ministry was a serious misfortune for Frederick the Great, and that great warrior-king again found himself in an almost hopeless situation. As Pitt had been Frederick's firm friend, so the Earl of Bute, the new British Prime Minister,

**British  
Abandon-  
ment of  
Frederick  
the Great.**

was the Prussian king's equally-determined enemy. The new British Ministry, in its ardent desire for peace, now withdrew its subsidies from Frederick the Great, and even proposed to abandon his cause entirely. Fortunately for Frederick the Great, Maria Theresa was at that time so confident of recovering Silesia that she rejected the British peace propositions with disdain.

British  
Conquest  
of French  
West  
Indies.

In the meantime the British conquered the principal islands that the French still retained in the West Indies—Martinique, St. Lucia, Granada and St. Vincent. A British land and naval expedition under the Earl of Albemarle and Admiral Pococke, in which was a New England contingent under Colonel Israel Putnam, captured Havana, the capital of Cuba, in the summer of 1762, with plunder amounting to three million pounds sterling. On the other side of the globe, the city of Manila, the capital of the Philippine Islands, was taken by a British armament under Admiral Cornish and General Draper. The Spaniards recovered the city by promising to pay a ransom of one million pounds, but they violated their engagements, and the ransom was never paid. About the same time British cruisers captured two valuable Spanish treasure-galleons containing property to the amount of two million pounds sterling, August 12, 1762. While the wagons conveying the treasure taken from the Spanish vessels were passing in front of the palace the cannon in the park announced the birth of a Prince of Wales—a coincidence which vastly increased the public joy at this happy event.

British  
Capture  
of  
Havana  
and  
Manila.

British  
Prizes.

Bute's  
Negotia-  
tions for  
Peace.

France and Spain had now become heartily tired of a war which menaced their respective colonies with ruin, and the new Tory Ministry of Great Britain under the Earl of Bute was as ardently desirous of peace. So anxious was the Earl of Bute to cease hostilities that he stopped the career of colonial conquest, and consented to sacrifice several acquisitions that the British had already made, although he held on to Canada and part of Louisiana, the chief settlements on the African coasts and the British supremacy in India. Contrary to all expectation, the British Parliament sanctioned the peace preliminaries.

Peter III.  
of Russia,  
and His  
Alliance  
with  
Frederick  
the Great.

It now appeared that Frederick the Great must fall before the overwhelming power of Austria and Russia; but in January, 1762, the Empress Elizabeth of Russia, Frederick's implacable enemy, died, and was succeeded by her nephew PETER III., who ardently admired the talents and courage of Frederick, and who immediately wrote to the King of Prussia requesting a renewal of their friendship. Peter III. also ordered his generals to cease from hostilities against Prussia and engaged to restore their conquests. In May, 1762, he made an alliance with the King of Prussia, each agreeing to aid the other with a force of fifteen thousand men.

Encouraged by the happy circumstances in which he so suddenly and unexpectedly found himself, the King of Prussia made the Austrians feel the effects of his vengeance by reëntering Silesia, defeating Daun at Buckersdorf and recapturing Schweidnitz with nine thousand prisoners, which again gave him possession of Silesia. Frederick next invaded Bohemia, destroyed the Austrian magazines at Prague, burned the city of Eger and terribly ravaged the country.

**Frederick's  
Successes  
over the  
Austrians  
in 1762.**

His brother Prince Henry was victorious in Saxony, defeating the Austrian and German imperial armies at Freiberg. Austria consented to an armistice; and, by overrunning Franconia, Suabia and Bavaria, Frederick the Great forced the princes of those German states to withdraw their forces from the imperial army, which was thus obliged to treat for a suspension of hostilities.

**Prussian  
Successes  
in  
Germany.**

The Czar Peter III. had been deposed in July, 1762, by his wicked wife, who then made herself sole sovereign of Russia, with the title of CATHARINE II. The unfortunate Peter soon afterward died in prison, supposed to have been assassinated at the instigation of Catharine. The new Empress immediately renounced the alliance with Frederick the Great, declared herself neutral with respect to the war in Germany and recalled the Russian armies from Prussia. Sweden had already made peace with Prussia by the Treaty of Hamburg, negotiated by Frederick's sister, the wife of King Adolphus Frederick of Sweden, May 22, 1762.

**Catharine  
II. of  
Russia,  
A. D.  
1762-  
1796.**

**Her Neu-  
trality.**

On February 10, 1763, Great Britain, France, Spain and Portugal concluded treaties of peace at Paris, by which they agreed to observe neutrality with regard to the war between Austria and Prussia. The terms of the Peace of Paris were most humiliating to France. Nova Scotia, Canada and all the other French possessions in North America east of the Mississippi river, except the small islands of Miquelon and St. Pierre, in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, were ceded to Great Britain; as were also the islands of Granada, Dominica, St. Vincent and Tobago, in the West Indies. France ceded Louisiana to Spain to indemnify her for her losses by the Family Compact. Spain ceded Florida to Great Britain, in exchange for Cuba and the Philippine Islands, which had been captured by the British navy. France also ceded to Great Britain the Senegal country in Africa, the French settlements made in India within the previous fourteen years, all the French conquests in Hanover and the island of Minorca. Great Britain restored Belleisle, on the coast of France, and the island of St. Lucia, in the West Indies.

**Peace of  
Paris.**

Austria and Prussia, thus left to themselves, soon agreed to a treaty of peace, which was signed at Hubertsburg, February 15, 1763; leaving the province of Silesia, for which so much blood had been shed, in the possession of Frederick the Great. Frederick promised his vote as

**Peace of  
Huberts-  
burg.**

Elector of Brandenburg for Maria Theresa's son, the Archduke Joseph II. of Austria, at the next election of Emperor of Germany, and also agreed to restore the Electorate of Saxony with all its archives to the King of Poland.

**British  
and  
Prussian  
Triumph.**

Thus Great Britain and Prussia emerged victorious from a gigantic struggle against the combined powers of Europe. Thus ended the great Seven Years' War, in which one million men perished and which raised Prussia to a front rank, assigned North America forever to the Anglo-Saxon race and established the British Empire in India.

**Situation  
of France,  
Great  
Britain,  
the  
German  
Empire  
and  
Prussia.**

By the result of this war, France, weakened and exhausted, had sunk far below the commanding position which she had formerly occupied, and her prestige was gone; while Great Britain took her place as the leading commercial and naval power of the world. The German Empire had long been rotten structure, and the Peace of Hubertsburg made its weakness clearly manifest. About three hundred and fifty states, of which the Empire was composed, exercised the rights of sovereignty and were almost independent of the Emperor, whose authority over the different princes of the Empire was little more than nominal. While the German Empire was thus in a decaying condition, the young Kingdom of Prussia, under its illustrious sovereign, Frederick the Great, had already taken its place as one of the leading powers of Europe. During the twenty-four years of Frederick's reign after the Seven Years' War, Prussia enjoyed the greatest prosperity.

**Neutral  
Traffic  
with  
Bellig-  
erents.**

During the Seven Years' War a question arose which led to very important discussions. France, unable to maintain commercial intercourse with her colonies, opened the trade to neutral powers. Great Britain declared this traffic illegal, and used her naval superiority in seizing neutral vessels and neutral property bound to hostile ports. The return of peace ended the dispute for the time, but it became a subject of angry controversy in every subsequent war.


**Great  
Britain's  
Funding  
System.**

During the Seven Years' War the internal condition of Great Britain improved rapidly by the extension of the funding system, which so intimately connected the pecuniary affairs of the government with those of the nation. By far the larger portion of the loans required for the expenses of the war were raised at home, so that the increase of the national debt more closely united the rulers and the people of Great Britain in the bonds of a common interest. This changed condition of affairs scarcely excited notice at the time, though it was the main source of the permanence and stability displayed by the British government when the dynasties of Continental Europe were menaced with overthrow by revolution.









### INTER-COLONIAL WARS

YEAR WAR BEGAN	NAME OF WAR	YEAR WAR CLOSED	TREATY CONCLUDED AT	YEARS WAR LASTED	RESULT OF WAR IN THE COLONIES
1689	King William's	1697	Ryswick	8	Each party to have same territory as before the war. 1713 British New-Fundland and Acadia ceded to Great Britain.
1702	Queen Anne's	1713	Utrecht	11	Each party to have same territory as before the war.
1739 1744	Spanish King George's	1748	Aix-la-Chapelle	9	In general terms all territory east of the Mississippi ceded to Great Britain.
1754	French & Indian	1763	Paris	8	

### KINDS OF GOVERNMENT IN THE COLONIES AT THE CLOSE OF THIS PERIOD

New Hampshire	Royal Province
New York	"
New Jersey	"
Virginia	"
North Carolina	"
South Carolina	"
Georgia	"
Maryland	Proprietary
Pennsylvania	"
Delaware	"
Massachusetts	Charter
Rhode Island	"
Connecticut	"

02 Longitude from Washington      06 East      06 West



## CHAPTER XXXVIII.

# DAWN OF THE AGE OF REVOLUTIONS.

### SECTION I.—FRENCH LITERATURE AND THE AGE OF REFORM (A. D. 1750–1792).

ABOUT the middle of the eighteenth century the foundations of all existing social, political and religious institutions were terribly shaken by a class of French writers—such as Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau and the Encyclopedists—who fearlessly attacked abuses in Church and State with unanswerable arguments and with the keenest wit and sarcasm.

**Influence  
of French  
Writers.**

These ingenious French writers, while attacking all that was vulnerable and that should have been wiped out, also assailed much that was valuable and beneficent. This French literature opposed religious constitutions and ecclesiastical order, attacked the prevailing forms of government, and represented the conditions of men and forms of society in the character of antiquated abuses. While these writers first assailed real blemishes and faults, in religion and the Church, in politics and law, in civil regulations and social relations, they gradually undermined all the foundations of human society and spread general discontent among the masses.

**Character  
of Their  
Writings.**

While these French writers sought to abolish all immunities, privileges and class prerogatives, and to give due value to freedom and personal merit, they also weakened the force of old statutes and rights and the strength of authority. While they assailed superstitious prejudices and worn-out opinions, they also confused faith and conscience, destroyed the veneration and reverence for all religion, and propagated the idea that human happiness could exist only on the ruins of existing institutions.

**Effects  
of Their  
Writings.**

Such was especially the case with the literary productions of Voltaire, Montesquieu and Rousseau, whose ingenious writings were read by all the learned class of Europe, because of the charm of their beautiful language and powers of description. These great writers pursued different paths, but with similar results.

**The  
Three  
Great  
French  
Writers.**

**Voltaire.** Voltaire, who was born in 1694, was a versatile and ingenious author, who had acquired fame in all kinds of literature. He mercilessly assailed everything customary and long established, all prevailing opinions and existing institutions, without the least concern as to what should be substituted in their stead. In his dramatic and epic poems—such as *Mohammed*, *The Henriad*, *The Maid of Orleans*—and in satires and romances, in historical and philosophical works—such as *Times of Louis XIV.*, *History of Charles XII. of Sweden*, *Essay on the Customs and Genius of Nations*—he presented his views and doubts, his thoughts and criticisms, his investigations and conclusions. His most violent assaults were hurled against religion and the Church, the priesthood and the popular belief. While destroying many prejudices, removing many superstitions and exhibiting ecclesiastical exclusiveness in its real character, Voltaire's writings broke down religious feeling in many a heart, sowed doubt and unbelief in many a mind, along with cold, worldly wisdom, and with it selfishness, representing self-love and self-interest as the highest motives of human actions. Voltaire's writings exerted the greatest influence over the popular mind of Europe long after his death in 1778.

**Montesquieu.** Montesquieu, who was born in 1689, was a more earnest writer than Voltaire, and drew attention to the faults and absurdity of existing conditions and arrangements, for the purpose of improving and reorganizing them in accordance with the spirit of the age. In his *Lettres Persannes*, "Persian Letters," Montesquieu assailed the faith of the Church and the whole form and system of government in France with the same wanton scorn as did Voltaire; and in the same manner, by his wit and irony, he exposed the customs and the social position of his contemporaries to ridicule. In his ingenious treatise, *On the Causes of the Greatness and the Decline of the Romans*, Montesquieu endeavored to prove that patriotism and self-reliance made a nation great, but that despotism brought about its destruction. Montesquieu's third great work, *Esprit des Lois*, "On the Spirit of Laws," represents the constitutional government of England as the one best adapted to mankind. His writings also exerted great influence long after his death in 1755.

**Rousseau.** Jean Jacques Rousseau, who was born at Geneva in 1712 and was the son of a watchmaker, combated existing conditions of society by an alluring description of a precisely-reverse condition of things. In his *Confessions*, in which he frankly acknowledged to the world the vicissitudes, poverty and errors of his youth, he reached, by solving a prize question on the influence of the arts and sciences upon manners, the fundamental doctrine of his whole life and efforts—the principle that all the misery and all the crimes, all the discontent and unhappiness, of mankind are due to a high degree of civilization; and that only in a state

of nature, the savage state, in a condition full of innocence and simplicity, free from all the fetters imposed by civilization, education and custom, are human creatures happy and contented. The ignorant, untutored savage is therefore the happy and contented man. Civilization and culture—everything tending to raise man above the level of the brute—makes men unhappy and discontented, because it awakens desires and ambitions which cannot be gratified or realized. This principle forms the central point of all Rousseau's writings, which are characterized by sentiment and by attractive descriptions, thus making them readable.

In his poetical and epistolary romance, *Nouvelle Heloise*, Rousseau contrasts the pleasures of a sentimental life of nature with the perverted relations of actual existence and the restraints and requirements of society. In his *Emile* he endeavored to establish a rational system of education, based on nature and parental affection, thus expiating the sin which he himself had been guilty of in allowing his own children to be taken to the foundling hospital. In this work is found *The Confession of Faith of a Savoyard Vicar*—in which Rousseau taught and recommended a religion of the heart and feelings in opposition to the prevailing doctrine of the Church—which resulted in his banishment and persecution.

His  
"Nouvelle  
Heloise"  
and His  
"Emile."

In his *Contrat Social*, Rousseau advocated the equal rights of all men, and represented a perfect democracy with popular legislative assemblies as the most desirable of all governments. His language in his works expresses his deep inward feeling, and reaches the heart because it comes from the heart.

His  
"Contrat  
Social."

Rousseau's writings had an incalculable influence; and every spot trodden by his foot, or where he had dwelt as a persecuted fugitive, was gazed upon reverently by the rising generation. He awakened a feeling for nature, for simplicity and for the domestic affections; but he also aroused a passionate desire for the lauded state of primitive liberty and equality, which could be realized only by the overthrow of existing institutions and conditions. He died in 1778.

Influence  
of His  
Writings.

Voltaire, Montesquieu and Rousseau produced so great an influence upon the opinions of all Europe for the simple reason that the fashion for everything then proceeded from Paris. The higher classes of Europe spoke only the French language and read only the French literature, and the writings of the three greatest French writers of the time excited universal attention by their agreeable form and their ingenious descriptions.

French  
Language  
and Lit-  
erature  
Supreme.

Such sovereigns as Frederick the Great of Prussia, Gustavus III. of Sweden, Charles III. of Spain and Catharine II. of Russia, as well as the great statesmen of all European nations and many influential in-

Rulers  
and  
French  
Writers.

dividuals, were in personal or epistolary correspondence with Voltaire and many of his contemporaries who held his opinions.

The  
French  
Encyclo-  
pedists.

Among these contemporaries the most famous were the mathematician and philosopher D'Alembert and the wanton poet Diderot. These two writers founded the French Encyclopedia, a clear, large-minded and unprejudiced summary of all human science, but hostile to all lofty efforts. From this work these two men and their coadjutors were called *Encyclopedists*.

Their  
Ascend-  
ency.

The time was favorable to the ascendancy of that brilliant galaxy of French philosophers who sought to supersede all previous writings by their *Encyclopedie*. Besides D'Alembert and Diderot, Condillac, Helvetius, Condorcet and Baron d'Holbach were the principal Encyclopedists. Baron d'Holbach's house was regarded as the headquarters of the atheistical philosophy.

Destruct-  
ive Effect  
of Their  
Writings.

The Encyclopedists contradicted the system of Descartes, who assumed the soul of man as the starting-point in all investigations, reasoned from a physical basis, and considered thought, sentiment and worship as mere phenomena of matter. Their speculations might have caused as little harm as those of the mediæval Schoolmen had they not been recommended by the clear and popular style in which they were written, or had they been opposed by anything better than the empty pretense of a state-religion, which served mainly as the cloak of the worst of despotisms. Not satisfied with assailing tyranny and priestcraft, the Encyclopedists also attacked the moral foundations on which the very existence of human society depends; so that everything appeared tottering on the brink of chaos, and revolt against authority soon proceeded from speculation to action, as we shall presently observe.

Paris as  
Europe's  
Center of  
Culture.

The French philosophical literature was eagerly read and admired in the higher circles of Europe; while it also became the fashion for the well-born youth of the various countries of Europe to spend some of their time in Paris to complete their education, so that no man of consequence could reckon upon consideration or regard unless he had been admitted into the intellectual circles of the French capital. All the monarchs and statesmen of Europe sought the favor and friendship of the French literati and philosophers.

The  
Effete  
Monarch-  
ies of  
Europe.

Most of the governments in Western and Central Europe had actually outlived their vital power. Spain had been enslaved by the Inquisition ever since the suppression of the Cortes more than two centuries before. France, which had no meeting of the States-General since 1614, had become a mere autocracy, against which the parliaments of the various provinces made but a feeble and formal protest. Holland was distracted by the struggle between the Orange and republican factions. The Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation was stifled by unmean-



FRENCH WRITERS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY





ing and obsolete forms; so that there was absolute truth in Voltaire's assertion that it was "not holy, not Roman, not an empire." All the Austrian states were distracted by the well-meant but ill-considered innovations of Joseph II. Prussia, which had recently and successively been under the sway of two remarkably-able sovereigns, was without a constitution by which a continuance of its greatness could be secured. Poland and Turkey were in hopeless anarchy. In all European countries the intelligence of the people was in advance of their respective governments, and the institutions which had served the requirements of the Middle Ages were inadequate to the increasing demands of modern times.

The latter half of the eighteenth century was signalized by the multiplication of clubs and secret societies in every European country, as well as by the universal diffusion of light periodical literature, instilling into the common people the skeptical philosophy which had already in the minds of the higher classes undermined all principles of civil or religious authority. The triumph of the American Revolution, which established popular government in the New World, seemed to justify the destruction of all thrones and class distinctions; though few considered the severe moral training which had prepared the Anglo-American colonists for their unique and heroic task. In the War of American Independence, the people of Europe, who were filled with the ideas and dreams of Rousseau, saw the beginning of the great struggle which was to give the human race a state of paradisiacal happiness—a struggle which was to end in the establishment of the inherent rights of humanity. The War of the American Revolution thus excited a particular interest in Europe because it was the first contest of young Freedom against the old prerogatives, forms and institutions.

The Age of Revolutions in Europe had only commenced. Before the storm passed, every European country was to experience changes, though France was the scene of the most violent transformation. The oppressions of a thousand years were certain to be avenged whenever the masses of the people should become sufficiently enlightened and fully conscious of their power.

The new spirit of the age, emanating from Paris, was fully recognized by the sovereigns and the Prime Ministers of the different nations of Continental Europe, who inaugurated various civil, political and ecclesiastical reforms. They sought to put in practice what was advocated in speech and writing as the truth. In all these European countries zealous efforts were made to revolutionize ancient forms and institutions, laws and customs, and by new arrangements to adapt them to the spirit of the age. In the realm of religion this spirit of reform first manifested itself by proclaiming toleration in matters of religious

**Influence  
of French  
Literature  
and the  
American  
Revolution.**

**Age of  
Revolutions.**

**Innovations  
of  
Monarchs  
and  
Prime  
Ministers.**

faith, in the suppression of the Order of Jesuits and in the abolition of the Inquisition. In France the new free religious toleration soon degenerated into the encouragement of open infidelity. This new epoch of humanity manifested itself most actively and with the best results in the affairs of law, in which efforts were made everywhere to establish, as far as possible, the equal administration of justice to all men, and to ameliorate or abolish the statutes and burdens which had been transmitted from the Middle Ages.

Political,  
Social  
and  
Economic  
Innova-  
tions.

Serfdom was abolished in many European countries, feudal duties being done away with and oppressive or degrading regulations being removed. New codes and ordinances concerning the administration of justice were adopted, annulling the cruel punishments of a stern and gloomy epoch, such as the rack, the wheel, etc., and granting the privileges of humanity even to the criminal. In the field of political economy new principles were established in France and were adopted in many other European countries. These principles recognized money as the great lever of science, and therefore the great object was to raise as large a revenue as possible by labor and by making use of natural means. This principle encouraged agriculture, mining, trade, industry and useful inventions; but it also led to the imposition of oppressive duties, to the royal right of preëmption, to indirect taxation and to the use of paper money.

Hostility  
to the  
Roman  
Catholic  
Church  
and the  
Jesuits.

General hostility to the Roman Catholic Church and its most powerful and celebrated Order, the Jesuits, was manifested in several of the Roman Catholic countries, such as Portugal, Spain and France. Several prelates in Germany sought to place the Roman Church under the control of the civil power. One of the German prelates was Hontheim of Treves, better known as "Febronius," under which name he wrote his celebrated treatise, *On the State of the Church and the Legitimate Power of the Pontiff*.

Jesuits  
Banished  
and Sup-  
pressed.

The writers against the Jesuits complained that the Order kept the people in ignorance; that it was opposed to all means of reform and popular enlightenment, and that it was the cause of religious intolerance. The Jesuits were successively banished from such Roman Catholic countries as Portugal, Spain, France and Naples; and the Order was finally suppressed by a papal edict, though it was subsequently restored. We shall now proceed to give an account of these events and of other innovations and reforms in European countries.

Carvalho,  
the  
Reform  
States-  
man of  
Portugal.

The first of these innovators and reformers was Carvalho, Marquis of Pombal, the all-powerful Prime Minister of King JOSEPH of Portugal, and one of the most remarkable statesmen of his time, who justly ascribed his country's decline to the grasping ambition of the Jesuits. During the bigoted and extravagant reign of Joseph's father and pred-

ecessor, John V., A. D. 1706–1750, all the gold and diamonds of Brazil had been inadequate to save Portugal from bankruptcy. One-tenth of the Portuguese population was immured in convents, while all forms of industry were in the hands of foreigners. By a treaty with Spain, in 1750, Portugal acquired the Seven Missions of Paraguay, whose inhabitants were under the rule of the Jesuits. The treaty provided for the removal of the Jesuits to Spanish territory; but the Portuguese and Spanish commissioners who were appointed to superintend the migration were successfully resisted by the Paraguayans themselves under the direction of their Jesuit teachers.

Before the Paraguayans and the Jesuits were reduced to submission, Lisbon was overwhelmed by the great earthquake of November 1, 1755, which destroyed thirty thousand houses and sixty thousand lives. The Jesuits attributed this dreadful calamity to Divine wrath against Carvalho, but the courageous Prime Minister was undaunted. After promptly and severely suppressing the pillage and disorder which had followed the earthquake, and after organizing the most liberal efforts for the relief of the sufferers, he proceeded with renewed vigor in the execution of his chosen policy. An attempt to murder King Joseph was attributed to the powerful family of Tavora and to the instigation of the Jesuits, and thus afforded a pretext for the expulsion of the Order from Portugal; and in September, 1759, all the Jesuits in the kingdom were shipped to the Pope's dominions. The Jesuit colleges in Portugal were thus closed, and Carvalho sought to enlighten his countrymen by the establishment of new seminaries of education and by the diffusion of printed books.

Carvalho's pervading activity was felt in all branches of the public service in Portugal. He caused the army to be reorganized by the German marshal, Count William of Lippe-Schaumburg. He encouraged agriculture and industry in order to draw the Portuguese people from dirt and indolence. He united the severity and arbitrariness of the despot to the courage and the penetrating will of the reformer, and filled all the prisons of the kingdom with those who opposed him.

King Joseph died in 1777, and was succeeded by his daughter MARIA, who was then forty-two years of age. As she was the first female sovereign of Portugal, there was some opposition to her accession; but this was easily suppressed, and her authority was generally acknowledged. As Joseph had no son he had his daughter married to his brother, her uncle, Dom Pedro, who reigned jointly with her as PEDRO III. until his death, in 1786. During the weak reign of Maria and Pedro III. the imprisoned opponents of Carvalho were released, and they united themselves in overthrowing the all-powerful Prime Minister; after which

**Lisbon Earthquake and Banishment of the Jesuits from Portugal.**

**Innovations and Reforms of Carvalho.**

**Queen Maria and Pedro III. and Fall of Carvalho.**

Portugal was plunged into the same condition as before. As Queen Maria became insane in 1792, her eldest surviving son, Dom Joam, or John, was intrusted with the government, which he administered in his mother's name until 1799, when he was made regent.

**Reforms  
of the  
Count  
d'Aranda  
in Spain.**

In Spain, during the reign of CHARLES III., A. D. 1759-1788, his famous Prime Minister, the Count d'Aranda, made efforts at reform in Church and State similar to those of Carvalho in Portugal. The Count d'Aranda's first act was the banishment of the Jesuits from Spain, A. D. 1767. He ordered all the members of the Order in Spain, five thousand in number, to be seized in one night, embarked on board ships without distinction of rank, and conveyed like criminals with great harshness to the States of the Church, to which they had declared that their obedience was due. But Pope Clement XIII. refused to receive them, and even ordered his cannon to fire on the ships which brought such unwelcome immigrants to his dominions. The property of the Jesuits in Spain was confiscated, and their colleges in that kingdom were closed. But during the latter years of the reign of Charles III. the clergy and the Inquisition again acquired great influence in Spain, and destroyed or disturbed most of the Count d'Aranda's reforms. Charles III. died in 1788, and was succeeded as King of Spain by his son CHARLES IV.

**His Ban-  
ishment  
of the  
Jesuits.**

**Reforms  
of the  
Duke de  
Choiseul  
in France.**

In France the Duke de Choiseul, the worthy Prime Minister of the dissolute Louis XV., was also a promoter of enlightenment and progress, but was unable to make any improvement under his voluptuous sovereign, though he also suppressed the Jesuits in France. The extensive commercial enterprises of the Jesuits had aroused numerous jealousies, and when one of their banking establishments became insolvent its French creditors obtained a judgment against the entire Order. An attempt by Damien to murder Louis XV. was made the pretext for the suppression of the Order of Jesuits throughout France, A. D. 1764, and Damien was subjected to the most painful tortures and finally torn to pieces by wild horses. The Jesuits were accused of many crimes, the chief of which was their allegiance to a foreign sovereign, the Pope.

**His Sup-  
pression  
of the  
Jesuits.**

**Jesuits  
Abolished  
by Pope  
Clement  
XIV.**

Pope Clement XIV. (Ganganelli), who had formerly favored the Jesuits, felt himself obliged to yield to the pressure of circumstances; and, moved by the urgency of all the Roman Catholic sovereigns, he abolished the Order of Jesuits, in 1773, as a disturber of the peace of Christendom. Maria Theresa, who had long endeavored to retain the Order in the Austrian states, was induced by her free-thinking son, afterward the Emperor Joseph II. of Germany, to consent to the dissolution of the Order. The papal edict against the Order was executed in Bavaria and other Roman Catholic states of Germany. The Jesuits were forbidden to live in community or to receive novices to propagate their Order. Thus driven from Roman Catholic countries, the Jesuits

**Their  
Suppres-  
sion in  
Germany.**

found refuge in non-Catholic lands, and were protected by Frederick the Great of Prussia and Catharine the Great of Russia.

Adam Weishaupt, professor in the University of Ingolstadt, with Knigge and others, founded the secret society of the *Illuminati*, who strove to counteract the teachings of the Jesuits; but their contest against the proscribed Order was soon checked by legal prosecutions on the part of the Bavarian government.

**The  
Illumi-  
nati in  
Germany.**

The island of Corsica, which belonged to the Republic of Genoa, had for many years been engaged in a war for its independence. The insurgent Corsicans, led by the gallant Pascal Paoli, defeated every attempt of the Genoese to reduce them to submission. When the Genoese became convinced that they could not restore their authority in the revolted island they sold Corsica to France. Paoli bravely resisted the French, and, after being forced to yield, he retired to England; and Corsica came into the possession of France in 1769.

**Corsica's  
Revolt  
against  
Genoa  
and Its  
Acquisi-  
tion by  
France.**

In the meantime attempts at reform were also made in the Scandinavian kingdoms. The history of Denmark had been uneventful during the reign of CHRISTIAN VI., the son and successor of Frederick IV., who died in 1730, and also during the reign of FREDERICK V., the son and successor of Christian VI., who died in 1746. Upon the death of Frederick V., in 1766, his son CHRISTIAN VII. became King of Denmark and Norway.

**Reforms  
in  
Denmark.**

Christian VII. was an imbecile monarch; and, through the influence of his queen, Caroline Matilda, a princess of the royal family of Great Britain, the German physician Struensee was made Prime Minister of Denmark. Clothed with unheard-of powers, so that all orders signed by him and provided with the seal of the Cabinet possessed the same validity as if they had been signed by the king himself, Struensee undertook various reforms in the spirit of the age, thus seeking to relieve the citizen and peasant classes, to curtail the power of the nobility and to improve the proceedings of justice.

**Struen-  
see, the  
Reformer  
of  
Denmark.**

Being a man without remarkable qualities, without strength of character, without courage or resolution, Struensee soon laid himself open in such a manner that his overthrow was easily effected. An unfavorable interpretation was put upon his confidential relations with the high-minded but imprudent queen. His use of the German language in all his official proclamations offended the national feeling of the Danes. By the lack of courage which he displayed on the occasion of a trifling tumult among the soldiers and sailors, he rendered himself contemptible and inspired his enemies with confidence.

**Struensee  
and His  
Enemies.**

While Struensee was at a ball the weak king's stepmother Juliana and some of her confidants entered the king's bedchamber and described the perils that menaced the state, thus inducing Christian VII. to sign a

**His Fall  
and Exe-  
cution.**

number of orders of arrest that were already prepared. Thereupon Struensee and his friend Brandt, the latter also a German, were imprisoned; and, after a most-iniquitously-conducted trial, Struensee was beheaded and Brandt was deprived of his right hand. Betrayed by Struensee's weakness, Queen Caroline Matilda was separated from her royal husband; and, after three years of wretchedness, she died in Celle.

Reaction  
under  
His Suc-  
cessors.

After the execution of Struensee, Juliana took the government into her own hands; and, through her favorite, Guldberg, whom she caused to be made Prime Minister, all the obnoxious reforms were repealed. But when Crown Prince Frederick arrived at maturity he conducted the Danish government in his father's name and made the gallant Bernstorff Prime Minister.

The Hats  
and Caps  
in  
Sweden.

During the weak reign of ULRICA ELEANORA and her husband, FREDERICK of Hesse Cassel, A. D. 1718-1751, Sweden was governed by a selfish aristocracy, the royal power being reduced to a mere shadow; while the country was distracted by the contest between the factions of the *Hats* and the *Caps*—the former being the adherents of France, and the latter the partisans of Russia.

Sweden  
under  
Adolphus  
Frederick,  
A. D.  
1751-  
1771.

During the reign of the next King of Sweden, the good-natured ADOLPHUS FREDERICK, A. D. 1751-1771, who had been Bishop of Lübeck, the power of the Swedish aristocracy attained its full development. All the powers of government were exercised by the Council of State, which consisted of men destitute of honor or patriotism, who sold themselves to foreign powers and served the interests of those which paid them the most money, without any regard for the welfare of their country. The two parties of the Hats and Caps—the former in the pay of France, and the latter in that of Russia—hated and persecuted each other even to the extent of bloodshed; and the Diet was the scene of their hostile attacks. The king was without power or respect.

Gustavus  
III. of  
Sweden,  
A. D.  
1771-  
1792.

Adolphus Frederick, who had married a sister of Frederick the Great of Prussia, died in 1771, and was succeeded on the throne of Sweden by his son, the brave, chivalrous, eloquent, adroit and popular GUSTAVUS III. After he had gained the support of the Swedish army and people, Gustavus III. surrounded the Council of State with troops and compelled that body to consent to a change in the government, thus effecting a bloodless revolution by which the royal power was restored in Sweden and the Council of State reduced within the bounds of a deliberative assembly, A. D. 1772, the second year of his reign. This important revolution placed the disposition of the army and navy and the appointment of civil and military officers in the hands of the king, and empowered the king to collect the votes of the Estates in the Swedish Diet before levying a tax, declaring war or concluding peace; but several years afterward he released himself from this restraint also by an arbi-

His Res-  
toration  
of the  
Royal  
Power.

trary exercise of power, and made the authority of the Swedish crown absolute.

Gustavus III., who was endowed with many talents and kingly qualities, took advantage of his exalted position to introduce many reforms in the government and administration of justice, which contributed to the welfare of his subjects, and which were in accordance with the spirit of the age. But many of his acts resulted from his love of magnificence, his desire to imitate French fashions and his attachment to the departed age of Chivalry. Great expenses were occasioned to the impoverished kingdom by the founding of an academy on the French model, the erection of theaters and opera-houses and the revival of tournaments and running at the ring. A perverted turn was given to the king's activity by his unreasonable dreams of heroism and his chivalrous whims.

His Inno-  
vations  
and  
Reforms.

By declaring that the distillation of brandy was a royal privilege; by compelling his subjects to buy their accustomed beverage for a high price at the royal distilleries instead of allowing them to prepare it for themselves as hitherto; and by engaging in a useless land and naval war with Catharine the Great of Russia, Gustavus III. gradually lost the affections of his subjects. Finally, when he contemplated a war with Revolutionary France in the interest of King Louis XVI., a conspiracy was formed against Gustavus III., who was assassinated by being shot at a masquerade by Major Ankarstrom, a former officer of the royal guard, March 29, 1792. The murdered Gustavus III. was succeeded as King of Sweden by his son, GUSTAVUS IV.

His  
Assasa-  
nation by  
Major  
Ankar-  
strom.

Gustavus  
IV.

In the meantime the spirit of reform manifested itself in Austria under Maria Theresa, whose enlightened Minister, Kaunitz, abolished many abuses and introduced many reforms, reorganizing the army, improving the administration of justice, establishing new seminaries of education and properly arranging the economy of the state. But Maria Theresa proceeded with prudence and discretion, and avoided doing violence to the national faith, the national rights and the established usages and customs.

Reforms  
of Maria  
Theresa  
and  
Kaunitz  
in  
Austria.

But her son JOSEPH II.—who had been elected Emperor of Germany upon the death of his father, Francis I., in 1765—did not pursue his mother's prudent policy in carrying forward the work of reform when her death in 1780 made him the absolute sovereign of all the hereditary Austrian states. He at once undertook a series of reforms in Church and State which offended the Roman clergy and the zealous friends of the Catholic Church, which prejudiced the privileged nobility and which outraged the national feelings of his subjects.

Emperor  
Joseph  
II., A. D.  
1765—  
1790.  
His  
Reforms.

The Emperor Joseph II. first introduced religious toleration, thus granting to the adherents of the Lutheran, Calvinistic and Greek

His  
Church  
Reforms.

Churches the free exercise of their religion and equal civil and political rights with his Roman Catholic subjects. He diminished the number of monasteries and nunneries, thus dissolving seven hundred convents and pensioning the thirty-six thousand monks and nuns from the funds. He applied the Church property thus obtained to the improvement of schools and to the erection of establishments of general utility. He limited the number of privileges and processions, and embarrassed the communication and intercourse of the Roman Catholic clergy with Rome. He also informed the Papal Nuncios that he would receive them only as political ambassadors.

**Joseph II. and Pope Pius VI.**

Pope Pius VI. visited Vienna in the vain hope of turning the Emperor Joseph II. from the course of innovation; but, while treating the Pope with great respect, the Emperor remained firm in his purpose and refused to hear him upon matters of public business; while the Emperor's all-powerful Minister, Kaunitz, treated His Holiness with deliberate personal neglect.

**Joseph's Civil and Political Reforms.**

Joseph II. inaugurated the work of civil and political reform by abolishing serfdom, thus establishing personal freedom. He established equal civil and political rights by introducing an equitable system of taxation and by granting the equal protection of the laws to all classes of his subjects in his hereditary Austrian states, thus showing the goodness of his heart.

**His Lack of Discretion and His Failure.**

Joseph II. was actuated by the noblest intentions in his innovations; but he proceeded with too great haste and without sufficient regard to prevailing conditions, customs and prejudices, and did not allow the changes which he introduced adequate time to mature. He thus gave the foes of progress the means of casting suspicion upon his actions and efforts, and of thus depriving of all their fruits the measures which he had designed for the welfare and happiness of his subjects in his hereditary Austrian dominions. The very active and restless disposition of Joseph II. led him to make long and frequent journeys; during which he visited Rome, Paris, St. Petersburg, the Crimea, Holland and his own provinces of the Austrian Netherlands.

**His Journeys.**

**Decay and Weakness of the German Empire.**

So completely had the German Empire lost all respect as a political body that it was unrepresented at the peace negotiations at Hubertsburg, and the sentence of outlawry pronounced against Frederick the Great was received with scorn and ridicule. The Emperor's power was reduced to a mere shadow and his revenue to several thousand florins. Almost three hundred and fifty princes and states, with the most varied powers and the most unequal extent of territory, ruled in Germany with all the powers of sovereignty, leaving nothing to the Emperor but the confirmation of mutual compacts, promotions, declarations of majority and the determination of precedence.



In time of war the German princes sometimes espoused the cause of the enemies of Germany. Thus Bavaria was always the ally of France. The Imperial Diet, which had assembled at Ratisbon (Regensburg) for a long time, and which consisted of representatives of the German princes and the imperial cities, had lost all respect, because it was too much occupied with speeches and debates to arrive at any decision, or was unable to enforce any decision which it did reach. In the Diet obsolete rights were contended for with a little-minded jealousy. Rank, title and the right of suffrage were guarded with the most jealous care, and all time and energy were devoted to doctrinal disputes without object, while foreign nations made Germany the scene of their wars and treated the imbecile body-politic with contempt, showing no regard for the suffering German people.

**Feeble-  
ness  
of the  
German  
Imperial  
Diet.**

The German courts of justice were in as melancholy a condition as was the Imperial Diet. The Imperial Chamber of Wetzlar, in which the complaints of Estates of the Empire against each other or against their vassals were examined, proceeded so tediously that cases were frequently pending for years before judgment was pronounced; while the suitors either died or fell into poverty, and the record increased to an incalculable extent. The judges mainly depended upon fees for their remuneration, and thus the administration of justice was exposed to corruption. An effort of the Emperor Joseph II. to improve and expedite the progress of justice in the Imperial Chamber was frustrated by the selfishness of the interested parties. Concerning the inferior tribunals, the great diversity in the laws and the number of small states, along with the unlimited power of the judges and officials, made it very difficult for the humble man to obtain justice. The weak were defenselessly exposed to all the injustice of the crafty and the strong. "It was the golden age of jurists and advocates."

**Ineffi-  
ciency  
of the  
German  
Courts of  
Justice.**

While the German Empire was thus in a rapidly-decaying condition, the young and vigorous Kingdom of Prussia, under the sagacious and energetic Frederick the Great, was gradually rising to greater power and prosperity. Frederick sought to heal the wounds which the Seven Years' War had inflicted upon his kingdom, to the best of his ability, by supporting the decayed landed proprietors and the manufacturers in the war-wasted province of Silesia and the Mark of Brandenburg with money, also by remitting their taxes for several years and by ameliorating the condition of the peasants. He encouraged agriculture and mining, colonized the untilled lands of his dominions, and fostered industry, trade and commerce with the greatest care. By these means Prussia became prosperous, and Frederick the Great was enabled to increase his taxes without oppressing his subjects with heavy burdens. His own frugality and the simplicity of his court, along with the well-

**Prussia  
under  
Frederick  
the  
Great.**

regulated economy of the state, caused the public treasury to be better replenished every year.

**His Later  
Oppres-  
sive  
Measures.**

Frederick did not adopt rigorous and oppressive measures until a later period. One of these was his management of the customs and the excise. He made the sale of coffee, tobacco, salt, etc., a royal monopoly, and forbade free trade in these commodities. In order to prevent any clandestine traffic, he appointed a number of French excise officers, who by their insolence made the otherwise-oppressive regulation wholly detestable.

**His  
Neglect of  
Education  
and the  
Church.**

Frederick devoted less attention to the Church and education. The situation of teacher in a small place was frequently a retiring-post for a discharged petty officer, while the higher institutions of learning were under the management of Frenchmen. The free-thinking king took little interest in religion or the Church, but he established the universal admission of the principle of Christian toleration in his kingdom.

**His  
Reforms  
of Law  
and the  
Courts of  
Justice.**

Frederick the Great devoted much attention to the affairs of justice. He abolished the rack and the horrible and degrading punishments of the Middle Ages, simplified the course of justice and improved the laws. He prepared the new book of laws that was introduced into Prussia under his successor. But what was more important than all these laws and arrangements was the fact that Frederick inspected everything himself; that during his journeys he narrowly inquired after the administration of justice and the management of affairs, and that he dismissed the negligent and punished the dishonest. By his assiduous activity from early morn until late at night, Frederick acquired a comprehensive knowledge of all the affairs of his kingdom; and his commanding character, which did not scruple at corporeal punishment, terrified the negligent and the unjust.

**Anecdotes  
of  
Frederick  
the  
Great.**

Frederick the Great was in the habit of walking about the streets of Berlin freely, and if he chanced to see an idler he gave him a good drubbing with his cane. On one occasion, meeting a number of boys engaged in playing, he addressed them thus: "Boys, be off to school." One of the larger boys boldly faced the king, saying: "You want to be king, and you don't know that there is no school to-day." The king laughed heartily and replied to the boy kindly, at the same time giving him a piece of money.

**His Pref-  
erence  
for the  
French  
Language  
and Lit-  
erature.**

One peculiarity of Frederick the Great has frequently and justly been censured—his love for what was foreign, his contempt for the things of his own country. He not only preferred the French literature and language to the German, writing his own letters and works in French; but he admired and imitated everything French. Hundreds of French adventurers found honor and support in Prussia; and this admiration of foreigners became the fashion in other German courts, so

that hare-brained Frenchmen swarmed in every part of Germany. Parisian barbers, dancing-masters and boasters were frequently preferred to the most deserving native Germans in the appointment to the higher offices of the court and the government.

In his old age Frederick the Great was involved in another war with Austria. At the end of the year 1777 the princely race of Wittelsbach, which had ruled Bavaria for six centuries, became extinct with the death of the Elector Maximilian Joseph; whereupon Charles Theodore of the Palatinate became Elector of Bavaria by inheritance. Charles Theodore was a licentious, profligate and bigoted prince. But, in spite of his many faults and vices, he is still remembered with affection by the people of the Palatinate. His love of art is fully attested by his many remarkable structures in Mannheim, Heidelberg and Schwetzingen.

As Charles Theodore had no legitimate offspring nor any love for Bavaria, he was easily persuaded by the Emperor Joseph II. to agree to a treaty in which he acknowledged the validity of the claims of the imperial House of Hapsburg to Lower Bavaria, the Upper Palatinate and the territory of Mindelheim, and expressed his willingness to relinquish these territories in exchange for certain advantages being assured to his illegitimate children.

Frederick the Great, alarmed at this aggrandizement of Austria, endeavored to interfere with the project of Joseph II. and Charles Theodore by inducing the future heir of Bavaria and the Palatinate, Duke Charles of Zweibrucken, to protest against the treaty in the Imperial Diet; and when this protest produced no effect the King of Prussia sent an army into Bohemia to prevent the contemplated aggrandizement of Austria, thus giving rise to the brief *War of the Bavarian Succession*, A. D. 1778-1779—a contest which was carried on more with the pen than with the sword, as both parties sought to prove themselves in the right by means of learned treatises. As all the German states were averse to a general European war, Russia under Catharine the Great and France under Louis XVI. offered their mediation in the contest, and persuaded Maria Theresa to consent to the Peace of Teschen, by which the Electoral House of the Palatinate was secured in the possession of Bavaria, while Innviertel and Braunau were assigned to Austria, and the succession of the Margravate of Anspach and Bayreuth was transferred to the King of Prussia.

The Emperor Joseph II. was irritated at the Treaty of Teschen; and, after he had become sovereign of the hereditary Austrian territories by the death of his mother, Maria Theresa, November 29, 1780, he made another effort to obtain Bavaria by offering the Austrian Netherlands to the Elector Charles Theodore in exchange. Charles

Charles Theodore and the Bavarian Succession.

His Cessions to the Emperor Joseph II.

War of the Bavarian Succession.

Peace of Teschen.

Charles Theodore and His Second Cession to the Emperor Joseph II.

Theodore allowed himself to be persuaded to accept this arrangement, A. D. 1785; but Frederick the Great again interfered and frustrated the ambitious project of the Emperor Joseph II., securing Bavaria to the Electoral House of the Palatinate by the formation of an alliance of German princes. This princely league increased the power and influence of the King of Prussia in the same proportion that it thoroughly undermined the Emperor's authority. Each German prince aimed at independent and unlimited power; and each formed a miniature court, modeled after the court of Versailles in magnificence and profusion, in morals and fashions, in language, literature and art.

**Alliance  
of  
German  
Princes.**

**Frederick  
William  
II. of  
Prussia,  
A. D.  
1786-  
1797.**

Frederick the Great did not live long after the formation of this princely alliance. He died at Potsdam, August 17, 1786, and was succeeded as King of Prussia by his nephew, the weak FREDERICK WILLIAM II. Frederick the Great left to his successor a well-regulated kingdom containing a population of six millions, a powerful and strictly-disciplined army and a well-provided treasury, but the greatest treasure which he left was the memory of his heroic and glorious deeds, which will long continue to animate his countrymen with awakening power and soul-stirring influence.

**Art,  
Science  
and Lit-  
erature in  
Germany.**


Notwithstanding the fact that the political division of Germany was prejudicial to the external power and greatness of the Empire, it promoted the development of the arts and sciences in the same degree. Many of the German princes patronized and encouraged literature and intellectual culture. They endeavored to attract distinguished men to their capitals and to their universities, and by conferring rewards and distinctions they encouraged poets and scholars to undertake great literary works.

**The  
Great  
German  
Poets,  
Scientists  
and  
Philoso-  
phers.**

Thus in the last half of the eighteenth century, when Germany had entirely lost her political importance and her military prestige, German literature, poetry, science and spiritual life received a mighty impulse and produced a degree of refinement almost unparalleled in modern times. Poetry especially flourished; and the names of Goethe and Schiller, of Klopstock and Lessing, of Herder and Wieland, shed immortal luster upon German poetry. During this period also flourished Winckelmann, the great German archæologist. Lavater, the eminent Swiss religious philosopher, was the leader of the Supernaturalists. Nicolai, the Berlin bookseller and author, was the founder of the Rationalists, who denied all divine revelation and supernaturalism, the belief in which they characterized as superstition. Immanuel Kant, of Königsburg, the greatest of German philosophers and metaphysicians, also adorned this age.

**Austro-  
Dutch  
Dispute.**

In 1783 the Emperor Joseph II. ordered the Dutch to withdraw their garrisons from the barrier towns in the Austrian Netherlands, and



GERMAN WRITERS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY



caused the fortresses to be demolished. The armed intervention of France prevented war between Austria and Holland, and secured the Treaty of Fontainebleau, November 10, 1785.

The sentiments of republican and democratic freedom which the War of American Independence had excited throughout Europe produced their first effects in Holland, where the republican, or patriotic party had gained strength during the long minority of the Stadtholder William V. The government of Holland under the House of Orange was entirely devoted to Great Britain after the War of American Independence; and, while the republican party had secured the alliance of France, the Orange party was supported by Great Britain and Prussia in upholding the hereditary nature of the dignities of Stadtholder, High Admiral and Captain-General, which the republican party desired to make elective in order to weaken the House of Orange.

Dissensions in the Dutch Republic.

Finally the republican party in Holland drove the Stadholder from the fortress of The Hague, treated his wife like a prisoner when she attempted to enter the city, and drove Duke Ernest of Brunswick from the country, while armed mobs committed violence in some of the towns. In 1787 King Frederick William II. of Prussia, the brother of the Stadtholder's wife, marched an army of thirty thousand men into Holland, thus suppressing the democratic insurrection and restoring the Stadtholder's authority. Some of the extreme republicans of Holland, who were excepted from the general amnesty, found a congenial field in France for their activity. Under the restored Stadtholder, Holland renounced her alliance with France and concluded a *Triple Alliance* with Great Britain and Prussia by the very important Treaty of Loo, in June, 1788.

Prussian Suppression of the Revolt in the Dutch Republic.

Triple Alliance.

The attempt of Joseph II. to introduce his reforms into the Austrian Netherlands, his establishment of a high court of justice at Brussels, and his attempt to reorganize the University of Louvain, which was under the control of the Roman Catholic clergy, caused disturbances that eventually ended in a general rebellion in those provinces. The Emperor's efforts to make the Netherlanders prosperous in spite of themselves were thus not crowned with success. The suppression of convents alarmed their bigotry, and the abrogation of their old charters aroused their patriotism. A secret society in opposition to the Emperor's reforms was formed in 1787, and soon numbered seventy thousand members. Encouraged by the outbreak of the French Revolution, in 1789, they convened at Breda and demanded the restoration of their old rights, appealing "to God and their swords" in case of the Emperor's refusal. The Austrian regency was driven from the Netherlands, and the Austrian garrisons were expelled from Ghent and from all Flanders. In January, 1790, the Belgian National Congress at

Rebellion in the Austrian Netherlands against Emperor Joseph II.

Brussels issued a Declaration of Independence and an Act of Union of the Belgian United Provinces.

**Death of Joseph II.**

This rebellion in the Austrian Netherlands, which had been instigated by the nobility and the clergy, and similar disturbances in Hungary about the same time, broke the heart of the Emperor Joseph II. and hastened his death, which occurred February 20, 1790; his health having been impaired during his campaigns against the Turks in the unhealthy regions of the Lower Danube, when he was the ally of the Empress Catharine the Great of Russia, as we shall presently see.

**His Good Motives Misunderstood.**

The indefatigable efforts of Joseph II. and the activity with which he superintended everything himself, as well as the freedom with which he admitted all classes of his subjects to his presence, and his abolition of official tyranny, were not appreciated. His views were misunderstood and misrepresented, his noblest plans were frustrated and his name was culminated; but posterity, which can appreciate his aims and efforts more justly, will always bless his memory.

**Emperor Leopold II., A. D. 1790-1792.**

Joseph II. was succeeded in the sovereignty of the hereditary Austrian territories and on the imperial throne of Germany by his brother LEOPOLD II., who had ruled the Grand Duchy of Tuscany for twenty-five years with the same liberality and with greater moderation than Joseph II. Leopold II. restored tranquillity and order in the Austrian Netherlands and in Hungary by restoring the old usages and abolishing the obnoxious reforms of his well-meaning predecessor and by increasing the liberties of the Netherlands; while his armies also overawed and defeated the rebels, and thus put an end to the Belgian Republic after it had existed less than a year. Leopold II. died early in 1792, after a reign of two years, while preparing to put down the French Revolution, and was succeeded as sovereigns of the Austrian states and as Emperor of Germany by his son FRANCIS II.

**Francis II., the Last Germano-Roman Emperor, A. D. 1792-1806.**

## SECTION II.—PARTITIONS OF POLAND AND RUSSO-TURKISH WARS (A. D. 1762-1796).

**Catharine the Great of Russia, A. D. 1762-1796.**

WHILE France, under her profligate monarch, Louis XV., was declining in national power and greatness, and while Prussia, under the illustrious Frederick the Great, had attained a leading position among the great powers of the earth, Russia, under her great Empress, CATHARINE II., exercised a preponderant influence in Eastern Europe, and was beginning to feel the new spirit of the age. The long reign of Catharine II., her conspiracies with Austria and Prussia in the three partitions of Poland, and her wars with the Ottoman Empire, are the prominent features in the history of Eastern Europe during the last four decades of the eighteenth century.



Catharine II.—also called CATHARINE THE GREAT—reigned thirty-four years, A. D. 1762–1796. She had become Empress in July, 1762, by uniting with the five brothers Orloff in the conspiracy in which her husband and predecessor, Peter III., was deposed.

**Her Accession.**

The unfortunate Peter III. was refused the permission to retire to his duchy of Holstein-Gottorp, which he humbly sought, and was strangled in prison by Alexis Orloff, with the consent of the Empress. Ivan VI.—who had been deposed by the Empress Elizabeth in 1741, and kept for twenty-three years in a loathsome captivity, which had reduced him to idiocy—was also murdered by order of Catharine the Great, who artfully engaged her former lover, Mirowitch, in an effort to release him. The conspiracy was made a pretext for the death of both; and the Czarina's share in the murderous plot was concealed by the execution of Mirowitch, while he eagerly and confidently expected the pardon which the Empress had promised him.

**Murder of Peter III. and Ivan VI.**

In her private character the Empress was dissolute and immoral. She left the government of her Empire to her favorites; and the court of St. Petersburg was as much distinguished for its luxury, immorality and debauchery as was that of Versailles. Her first paramour was Alexis Orloff, to whom she surrendered her person, as well as the government of her Empire. After him she had a succession of other paramours, all of whom she loaded with wealth and honors; and the situation of the favored lover of the Empress was at length disposed of as a court office. The one who enjoyed the favor of the Empress longest was Potemkin the Taurian, who for sixteen years conducted the affairs of the Russian government and the plans of conquest, living all that time in a fabulous state of magnificence, and displaying in a truly remarkable manner the wealth which his liberal imperial mistress showered upon him. The Empress regarded the man who had a spirit of enterprise so daring that he spared neither money nor life as the man capable of bestowing proper glory and renown upon her reign.

**Immorality of Catharine the Great.**

**Orloff and Potemkin.**

Catharine the Great was a masculine woman, with a susceptible mind. Her talents for government were equaled only by her crimes, and the wonderful success of her reign would fully justify her title of *the Great* if her personal errors could be forgotten. She effected many of the well-meant reforms which had contributed to her husband's overthrow. She caused the funds of Church sinecures to be applied to secular uses, the army and the civil service to be reorganized to the highest efficiency, and the whole Empire to be divided into its present *governments* for convenience of administration. She also greatly improved the administration of justice.

**Ability and Reforms of Catharine the Great.**

Catharine the Great maintained a correspondence with Voltaire and other French writers of the same sentiments, and she invited Diderot to

**Catharine and the French Writers.**

St. Petersburg. She encouraged science and art and founded schools and academies. Her efforts for the promotion of Russian civilization were loudly applauded by the French authors.

Poland's  
Decline  
and  
Weak-  
ness.

The two great victims of Catharine's ambition were the tottering Republic of Poland and the declining Ottoman Empire, and her whole political policy was one of aggression and territorial aggrandizement. The Republic of Poland was becoming weaker and weaker every day. The decline of this nation was attributable to its internal dissensions, in consequence of its elective constitution. About two-thirds of the Polish people were serfs, whose ignorance and squalid misery kept them in a condition but little above that of the brute creation. They were incapable of possessing property, and thousands died of starvation in case of the failure of a crop. The remaining third of the Polish population consisted of the three orders of nobility, with clergy, lawyers, citizens and Jews.

Polish  
Serfs.

Polish  
Nobles.

The higher nobles numbered only one hundred and twenty, four or five of whom were the leaders of powerful factions. The middle class of nobles consisted of about twenty-five thousand persons. The lower nobility numbered over a million, and were an idle, ignorant, and many of them a beggarly class of people, who were shut out by their pride of birth from the thrift and comfort which they might have acquired by industry; while the most insignificant of them could nullify the proceedings of the Polish Diet by his single veto.

Polish  
Citizens.

The citizens consisted mainly of about fifty thousand artisans, who were scattered in wretched villages and were almost as completely subject to the oppressions of the nobles as were the serfs themselves. Only Jews, artisans and clergy were taxed; and the Polish finances were entirely without a system. The Ministers, or heads of the various departments of the government, were responsible to the Diet, not to the king.

Ministers.

Rebell-  
ious  
Nobles.

All these elements of weakness were aggravated by the conduct of the nobles, who clung to their old constitutional privilege of forming armed confederations against their king whenever his policy did not meet their approval. For more than a century the tendency to dissolution had been so evident that King John Casimir, the last of the Polish Vasas, clearly predicted, as early as 1661, that Poland would eventually be partitioned by the Houses of Romanoff, Hapsburg and Hohenzollern—a prediction that was now soon to be fulfilled.

John  
Casimir's  
Predic-  
tion.

Poland's  
Internal  
Decay  
and Dis-  
sensations.

Thus the Kingdom, or "Republic," of Poland had long been a rotten structure, and was preserved only by the disagreements and jealousies of its neighbors, not by its own strength. Its elective constitution was another great misfortune; as every election of king was the scene of the greatest contention and the most violent proceedings, and bribery

and corruption became predominant. As the nobles thus possessed privileges that were incompatible with any well-organized state policy, and as the king was utterly powerless, there was no hope for the unhappy country.

The Polish Diet, which gave laws to the nation, became proverbial for the vehement party contests that rendered every debate fruitless; while the whole political power of the country was in the hands of the armed confederation of nobles. A kingdom in which only the noble possessed political liberty or the privilege of bearing arms, and who, relying upon his sword, despised the law; in which enslaved peasants were held in a condition of abject serfdom, and in which commerce was in the hands of sordid and avaricious Jews, was likely to excite the cupidity of ambitious and unscrupulous neighbors.

The death of Frederick Augustus II., in 1763, was followed by an interregnum of some months, which left Poland in that condition of anarchy to which it was at all times rendered liable by its miserable constitution; and the kingdom again became a prey to the old elective tempests. One of the factions which fought for the disposal of the Polish crown was supported by Russia, while the other faction was backed by France. With the alliance of Frederick the Great of Prussia, the Empress Catharine the Great of Russia secured the election of one of her old lovers, STANISLAS PONIATOWSKI, who was chosen King of Poland by the Polish nobles on the plain of Wola amid the clash of Russian sabers, September 4, 1764.

King Stanislas Poniatski was a connoisseur and patron of art and literature, and was an amiable and accomplished gentleman, but lacked strength of character or power of will. Weak and without any consistency of character, he was a mere puppet in the hands of the powerful. His weak and pliable character promised to make him a useful instrument of the interests of Russia's great Empress. The Russian ambassador at Warsaw possessed greater power than the Polish king; and, for the purpose of preventing the possibility of Poland's release from this condition of disorder and weakness, Catharine the Great of Russia and Frederick the Great of Prussia resolved to maintain the old Polish constitution unaltered.

It was about this time that the *Dissidents*, as all Polish Protestants and adherents of the Greek Church were called, petitioned the Polish Diet for the restoration of the civil and religious privileges of which they had been deprived by the Diets of 1717 and 1733. The Dissidents were supported in their reasonable demands by the Empress of Russia and the King of Prussia and by most of the Protestant governments of Europe. As the demand of the Czarina of Russia had been followed by the advance of a Russian army into Poland, the Poles perceived the

Polish Diet and Nobility, and National Helplessness.

Interregnum of 1763-64.

Election of Stanislas Poniatski.

His Weak Character.

Russian Ascendancy.

The Polish Dissidents and Russian Intervention.

Dissidents' Demands Rejected by the Polish Diet.

motives of her intervention; and, in one impulse of national independence, the Roman Catholic majority in the Polish Diet of 1765, through the influence of the Polish clergy, rejected the reasonable petition of the Dissidents and renewed all the intolerant edicts against heretics. King Stanislas Poniatowski was forced to submit. The Russian Empress, exasperated at his evasion of her commands, secured Prince Radzivil, the leading opponent of the king and formerly the enemy of all Russian influence in Poland, as her instrument of revenge.

Confederation of Radom.

Through the efforts of Prince Radzivil, with a lavish distribution of Russian gold among the Polish nobles, one hundred and seventy-eight distinct confederations were formed among the nobles; and these confederations were eventually united into one of eighty thousand members, known as the *Confederation of Radom*, which assumed dictatorial powers in accordance with custom, July 23, 1767. The business of this confederation was delegated to two committees, one of sixty and the other of fourteen members, the latter having the power to pass resolutions of binding force upon the Polish nation by a majority of votes. Thus eight men were intrusted with the fate of Poland.

Russian Coercion of the Polish Diet.

The Confederation of Radom called upon Russia for aid, and extorted religious toleration, the restoration of the churches which they had formerly possessed, and equal civil and political rights, from the Diet with its Catholic majority. Surrounded by Russian troops, the members of the Polish Diet, with the portrait of the Russian Empress above their heads, signed the act of toleration, which was greeted by all Europe and which was the sign of Poland's weakness. In order that this weakness might remain permanent, it was decided that no change should be made in the existing Polish constitution without the consent of the Russian Empress.

Russian Influence in Poland and over King Stanislas Poniatowski.

These proceedings offended the national feeling of the Polish patriots and excited the religious animosity of the Catholic bigots. As the two committees of the Confederation of Radom were soon found to be under the absolute control of Prince Repnin, the Russian ambassador at Warsaw, who arranged with King Stanislas Poniatowski, the Primate of Poland, the Grand Treasurer and Prince Radzivil all the business brought before them, the conviction grew strong that the Polish king had sold himself and his kingdom to Russia and that his recent semblance of independent action had formed part of a plot only to deceive his subjects.

Confederation of Bar.

At the instigation of France, the Polish Catholics formed the *Confederation of Bar*, in opposition to that of Radom, for the purpose of again depriving the Dissidents of their civil and religious rights, liberating Poland from Russian supremacy and dethroning King Stanislas Poniatowski, February 28, 1768. France supported this con-

federation with money and officers. A bloody civil war ensued between the two confederations. With the assistance of a Russian army, the Confederation of Radom came forth triumphant. Bar and Cracow, the strongholds of the Bar Confederates, were carried by assault by the Russian general Suwarow, who thus began his long and celebrated military career. The defeated forces fled into the Turkish territories, closely pursued by the victorious Russians, who continued murdering, plundering and devastating even on neutral soil.

**Civil  
War in  
Poland.**

**Russian  
Victories.**

Like Poland, Turkey was in a most deplorable state of anarchy and weakness. Sultan Mahmoud I. had died in 1754 and had been succeeded on the Turkish throne by his brother OTHMAN III., who died in 1757 and was succeeded by his nephew MUSTAPHA III., who was still Sultan while this civil war in Poland was raging.

**Turkey's  
Weak-  
ness.**

The violation of Turkish territory by the Russians, in the pursuit of the defeated and retreating Poles, caused the Ottoman Porte to declare war against Russia, at the instigation of the French ambassador at Constantinople, December 4, 1768; and for six years, A. D. 1768-1774, a sanguinary land and naval war raged between the Turks and the Russians. The Tartars of the Crimea overran the southern provinces of Russia and perpetrated frightful devastations. The Russians under Prince Alexander Galitzin met with little success in the campaign on the Dniester in 1769.

**Russo-  
Turkish  
War of  
1768-  
1774.**

Prince Galitzin crossed the Dniester at various times, but was always repulsed by the Turks, who also failed in their efforts to force a passage of that river. On their last attempt, in September, 1769, twelve thousand men had crossed it when a sudden flood broke down the bridge and cut off the Turkish retreat. This Turkish detachment was cut to pieces by the Russians, whereupon the Turks were seized with a panic and were thus forced to abandon their camp and the fortress of Kotzim. The Russians took possession of both without the loss of a life, and soon afterward they marched into the interior of Moldavia and Wallachia.

**Russian  
Invasion  
of  
Turkey.**

General Romanzoff, who assumed the command of the Russian army in 1770, achieved two great victories, one near the Pruth, July 18, 1770; and the other near the Kukuli, August 1, 1770, thus effecting the conquest of the Turkish tributary principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia; while another Russian army under Count Pania assailed the strong fortress of Bender, which was defended by a formidable Turkish garrison, but was taken by storm, September 26, 1770, when most of the garrison were massacred by the victorious Russians.

**Russian  
Victories  
and  
Conquests  
in  
Turkey.**

In the meantime a Russian fleet under Alexis Orloff, the paramour of the Czarina Catharine the Great, after sailing from the Baltic to the Mediterranean, engaged the Turkish fleet under the Capitan Pasha

**Turkish  
Naval  
Disasters  
off Scio.**

off the island of Scio, July 5, 1770. The ships of the Russian Admiral Spiritoff and the Turkish admiral, the Capitan Pasha, caught fire and were blown to atoms. Darkness put an end to the conflict; and the Turkish fleet imprudently sailed to the narrow bay of Chismé, pursued by the Russians, who burned the entire Turkish fleet—a catastrophe which created the wildest consternation in Constantinople. Had the Russian fleets, under Alexis Orloff, Admiral Spiritoff and the Englishman Rear-Admiral Elphinstone, made a descent on the Turkish capital in the midst of this panic they might have taken the city; but the Russian admirals refused to follow the Englishman's advice.

Greek  
Revolt  
against  
Turkey.

One of the vast projects of the Empress Catharine the Great was the erection of a new Greek Empire on the ruins of the Ottoman, but her premature efforts for the liberation of the Greeks involved those people in misfortune. As soon as the Czarina's other schemes of conquest demanded the withdrawal of her fleets from the Mediterranean the insurgent Greeks were exposed to the vengeance of the Turks, who ravaged the Morea with fire and sword, filling whole districts with ruins and corpses.

Russian  
Liberation  
of the  
Crimea  
from the  
Turks.

In 1771 the war on the Danube was prosecuted in a feeble manner by the Russian army commanded by Prince Dolgoruki, who forced the lines at Perekop, defended by an army of sixty thousand Turks and Crim Tartars, under the command of the Khan of the Crimea. After surmounting this formidable barrier, Prince Dolgoruki took possession of the Crimea and the island of Taman, and received the surname of *Crimski* from the Empress Catharine the Great as a reward for his brilliant achievements. Certain pretended deputies from the Crim Tartars signed an act renouncing the dominion of the Turks and placing themselves under the protection of Russia's great Empress, A. D. 1772.

Russian  
Exhaustion  
and  
Pestilence.

But these splendid conquests exhausted Russia, which was obliged frequently to recruit her armies, which were constantly thinned by battles, fatigue and disease; so that the Russian Empress soon perceived the necessity of peace. The Russians were now attacked by an enemy more terrible than the Turks. A frightful pestilence passed from the Russian army into the interior of the Russian Empire, penetrating as far as Moscow, where one hundred thousand people fell victims to its terrible ravages during the year 1771 alone.

Threatened  
Intervention  
of Austria  
and  
Prussia.

To add to the embarrassments of the Empress Catharine the Great, the Emperor Joseph II. of Germany and Frederick the Great of Prussia, who had undertaken to mediate between the Czarina and the Sultan, disdainfully rejected the terms of peace proposed by Catharine the Great and earnestly opposed her schemes for the erection of Moldavia, Wallachia and the Crimea into states independent of the Ottoman Porte, while they also refused to permit the Russians to cross

the Danube and invade Bulgaria. The court of Vienna even threatened to make common cause with the Sultan of Turkey, to force the Russian Empress to restore her conquests and to place matters between Russia and Turkey on the footing in which they had been placed by the Treaty of Belgrade in 1739. Austria and Turkey signed a convention to that effect at Constantinople, July 6, 1771; but this Austro-Turkish convention was not ratified, on account of future developments.

In the meantime the civil war in Poland was raging with increased fury, and King Stanislas Poniatowski narrowly escaped from some conspirators who intended to carry him off from Warsaw. Poland was suffering all the miseries of barbarous warfare. On all sides the eye beheld plains deluged with blood, villages reduced to ashes and weeping inhabitants. The weakness of Poland exposed her to the cupidity of her three powerful neighbors.

Fearing that both Poland and Turkey would be absorbed by Russia, Austria and Prussia resolved to unite in preserving the balance of power, or at least in obtaining a share of the spoils. The mediation of Austria and Prussia in the war between Russia and Turkey brought about the seizure of part of the Polish territory by Austria, Prussia and Russia. The Emperor Joseph II. had several interviews with Frederick the Great to concert plans for checking Russian aggrandizement, especially as he was displeased with the conditions on which the Empress Catharine the Great proposed to make peace with Turkey.

In the summer of 1770 Austrian troops marched into the Polish territories, occupying the county of Zip and overrunning Gallicia even beyond Cracow; and the court of Vienna declared these territories annexed to Hungary on the ground that they had formerly constituted a part of that kingdom, and placed them under Austrian governors. In the anarchy and terror which prevailed in Poland the peasantry ceased from tilling the soil and were herded together in towns, where they soon suffered from famine, and afterward from pestilence also. Frederick the Great of Prussia, under pretense of forming a cordon of defense against the pestilence, sent an army into Polish Prussia.

As the Empress Catharine the Great was still engaged in her war with the Turks, she was unable to resist the Austrian and Prussian occupation of Polish territory; and she declared to Prince Henry of Prussia, who was then at St. Petersburg, that if Austria seized any portion of Poland the other neighbors were entitled to do the same. Prince Henry communicated this overture to his brother, King Frederick the Great, who resolved to act on this new idea, as he foresaw that it would be a proper means for indemnifying Russia, satisfying Austria and increasing his own dominions by connecting his detached territories of Prussia proper and Brandenburg.

Poland's  
Anarchy  
and  
Distress.

Austro-  
Prussian  
Alliance  
and  
Media-  
tion.

Austrian  
and  
Prussian  
Occupation  
of  
Polish  
Territory.

Project of  
Catharine  
the Great  
and Fred-  
erick the  
Great.

Negotiations of Frederick with Catharine and Joseph II.

These considerations induced the King of Prussia to negotiate with the courts of Vienna and St. Petersburg. He plainly notified the Emperor Joseph II. that if war should break out between Austria and Russia he would be the ally of the Empress Catharine the Great; while he informed the Russian Empress that if she would restore the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia to the Sultan of Turkey and indemnify herself by a portion of Poland she would avoid a new war and facilitate a treaty of peace with the Turks.

Projected Dismemberment of Poland.

Thus, after long and intricate diplomacy, Frederick the Great succeeded in recommending to the imperial Houses of Hapsburg and Romanoff a project which was to give Europe the example of the dismemberment of a kingdom on mere pretexs of convenience. An agreement was reached between Russia and Prussia in the Convention of St. Petersburg, in February, 1772; and Maria Theresa was invited to enlarge the Austrian dominions by sharing in the spoils of ill-fated Poland. The Austrian empress-queen long resisted the nefarious project; but her counsels were overruled by her Minister, Kaunitz, and by her son, the Emperor Joseph II. of Germany, after a personal interview between Joseph II. and Frederick the Great.

First Partition of Poland.

When Maria Theresa finally signed the treaty of partition she did it in these words: "*Placet*, because so many great and learned men will it; but when I am dead the consequences will appear of this violation of all that has been hitherto held just and sacred." The triple treaty between Russia, Prussia and Austria was signed at St. Petersburg, August 5, 1772, by which these three powers seized those portions of Poland adjoining their own dominions. By this *First Partition of Poland*, Russia absorbed Polish Livonia and the territories between the upper waters of the Dwina and the Dnieper; Prussia obtained Polish Prussia, except Dantzic and Thorn, and a large part of Great Poland, embracing the district of the Netz and the fertile lands of the Vistula including Elbing, Marienburg, Culm, etc.; while Austria was assigned the palatinate of Galicia with Lodomiria, celebrated for their rich mines. Though Prussia obtained the smaller and less populous portion of the stolen territory, the value of her share of the spoils was enhanced by the industry and wealth of its inhabitants, while it also connected Prussia proper with Brandenburg. The three powers agreed to defer taking possession of the partitioned districts until September following, and to act in concert to obtain a final settlement with Poland.

Forcible Execution of the Partition Treaty.

By the same treaty the Czarina of Russia agreed to restore the conquered principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia to the Sultan of Turkey, in order to expedite the conclusion of a treaty of peace between her and the Sultan. In the terms of that treaty the courts of St. Petersburg, Berlin and Vienna presented their declarations and let-



ters-patent at Warsaw in September, 1772, and took possession of their respective shares of the spoils without much difficulty, as the Confederates of Bar had already been driven from their last stronghold. Upon taking possession the three powers published memorials for establishing the validity of their claims over the territories assigned to them by the treaty of partition.

King Stanislas Poniatowski and his Ministry vainly claimed the assistance and protection of the powers that had guaranteed the treaties. The weak king and his Ministers had no other alternative than to submit to everything demanded by the three robber powers. The feeble king was compelled to summon a Diet to confirm their thefts of Polish territory; while an allied Russian, Prussian and Austrian army marched into the territories still left to Poland, in order to overawe resistance. Those Polish nobles whose estates had been seized were expressly excluded from this Diet.

Only one hundred and eleven members met in the Diet of 1773 at Warsaw; and, with the insane frivolity of despair, in a series of balls and banquets of unparalleled extravagance, they appeared to celebrate their country's ruin. This Polish Diet remained in session almost two years, A. D. 1773-1775. It vainly protested before the whole world against this iniquitous scheme—this most audacious violation of the rights of nations. It vainly showed that the pretended rights and claims which the three powers insisted upon had long been relinquished by cessions of territory and treaties of peace. Surrounded and threatened by Russian troops, the Diet at length yielded to force and consented to the dismemberment of Poland. During its two years' session the Polish Diet signed seven treaties—three with Russia, two with Prussia and two with Austria.

In thus dismembering Poland, Russia, Prussia and Austria renounced, in the most formal manner, all claims on the territory still remaining to Poland. Thus the First Partition of Poland was a fatal blow at the European States-System, which had prevailed for almost three centuries. After so many alliances had been contracted, and after so many wars had been undertaken to preserve the weaker states of Europe against the ambition of the stronger, three of the great powers combined to dismember a kingdom which had never given them the slightest offense. Thus the barriers between legitimate right and arbitrary power were overthrown, and thereafter the destiny of inferior states was no longer secure. The system of political equilibrium became the jest of innovators, and many well-disposed men began to consider it a chimera. Though the principal blame for this iniquitous transaction rests upon Russia, Prussia and Austria, Great Britain and France were to some extent responsible because they permitted this

**Poland's  
Reluctant  
Acquies-  
cence  
Enforced.**

**Protest  
and  
Useless  
Resist-  
ance  
of the  
Polish  
Diet.**

**Fatal  
Blow  
at the  
European  
States-  
System.**

spoliation to be consummated without protest. This and the two subsequent partitions of Poland have ever since been justly regarded as the most outrageous of political crimes.

Poland's  
Effete  
System.

It is very true that the vicious constitution of Poland, and the blind adherence of the nation to the worst institutions of the Middle Ages, centuries after other European nations had developed more rational and stable systems of government, would have insured Poland's destruction in any event; but the sovereigns of Russia, Prussia and Austria, who thus aggrandized themselves by Poland's ruin, could have as easily and with more justice made their power felt by the institution of a better system.

Poland's  
New Con-  
stitution  
and Ruin.

After the dismemberment of Poland, Russia guaranteed a new constitution which the Poles adopted; but, as the Polish crown remained elective and the king was rendered more helpless than before, while the mischievous *Liberum Veto* requiring unanimity in the proceedings of the Polish Diet was retained, the ruin of the unfortunate country was only accelerated, though foreign princes were excluded from the crown of Poland.

Pro-  
tracted  
Russo-  
Turkish  
Peace  
Negotia-  
tions.

The year 1772 was passed almost entirely in peace negotiations between Russia and Turkey, and an armistice was agreed to by the belligerent powers. Under the mediation of Austria and Prussia, a peace congress was opened at Foczani, in Moldavia. Another peace congress was afterward held at Bucharest, in Wallachia. Both of these congresses led to no results; as the Turks regarded the conditions proposed by Russia as inadmissible, especially the article relating to the independence of the Tartars of the Crimea, which they rejected because it tended to produce a rivalry between the two Khalifs. They settled the nature of the religious dependence which the Khans of the Crimea were to maintain toward the Ottoman Porte; but the Turks would not consent to surrender the ports of Kertch and Yenikale to the Russians or to grant the Russian demand for the unrestricted liberty of navigation in the Turkish seas.

Renewal  
of Hos-  
tilities.

These conferences were broken off in 1773, when hostilities were renewed. The Russians failed in two efforts to cross the Danube into Bulgaria and lost many men in their conflicts with the Turks. The campaign of 1774 was decisive. In that year Sultan Mustapha III. died, and was succeeded on the Turkish throne by his brother ABDUL HAMID I., who made extraordinary preparations for this campaign. The Ottoman army of three hundred thousand men greatly surpassed the Russians in numbers, but were not equal to them in discipline and military skill.

About the close of June, 1774, the Russians under Marshal Romanzoff crossed the Danube into Bulgaria and cut off communication

between the Grand Vizier and his detachments near Shumla. The Grand Vizier was alarmed by the defeat of twenty-eight thousand Turks, who were bringing a convoy of five thousand wagons to his army, by the Russians under General Kamenski. Seeing that his army was about to disband, the Grand Vizier agreed to treat for peace on such conditions as Marshal Romanzoff chose to dictate.

**Turks  
Forced to  
Accept  
Russian  
Terms.**

By the Peace of Kudschuk-Kainardji, about twelve miles from Silistria, in July, 1774, Sultan Abdul Hamid I. recovered the provinces of Bessarabia, Moldavia, Wallachia, Georgia and Mingrelia and the islands in the Archipelago conquered by the Turks; but he acknowledged the political independence of the Crim Tartars north of the Black Sea, who were to elect their own sovereign from the descendants of Zingis Khan, while they continued to acknowledge the religious supremacy of the Sultan as Mohammed's successor. Russia retained the city and territory of Azov, the two Kabartas, the fortresses of Kertch and Yenikale, in the Crimea, and the Castle of Kinburn, at the mouth of the Dnieper, opposite Oczakoff, with the neck of land between the Bug and the Dnieper, on which the Empress Catharine the Great afterward founded the city of Kherson to serve as an emporium for her commerce with the Levant. Russia also obtained the free navigation of the Black Sea and the right of passage through the Dardanelles for purposes of commerce.

**Peace of  
Kud-  
schuk-  
Kainardji.**

Bukowina, which Russia had conquered from Turkey, was ceded to Austria. Prince Ghikas of Moldavia was put to death by order of the Sultan of Turkey for having opposed the cession of Bukowina to Austria; and that province was confirmed to Austria by subsequent conventions between Austria and Turkey, A. D. 1776 and 1777, which also particularly defined the boundaries between the German and Ottoman Empires.

**Turkish  
Cession of  
Buko-  
wina to  
Austria.**

The Peace of Kudschuk-Kainardji was glorious for Russia but disastrous to Turkey. By acknowledging the independence of the Crim Tartars the Turks lost one of their chief bulwarks against Russia. They were exasperated at seeing the Russians established on the Black Sea and allowed unrestricted navigation in all the Turkish seas. Thenceforth they had reason to fear for the security of their capital, as the Russians might assail it with impunity and intercept its supplies whenever the least disturbance might arise between the two Empires.

**Russia's  
Gains  
from the  
Turks.**

In 1774 a formidable rebellion against the Empress Catharine the Great, headed by Pugatscheff, a Don Cossack, calling himself Peter III., broke out in the region of the Volga; but the revolt was speedily suppressed, after the loss of three million lives; and Pugatscheff, betrayed by his best friend, was beheaded in Moscow in 1775, and his body was cut to pieces.

**Pugat-  
scheff's  
Rebellion  
in Russia.**

**Kalmuck  
Migra-  
tion.**

In 1782 the Kalmuck Tartars, numbering half a million, affronted at the Russian Empress, abandoned their homes in European Russia, and, wandering eastward several thousand miles, settled themselves in the dominions of the Emperor of China, having remained ever since on the plains of Central Asia.

**Russian  
Designs  
on the  
Crimea.**

Russian ambition was not satisfied by the Peace of Kudschuk-Kainardji, as the policy of the Empress Catharine the Great aimed at the dominion of the Black Sea and its shores; and the years which followed that treaty of peace were marked by frequent disputes concerning the independence of the Crim Tartars.

**Turkey's  
Evasion  
of the  
Treaty.**

The Ottoman Porte was too haughty to admit the independence of the Crim Tartars, which the Peace of Kudschuk-Kainardji had sanctioned. The Sultan was exasperated at seeing the Russians parading their flag even under the walls of Constantinople, and he made use of various stratagems to evade the execution of those articles in the treaty which did not meet with his approbation.

**Russian  
Interven-  
tion  
in the  
Crimea.**

Russia considered the independence of the Crimea as a step toward the execution of her ambitious projects, and with this view she deposed the Khan Dowlat Gueray, who was favorably disposed toward the Sultan of Turkey, and put Sahin Gueray in his place; the latter being devoted to the Russian interests. Sahin Gueray was deposed by Selim Gueray, who made himself Khan of the Crimea, with the assistance of the Ottoman Porte; whereupon the Empress of Russia sent an army under Marshal Suwarrow into the Crimea in 1778, thus restoring her protégé by force of arms.

**The Ex-  
plicative  
Conven-  
tion.**

The Sultan of Turkey now made great preparations for war with Russia, and a rupture between the two Empires appeared inevitable, when the mediation of M. de St. Priest, the French ambassador at Constantinople, brought about an agreement between Russia and Turkey, called the *Explicative Convention*, concluded at Constantinople, March 21, 1779. By this arrangement the independence of the Crimea and the sovereignty of Sahin Gueray were acknowledged and confirmed anew. Russia and Turkey agreed to withdraw their troops from the Crimean peninsula and also from the island of Taman. Turkey promised particularly never to assert any pretexs of spiritual alliance to interfere with the civil or political power of the Khans of the Crimea. The free intercourse between the Black Sea and the White Sea was expressly secured to all Russian vessels of the same form, size and capacity as the ships of other nations that carried on commerce in the Turkish ports.

**Revolu-  
tion  
in the  
Crimea.**

The Explicative Convention did not restore any permanent good understanding between the Muscovite and Ottoman Empires; as fresh difficulties soon arose in the Crimea, where another revolution resulted

in the deposition of the Khan Sahin Gueray by the party which adhered to the Sultan of Turkey, A. D. 1782.

Thereupon a Russian army under Potemkin marched into the Crimea and restored the deposed Khan, while a Russian fleet sailed from Azov and cut off all communication between the malcontents and the Turkish capital. The Empress Catharine the Great, who now considered the time opportune for the annexation of the Crimea to her dominions, caused her troops to occupy that peninsula and the whole of the Cuban, or Little Tartary, and drove the Turks from the island of Taman, which they had occupied for the purpose of opening a communication with the Crim Tartars. The Czarina issued a manifesto explaining the motives which actuated her in annexing the Crimea, the Cuban and the isle of Taman to the Russian Empire, and requiring the Khan Sahin Gueray to resign formally the sovereignty of the Crimea, June 28, 1783. When the Crim Tartars resisted, thirty thousand of them were massacred by the Russians.

**Russian  
Conquest  
and  
Annexa-  
tion  
of the  
Crimea.**

The annexation of the Crimea to the Russian Empire was a terrible blow to the Ottoman Porte. The populace of Constantinople loudly demanded war against Russia; but the Divan, who was conscious of Turkish weakness, sought every expedient to avoid hostilities. Russia made immense military and naval preparations; and the Empress Catharine the Great had a thorough understanding with the Emperor Joseph II. of Germany, who was now also hereditary sovereign of Austria, Bohemia and Hungary. Great Britain, then under the administration of the younger William Pitt, vainly endeavored to incite the Turks to take up arms against Russia; but they were restrained by France and Austria.

**Threat-  
ened War  
between  
Russia  
and  
Turkey.**

After some negotiation, a new treaty between Russia and Turkey was signed at Constantinople, January 8, 1784. By this treaty Russia obtained the sovereignty of the Crimean peninsula, the island of Taman and all that part of the Cuban which lay on the right bank of the Cuban river and which had formed a frontier between the Russian and Ottoman Empires. Turkey obtained the fortress of Oczakoff and all its territory, to which the Crim Tartars had some claims. Thus ended the Tartar dominion in the Crimea—a dominion which had existed there since the days of Zingis Khan's successors and which had once been so terrible to Russia. The Empress Catharine the Great formed all of that vast country on the north side of the Black Sea into two new governments—Taurida and Caucasia.

**Treaty of  
Constan-  
tinople.**

**Taurida  
and  
Caucasia.**

Paul Potemkin—the all-powerful favorite of the Czarina of Russia and the chief director of her policy in Crimean affairs—founded the new capital, Kherson, for the two new governments of Taurida and Caucasia. The happiness and prosperity of the inhabitants ceased with

**New City  
of  
Kherson.**

their freedom. The once-splendid city of tents degenerated into a camp of gypsies, and the houses and palaces of stone fell into ruins.

Catharine's  
Journey  
to  
Taurida  
and  
Caucasia.

In May, 1787, the Czarina Catharine the Great visited her newly-acquired provinces of Taurida and Caucasia to do honor to Potemkin and to receive the homage of her new Tartar subjects. She embarked at Kiev and sailed down the Dnieper with a sumptuous flotilla of twenty-two vessels. She was joined in her journey by King Stanislas Poniatowski of Poland, the victim of her wiles, and by the Emperor Joseph II. of Germany, who accompanied the Russian Empress in disguise and discussed with her their common plans for the spoliation of Turkey.

Potemkin's  
Temporary  
Villages.

In order to produce the impression that the newly-acquired territories were prosperous and blooming, Potemkin caused temporary villages to be erected along the route of the Czarina's journey, and peopled them with inhabitants brought from a distance and dressed in holiday attire, while herds of cattle and sheep grazed in the intervening pastures, and country festivals were held along the road; but no sooner had the brilliant procession passed than hamlets, people and herds disappeared like a scene in a drama. This affair fully illustrated the illusive character of this entire reign so far as civilization is concerned.

Turkey's  
Fears of  
Russia  
and  
Austria.

The evident design of the Empress Catharine II. of expelling the Turks from Europe and founding a new Christian empire, with Constantinople for its capital and a member of the imperial House of Romanoff for its prince, and the aggressive conduct of Russia in the region of the Black Sea, alarmed the Ottoman Porte. For a long time the greatest animosity had existed between Russia and Turkey. The Turks could not endure the humiliating conditions which Russia had imposed upon them. The high tone which the court of St. Petersburg had assumed in its official communications wounded the pride of the Ottomans; and the remarkable journey of the Empress Catharine the Great and the Emperor Joseph II. excited intense alarm in Constantinople, where it was believed that the journey indicated a premeditated design of the imperial Houses of Romanoff and Hapsburg to annihilate the Ottoman Empire and to divide the spoil between them.

British  
and  
Prussian  
Jealousy  
of Russia.

Great Britain and Prussia dexterously fanned the smouldering flame in the Turkish capital; as they desired to be avenged on Russia for the obstacles which she had thrown in the way of renewing their treaty of commerce, and for the advantageous conditions which she had granted to France by the commercial treaty which she had concluded with that power. British jealousy had been excited by the great activity which Russia had displayed in carrying on her commerce in the Black Sea since she had obtained entire liberty of commerce by her treaties with Turkey, Great Britain fearing that her own commercial relations with the Ottoman Empire in the Black Sea might be destroyed.

The Turks also complained of the hostile conduct of the Russian consul in Moldavia, whom they accused of seeking by every means in his power to interrupt the amicable relations between the Russian and Ottoman Empires. The Turks demanded that the obnoxious Russian consul be recalled and that the Empress Catharine the Great should renounce the protection of Prince Heraclius of Georgia and withdraw her troops from that principality. The Turks also desired that all Russian vessels passing the Dardanelles and the Bosphorus should be subjected to an examination for the purpose of preventing contraband trade.

As soon as the Empress of Russia had returned to St. Petersburg from her extraordinary journey to Taurida the Divan declared war against Russia, without waiting for an answer from the Russian court, by seizing M. de Boulgakoff, the Russian ambassador at Constantinople, and sending him a prisoner to the Castle of the Seven Towers, August 18, 1787. Upon hearing of this action of the Sublime Porte the Czarina of Russia sent a large army under Potemkin against the Turks; her troops occupying a line from Kaminiec, in Podolia, to Balta, a Tartar village on the Polish frontier, between the Dniester and the Bug. Under Potemkin served Suwarrow, Repnin, Kamenski and other able Russian generals. Thus another bloody land and naval war broke out between Russia and Turkey, and lasted five years, A. D. 1787-1792. The Turks began hostilities by an attack on Kinburn in September, 1787, in which they were repulsed.

For some time the Emperor Joseph II. of Germany attempted to mediate between Russia and Turkey, and he finally declared war against Turkey and thus became the ally of the Russian Empress, February 9, 1788. At the head of the Austrian army, Joseph II. attacked the Turks in Moldavia and at several points from Hungary. The Austrian force under Marshal Laudon besieged Belgrade, and took that fortress October 8, 1789, and subdued portions of Servia and Wallachia; but in the meantime the Emperor Joseph II. had returned to Vienna.

In 1788 King Gustavus III. of Sweden, instigated by Great Britain and Prussia, made war on Russia as an ally of Turkey, and thus prevented the Russian fleets in the Baltic from sailing to the Mediterranean. By his orders a Swedish army was formed in Swedish Finland; while a Swedish fleet of twenty ships-of-the-line and ten frigates advanced on Cronstadt, thus creating consternation in St. Petersburg. An indecisive engagement occurred between the Swedish and Russian fleets near the island of Hoogland, May 30, 1789. The Swedish king had prepared to attack the city of Frederiksham, in Russian Finland; but several of his officers refused to march, assigning as a reason that the constitution of Sweden did not permit them to be accessory to an offensive war which the Swedish nation had not sanctioned. The ex-

Turkey's  
Demands  
on  
Russia.

Russo-  
Turkish  
War of  
1787-  
1792.

Austria's  
Alliance  
with  
Russia.

Austrian  
Suc-  
cesses.

Sweden's  
Alliance  
with  
Turkey.

Swedish  
Invasion  
of  
Russian  
Finland.

ample of these Swedish officers was followed by a large portion of their troops; and thus the Swedish expedition to Russian Finland failed, allowing the Russians time to put themselves in a state of defense.

Danish  
Invasion  
of  
Sweden  
and  
Siege of  
Gotten-  
burg.

When the Empress of Russia found herself thus attacked by the King of Sweden she called upon her ally, King Christian VII. of Denmark, to invade Sweden. The King of Denmark fitted out a squadron and sent an army into Sweden. This Danish army soon conquered the province of Bohus, after which it marched into West Gothland and besieged Gottenburg, A. D. 1788. The Swedish king hastened in person to the defense of that city, which was one of the most important in his kingdom. The Danes would have taken Gottenburg had not Great Britain, Holland and Prussia now intervened and compelled Christian VII. of Denmark to conclude truces with Sweden and remain neutral in the war, A. D. 1789.

Russo-  
Swedish  
Naval  
Opera-  
tions.

The war between Russia and Sweden was then confined to naval operations, and in the campaigns of 1789 and 1790 success was almost evenly balanced on both sides. The Swedish fleet was defeated in the Gulf of Viborg, July 3, 1790; but the Swedish fleet under King Gustavus III. gained a great victory over the Russian fleet commanded by the Prince of Nassau-Siegen at Swenkasund, July 9-10, 1790, the Russians losing many ships and men. The King of Sweden, deserted by Great Britain and Prussia, and fearing that the Russians would take advantage of the discontents prevailing among the Swedish nobles to invade his kingdom, accepted the equitable conditions of peace which the Empress Catharine the Great offered him; and by the Peace of Werela, near the river Kymen, August 14, 1790, the boundaries of Russia and Sweden remained as they had been before the war.

Peace of  
Werela.

Russian  
Captures  
of  
Turkish  
For-  
tresses.

In the meantime the Russians had been completely victorious over the Turks. An allied Russian and Austrian army captured the fortress of Kotzim in September, 1788. After the Ottoman fleet had been totally destroyed in a battle near Oczakoff, in June, 1788, a Russian army under Prince Potemkin laid siege to Oczakoff, and took that strong fortress by storm December 17, 1788, in spite of the gallant defense made by the Turks. The victorious Russians massacred the entire garrison and many of the inhabitants. An allied Russian and Austrian army under Marshal Suwarrow and the Prince of Coburg defeated the Turks near Foczani, in Moldavia, July 21, 1789, and also near Martinesti, on the river Rymna, September 22, 1789, thus obtaining possession of the strong fortress of Bender; after which the Russians effected the conquest of Moldavia and Bessarabia by the successive captures of a number of strong fortresses. Suwarrow took the fortress of Ismail by storm, December 22, 1790, and massacred twenty thousand Turks; while the Turkish fleet was destroyed near Sevastopol.



The road to Constantinople now stood open to the Russians; and the name Constantine, given to the second grandson of the Empress Catharine the Great, was believed to indicate the Czarina's secret design of placing a Christian prince upon the throne of Constantinople. This alarmed Great Britain and Prussia; and the British Ministry under the younger William Pitt sent an expedition to make a diversion in favor of Sultan SELIM III., the successor of Abdul Hamid I., who had died in 1789; while King Frederick William II. of Prussia sent an army to the frontiers of Silesia and Poland as a menace to Austria and Russia, and even entered into a formal alliance with Turkey, agreeing to declare war against Austria and Russia the next spring.

**British  
and  
Prussian  
Interven-  
tion.**

All these powerful interventions rendered peace more difficult, because of the offense thus given to the Empress Catharine the Great by the attempt of other powers to dictate terms to her; but the death of the Emperor Joseph II. of Germany and the rebellions in Hungary and the Austrian Netherlands rendered peace a necessity to Austria. The Emperor Leopold II., the successor of Joseph II., desired peace and yielded to the menaces of Great Britain and Prussia; and thus Austria concluded the Peace of Reichenbach with Prussia, July 27, 1790, by which she entered into an armistice with Turkey and consented to make peace with the Sultan on the basis of the *status ante bellum*. By the Peace of Sistova, in Bulgaria, between Austria and Turkey, August 4, 1791, signed under the mediation of Holland and Prussia, Austria restored the fortress of Belgrade and most of the other conquests which the Austrians had made from the Turks during the war.

**Peace of  
Reichen-  
bach.**

**Peace of  
Sistova.**

The Empress of Russia, disdaining the dictation of the powers which had offered their unwelcome intervention, then prosecuted the war alone against the Ottoman Empire; and her armies gained new victories over the Turks in the campaign of 1791. Great Britain and Prussia were now anxious for peace with Russia, and their desertion of the cause of Turkey led to negotiations for peace between the Czarina and the Sultan. A preliminary treaty between Russia and Turkey was signed at Galatz, on the Danube; and this was followed by the definitive Peace of Jassy, in Moldavia, January 9, 1792.

**Russian  
Suc-  
cesses.**

**Russo-  
Turkish  
Treaty.**

By the Peace of Jassy the stipulations of all the treaties between Russia and Turkey since the Peace of Kudschuk-Kainardji were renewed, and the Dniester was mutually recognized as the boundary between the Russian and Ottoman Empires. Thus the Sultan ceded the fortress of Oczakoff with all the territory between the Bug and the Dniester to Russia, and confirmed the cession of the Crimea, the isle of Taman and that part of the Cuban lying on the right bank of the Cuban river to Russia. The Sublime Porte also agreed to suppress the piracies of the Barbary corsairs in the Mediterranean, and even to in-

**Peace of  
Jassy.**

demnify Russian subjects for their losses by those piracies in case reparation was not given them within a limited time. Russia restored all her other conquests, only stipulating for certain advantages in favor of the principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia.

Turkish  
Indemnity  
Remitted.

New City  
of  
Odessa.

Poland's  
Efforts at  
Regener-  
ation.

By the Peace of Jassy the Sublime Porte had agreed to pay a war-indemnity of twelve million piasters to Russia; but immediately after the conclusion of the treaty the Empress Catharine the Great renounced this payment—an act of generosity which excited the admiration of the Ottoman plenipotentiaries. The Peace of Jassy gave new energy to Russian commerce on the Black Sea; and the Russian Empress founded the commercial city of Odessa, on that sea.

In the meantime Poland was trying to free herself from Russian domination. The Poles had flattered themselves that while Russia was engaged in war with Turkey and Sweden they would be left at liberty to alter their constitution and thus give new vigor to their government. An extraordinary Diet, convened at Warsaw in 1788, organized itself into a confederation for the purpose of avoiding the inconveniences of the *Liberum Veto* and of the unanimity required in ordinary Diets.

Prussia's  
Instiga-  
tion of a  
Polish  
Rising  
against  
Russia.

The Empress of Russia sought to induce this Polish Diet to join her in an alliance against Turkey; but her designs were frustrated by King Frederick William II. of Prussia, who, as the ally of Great Britain and Turkey, used every effort to instigate the Poles against Russia. The Prussian king encouraged the Poles by offering them his alliance in their effort to reform their government, which Russia had recently guaranteed. The Polish Diet appointed a Committee of Legislation, which was commissioned to frame a constitution that would give new energy to Poland. With the support of Prussia, the Polish Diet dissolved the *Perpetual Council*, which Russia had established at Warsaw to rule Poland.

Catha-  
rine's  
Remon-  
strance  
and  
Polish  
Neglect.

The action of the Polish Diet displeased the Empress Catharine the Great, who remonstrated against it as a direct infraction of the treaty which she had entered into with Poland in 1775. The Poles, thus foreseeing the trouble in which their design would involve them with the Russian Empress, should have considered how to put themselves into a good state of defense. But instead of improving their finances and putting their army on a respectable footing, the Polish Diet wasted precious time in discussing the plan of the new constitution which had been submitted to it.

False  
Hopes  
Inspired  
by the  
Prusso-  
Polish  
Alliance.

The assurances of protection and support which Prussia had officially given to the Poles rendered them too confident; and the treaty of alliance which King Frederick William II. of Prussia had practically concluded with Poland, March 29, 1790, lulled the Poles into a profound security. King Stanislas Poniatowski long hesitated as to which party

he ought to sustain, and at length he joined the national party in the Polish Diet which desired to extricate Poland from that state of degradation into which she had fallen. The new constitution was adopted by acclamation May 3, 1791, and King Stanislas Poniatowski took an oath to observe and defend it.

This constitution, which was applauded by all Europe except Russia, changed Poland from an elective kingdom into an hereditary monarchy with two legislative chambers; and, however imperfect it might appear, it was in accordance with the state of civilization which Poland had attained. It corrected several of the errors and defects of former Polish statutes; and, though it was practically republican, it was free from the extravagant ideas of republicanism which had been brought into fashion by the French Revolution, then in full blaze.

This new Polish constitution made the throne of Poland hereditary in the Electoral House of Saxony, abolished the absurd *Liberum Veto* and the law of unanimity based thereon, and declared the Diet permanent with two legislative chambers—a Senate and a Chamber of Deputies. The Chamber of Deputies was composed of representatives of the Polish people elected for two years, and was empowered to frame and discuss laws. The Senate, over which the king presided, was invested with the power of sanctioning or rejecting the laws proposed by the Chamber of Deputies. The executive power was vested in the king and a Council of Superintendence consisting of seven members, or responsible Ministers.

This constitution conferred upon the inhabitants of the Polish towns the privilege of electing their own Deputies and Judges, and the way for attaining the honors of nobility was laid open to the burgesses. The nobility were retained in all the plenitude of their rights and prerogatives; and the peasantry, hitherto in a condition of abject servitude, were placed under the immediate protection of the laws and the government. The constitution sanctioned in advance the compacts which the landed proprietors might enter into with their tenantry to ameliorate the condition of the latter.

The efforts made by the Poles to secure their independence aroused the resentment of the Empress of Russia. As soon as Catharine the Great had concluded the Peace of Jassy with the Sultan of Turkey she engaged a party of Polish nobles who were dissatisfied with the new constitution to form the *Confederation of Targowicz* for the purpose of restoring the old elective constitution. The *Confederation of Targowicz*, signed May 14, 1792, was headed by the Counts Felix Potochi, Rzewuski and Branicki. This party received the aid of the Russian Empress, who immediately sent an army into Poland to wage war against the supporters of the new constitution.

New  
Polish  
Constitu-  
tion.

Its Pro-  
visions  
for the  
Govern-  
ment of  
Poland.

Privi-  
leges  
Granted  
to Towns,  
Nobles  
and  
Peasants.

Confeder-  
ation of  
Targo-  
wicz.

Its Aid  
from  
Russia.

Polish  
Rise  
against  
the Tar-  
gowicz  
Confeder-  
ates and  
Russia.

For the first time the Poles thought of adopting vigorous measures. The Diet of Poland ordered an army to take the field against the Confederates of Targowicz and their Russian allies, and decreed a levy of several corps of light troops. The Diet also ordered a loan of thirty-three million florins without the least opposition; but the refusal of the Diet to accede to a mercantile scheme by which Dantzic and Thorn were to be relinquished to the King of Prussia had disaffected that monarch toward Poland; and when the Prussian ambassador at Warsaw was called upon to give some explanation as to the subsidies which King Frederick William II. had promised to Poland by the treaty of alliance in 1790 he gave an evasive answer, thus discouraging the whole patriotic party of Poland. It was therefore an easy matter for the Empress of Russia to obtain the consent of the King of Prussia to another dismemberment of Poland. Accordingly the King of Prussia, who had just been in alliance with the Polish patriots, now sided with Russia in the contest, on the ground that the principles of French republicanism were embodied in the new Polish constitution. Although the events in Poland, where the king and the nation were acting in concert, had nothing in common with the French Revolution except appearances, so great was the dread which the crowned heads of Europe entertained for everything resembling that great event that King Frederick William II. of Prussia was thereby influenced to break his treaty of alliance with Poland.

Prussia's  
Desertion  
of Poland  
and Her  
Alliance  
with  
Russia.

Poland's  
Despair.

Then, for the first time, the Poles fully comprehended the danger of their situation. Their first ardor cooled, and the entire Polish Diet was thrown into a state of the utmost consternation. Thus abandoned to her own resources and convulsed by internal dissensions, Poland then perceived her utter inability to cope with an enemy so powerful as Russia.

Kosci-  
uszko's  
Defeat at  
Dubienka.

The campaign of 1792 resulted wholly to the disadvantage of the Polish patriots. The illustrious Thaddeus Kosciuszko, who had fought nobly for freedom in America, became the chief of the patriot party, and led the Polish army against the Russians, by whom he was defeated at Dubienka, July 17, 1792. The victorious Russians advanced on Warsaw; and King Stanislas Poniatowski was so intimidated by a threatening letter from the Russian Empress that he renounced hostilities against Russia and joined the Confederation of Targowicz by renouncing the new Polish constitution and the acts of the revolutionary Diet at Warsaw. The Polish king was even intimidated to subscribe to all the conditions which the Empress Catharine the Great thought proper to dictate to him, August 25, 1792. An armistice was agreed to, which stipulated for the reduction of the Polish army. The gallant Polish patriots, whose efforts had been paralyzed by the cowardice and

Cowardly  
Submis-  
sion of  
King  
Stanislas  
Ponia-  
towski.

irresolution of their king, fled from their country, burning with wrath against their Russian oppressors.

In consequence of the Convention of St. Petersburg between Russia and Prussia, January 23, 1793, a Prussian army invaded Poland and overran the country, as did the Russians. In April, 1793, the Russian and Prussian courts issued proclamations declaring those portions of Poland occupied by their respective troops annexed to their own dominions, assigning as a reason that the principles of the French Revolution were fast gaining ground in Poland, as evinced by the adoption of the constitution of 1791. The Polish Diet, which assembled at Grodno, and which resolutely, but vainly, opposed itself to the new treaty of partition, was surrounded by Russian troops, who violently carried off the boldest speakers; and the *Second Partition of Poland*, between Russia and Prussia, was successfully consummated, A. D. 1793.

**Second  
Partition  
of Poland.**

By this second partition the eastern Polish provinces of Volhynia, Podolia, Lithuania, the Ukraine and Little Poland were absorbed by Russia; while most of Great Poland, including the cities of Dantzic and Thorn, along with the town of Czenstochowa, in Little Poland, were annexed to Prussia; thus leaving to the Republic of Poland scarcely a third portion of her former territory.

**Russia's  
and  
Prussia's  
Acquisitions.**

The Polish Diet at Grodno was compelled to ratify treaties with Russia and Prussia surrendering the provinces which the two powers had seized. The treaty between Poland and Russia was signed by the Diet of Grodno, July 13, 1793; but that between Poland and Prussia met with the most determined opposition, so that it was necessary to use threats of force before it was ratified, October, 1793.

**Polish  
Diet  
Coerced  
into Sub-  
mission.**

The stolen provinces were immediately occupied by Russian and Prussian troops; and General Iglestrom, the Russian ambassador at Warsaw, ruled with pride and insolence in Poland. After the treaties of partition Russia and Prussia again renounced all further claims against Poland, and they agreed to guarantee the constitution that the Polish Diet should establish with the free consent of the Polish nation.

**Russian  
and  
Prussian  
Occupation.**

These treaties of partition were also followed by a treaty of alliance between Russia and Poland, October 16, 1793, the third article of which guaranteed their mutual assistance in case of attack by any other power; the direction of the war being reserved to Russia, as well as the privilege of sending her troops into Poland and establishing magazines there when she might consider it necessary to do so; while Poland agreed to enter into no alliance with foreign powers and to make no change in her constitution without the approbation of Russia. What remained of the Republic of Poland was divided into eighteen Palatinates; each of which was assigned two Senators, a Palatine, a Castellan, and six Deputies in the national Diet.

**Alliance  
of Russia  
and  
Poland.**

Secret  
Polish  
Organiza-  
tion and  
Its Con-  
spiracy.

These different treaties and the grievances of which the Poles had just cause to complain excited the public mind in Poland to the highest degree and again aroused the national spirit. A secret association was formed at Warsaw and extended its various branches all over Poland, and in the spring of 1794 this secret organization of Polish patriots inaugurated a conspiracy for the purpose of reconquering the lost territories and restoring the constitutional government. This conspiracy found numerous partisans in the Polish army, which was to have been disbanded according to the treaties with Russia. Kosciuszko and the emigrant Poles returned to their country and placed themselves at the head of the patriot party, whose central point was then at Cracow.

Delusive  
Polish  
Hopes.

The Poles counted with confidence on the aid of Austria, which had no share in the Second Partition of Poland, and flattered themselves that Turkey and Sweden, the old enemies of Russia, would not remain idle spectators for the efforts which they were making to recover their liberty and independence. Kosciuszko had desired that his countrymen should postpone the execution of their plan in order to gain more time for preparation, especially as a suspicion was aroused among the Russians. He even retired from Saxony into Italy, where he remained until one of his accomplices, who had been ordered to leave Poland on the charge of propagating sedition, informed him that his countrymen desired him to return to Poland without delay, as a better opportunity might not soon present itself.

Kosci-  
uszko's  
Return to  
Poland.

Poland's  
Rise  
against  
Russia  
and  
Prussia.

Upon his reappearance in Poland, Kosciuszko, as the chosen leader of the projected insurrection, proceeded at once to Cracow. The signal for insurrection was given by Madalinski, the commander of a brigade of cavalry under the new government in Poland, who threw off the mask by refusing to disband his force when ordered to do so, and who suddenly retired from his station, crossed the Vistula, dispersed some Prussian detachments which he encountered in his route, marched directly to Cracow and there erected the standard of revolt.

Kosci-  
uszko's  
Leader-  
ship  
of the  
Polish  
Patriots.

The inhabitants of Cracow at once flew to arms, drove the Russian troops from their city and proclaimed Kosciuszko as their commander-in-chief, conferring upon him the powers of a dictator during the struggle for the liberation of Poland, March 24, 1794. He took an oath of fidelity to the nation and of adherence to the principles enunciated in the act of insurrection by which war was declared against the foreign invaders of their rights and liberties. He also issued a summons to his countrymen calling upon them to rise in arms for the recovery of their freedom and independence, for the reconquest of their lost territories and for the establishment of constitutional government.

Russian and Prussian troops were immediately sent to check the progress of the insurrection. Kosciuszko's victory over a Russian de-

tachment at Raslavice inspired the Polish patriots with new courage. The flame of insurrection spread to Warsaw, where the tocsin of revolt was sounded on the night of Maundy-Thursday, April 17, 1794, when the insurgents seized the arsenal and distributed arms and ammunition among the populace. A brisk cannonade took place between the populace and the Russian garrison, which lasted two days, during which twenty-five hundred Russians were slain, while four thousand five hundred were taken prisoners, and General Iglestrom fled from the city with about three thousand. Iglestrom's palace was burned to the ground, and four of the leading Polish partisans of Russia were hanged. An insurrection also broke out at Wilna and extended over all Lithuania. Several Polish regiments in the Russian service changed sides and enlisted under the banners of the insurgents, and all Poland was soon in arms.

The  
Russian  
Garrison  
Expelled  
from  
Warsaw.

Notwithstanding her first success, it was soon perceived that Poland lacked in the essential resources for an enterprise of such a magnitude as that in which she had engaged. The bulk of the citizens were neither sufficiently numerous nor sufficiently wealthy to serve as a center for the revolution which they had undertaken, while the servitude in which the peasantry had always been kept was not at all calculated to inspire them with enthusiasm for a cause in which their masters only were to gain anything.

Poland's  
Lack of  
Resour-  
ces.

The nobles, who should have shown energy and courage, were but little disposed to give any effectual support to the cause of Polish liberty. Every contribution seemed to them an encroachment on their prerogatives; and they were as much averse to a levy *en masse* as they were opposed to the raising of recruits, as both deprived them of their tenantry. They were also afraid of losing those rights and privileges which they exclusively enjoyed. The Polish patriots were also divided in opinion; and King Stanislas Poniatowski, although seemingly approving their action, inspired such mistrust by his timidity and weakness that they even accused him of secretly abetting the Russian interests.

Her  
Selfish  
Nobility  
and Her  
Dissen-  
sions.

Under these circumstances, Kosciuszko was convinced of the impossibility of organizing an army capable of coping with that of the Russians and the Prussians, who were acting in concert to defeat the measures of the Polish patriots.

Kosci-  
uszko's  
Despair.

After some inferior operations, an important engagement occurred on the frontiers of the Palatinates of Siradia and Cujavia, June 8, 1794, in which Kosciuszko was defeated, thus enabling King Frederick William II. of Prussia to take possession of Cracow. With the support of a Russian detachment, the King of Prussia besieged Warsaw. The main force of the Polish army, assembled under the walls of Warsaw,

Unsuc-  
cessful  
Siege of  
Warsaw  
and  
Prussian  
Retreat.

amounted to about twenty-two thousand men; while the allied Russians and Prussians numbered more than fifty thousand. After the siege of Warsaw had lasted two months, a general insurrection which had spread from Prussia's recently-acquired province of Great Poland into West Prussia obliged the Prussian king to raise the siege and to retire, in order that he might suppress the revolt in his own dominions. He was pursued in his retreat by the Poles under Kosciuszko, Dombrowski and Joseph Poniatowski; the last of whom was the Polish king's illustrious nephew.

Austrian  
and  
Russian  
Invasion  
of Poland.

The joy of the Polish patriots on account of the disastrous retreat of the Prussians was of short duration. The Polish success only increased the enemy's desire for vengeance; while Austria, which hitherto had observed a strict neutrality, also sent an army into Poland. This Austrian army advanced in two columns, one marching against Brzesci and the other against Dowbno. A Russian army under Field-Marshal Suwarrow marched into Lithuania in pursuit of a Polish detachment under Sirakowski.

Kosciuszko  
Defeated,  
Wounded  
and Made  
Captive.

Kosciuszko, now seeing the great superiority of the enemy, made a final effort to prevent a junction of the Russian armies commanded respectively by Field-Marshal Suwarrow and Baron de Fersen. He accordingly marched against Baron de Fersen, by whom he was defeated in a sanguinary engagement near Macziewice, October 10, 1794. In this battle, which lasted from sunrise until beyond noon, six thousand of the Polish army were slain and the remainder were taken prisoners. Kosciuszko sought to escape by the swiftness of his steed, but was overtaken by a detachment of Cossacks, one of whom, not knowing who he was, thrust a lance into his back. The illustrious Polish patriot, thus wounded, fell from his horse, exclaiming: "The end of Poland!" He was carried a prisoner to a monastery, where one of his officers intimated to his captors that he was the Polish leader, whereupon surgical aid was rendered to him; and soon afterward he was conveyed a captive to St. Petersburg.

Siege of  
Warsaw.

The Poles were terribly dejected by Kosciuszko's defeat and capture; and Generals Dombrowski and Madalinski, who commanded the Polish forces in Polish Prussia and Great Poland, retired from those provinces and advanced with their armies to the relief of Warsaw. Field-Marshal Suwarrow led the Russian army toward Poland's capital, where he was reinforced by a large Prussian force under Dorfelden and Fersen, in conjunction with which he laid siege to Warsaw, November 4, 1794. The Russians, twenty-two thousand in number, prepared for an assault on the intrenchments of Praga, a suburb of the Polish capital. The Polish garrison, numbering from eight thousand to ten thousand men, made a heroic defense; but they were unable to withstand the ardor



and impetuosity of the Russians, who were burning with rage to avenge the blood of their countrymen massacred at Warsaw.

The Russians had erected three batteries during the night; and the first two divisions bravely surmounted every obstacle, though harassed by a vigorous fire in every direction except the rear. Within four hours the besiegers carried the triple line of intrenchments of Praga by storm; after which they rushed into the town and pursued the Polish troops through the streets, massacred many of them and drove about a thousand into the Vistula. A regiment of Jews which made an obstinate defense was at length wholly exterminated. Thirteen thousand Poles were slain in the struggle. Two thousand were drowned in the Vistula. From fourteen thousand to fifteen thousand were taken prisoners. The suburb of Praga was pillaged and was razed to the ground.

**Capture of Praga by Storm.**

The fall of Praga spread consternation among the inhabitants of Warsaw and made them willing to surrender. Field-Marshal Surwarow made his triumphant entry into Poland's capital and received the keys of the city, November 9, 1794. The Polish troops laid down their arms. All resistance was at an end, and poor Poland lay prostrate and bleeding at the feet of her merciless conquerors. Most of the leaders of the patriot party were arrested by the conquering Russians, and King Stanislas Poniatowski fled to Grodno.

**Russian Occupation of Warsaw.**

**Prostration of Poland.**

A partition of what remained of the Republic of Poland, between Russia, Prussia and Austria, took place in 1795. The three allied powers came to an agreement respecting the final dismemberment of the unhappy kingdom only after almost ten months of negotiation.

**Third Partition Treaty.**

Prussia had signified her intention of retaining Cracow and the neighboring territory which had just been taken possession of by her troops; but Austria, which also desired to appropriate that part of Poland, took advantage of the dissatisfaction which Prussia's conduct during the campaign of 1794 and her retreat from the ensuing coalition had aroused in the Empress Catharine the Great, and entered into a separate negotiation with the Czarina.

**Austria's Acquisition of Cracow.**

Russia and Austria arranged secretly with each other concerning the shares of the Polish territory which each should have. These two powers signed a convention at St. Petersburg, January 3, 1795, inviting Prussia to accede to the stipulations which they had agreed upon between them, and offering to acquiesce in the annexation of the remainder of ill-fated Poland to the Prussian monarchy and to guarantee such acquisition.

**Austro-Russian Secret Treaty.**

A protracted negotiation afterward took place between the three allied powers. This tedious diplomacy was owing to the fact that Prussia, which was unaware of the secret treaty between Russia and Austria assigning Cracow to Austria, had always entertained the hope

**Protracted Negotiation.**

of being able to retain that city and the surrounding territory herself. Only when the secret treaty of partition between Russia and Austria, signed at St. Petersburg, January 3, 1795, was revealed to Prussia did the court of Berlin agree to a special convention with the court of Vienna.

**Austro-Prussian Treaty.**

By this special convention between Prussia and Austria, signed at St. Petersburg, October 24, 1795, Prussia relinquished the city of Cracow and its immediate vicinity to Austria, which in turn abandoned to Prussia a part of the Polish territory which her secret convention with Russia, signed at St. Petersburg, January 3, 1795, had secured to her. Prussia and Austria now agreed that the limits of the Palatinate of Cracow should be regulated between them under the mediation of Russia.

**Abdication of King Stanislas Ponia-towski.**

As the three allied powers had now come to an agreement respecting the division of what remained of Poland among themselves, King Stanislas Poniawski was obliged to abdicate the crown of Poland, which he formally did at Grodno, November 25, 1795. He took up his residence at St. Petersburg, where he was supported by an annual pension of two hundred thousand ducats from the three allied powers until his death, which occurred in 1798—an object of deserved contempt.

**Third Partition of Poland.**

By the *Third Partition of Poland*, as agreed upon by the various treaties between the three allied powers, Austria obtained the southern provinces of the prostrate kingdom with Cracow; Prussia took the Polish territory west of the Vistula with Warsaw, and Russia seized the remainder of the ill-fated kingdom.

**Poland's End.**

Thus the once-powerful Poland ceased to exist as an independent power, being entirely blotted from the list of independent nations—a victim to its own weakness and its internal dissensions, as well as to one of the most audacious outrages in all history in the rapacity of its neighbors.

**Death of Catharine and Kos-ciuszko.**

The Empress Catharine the Great did not long survive this great political crime. She died November 7, 1796, and was succeeded on the throne of Russia by her son, the eccentric PAUL, who released Kos-ciuszko. That illustrious patriot died as a private individual in Switzerland in October, 1817, and his remains were conveyed to Cracow, where they were interred.

**Camp-bell's Poem.**

We will close this section with the following stanzas from the Scotch poet Thomas Campbell's beautiful poem on the battle of Warsaw and the downfall of Poland.

“Oh sacred Truth! thy triumph ceased awhile,  
And Hope, thy sister, ceased with thee to smile,  
When leagued Oppression poured to northern wars  
Her whiskered pandours and her fierce hussars,

Waved her dread standard to the breeze of morn,  
 Pealed her loud drum and twanged her trumpet horn;  
 Tumultuous horror brooded o'er her van,  
 Presaging wrath to Poland—and to man!


\* \* \* \* \*

“Oh bloodiest picture in the book of time,  
 Sarmatia fell, unwept, without a crime;  
 Found not a generous friend, a pitying foe,  
 Strength in her arms, and mercy in her woe!  
 Dropped from her nerveless grasp the shattered spear,  
 Closed her bright eye, and curbed her high career;  
 Hope, for a season, bade the world farewell,  
 And Freedom shrieked—as Kosciuszko fell!

\* \* \* \* \*

“Departed spirits of the mighty dead!  
 Ye that at Marathon and Leuctra bled!  
 Friends of the world! restore your swords to man,  
 Fight in the sacred cause and lead the van!  
 Yet, for Sarmatia's tears of blood, atone,  
 And make her arm puissant as your own!  
 Oh! once again to Freedom's cause return  
 The patriot Tell—the Bruce of Bannockburn.”













## CHAPTER XXXIX.

# ENGLAND AND AMERICAN REVOLUTION.

---

### SECTION I.—ENGLAND'S STRUGGLE FOR FREEDOM OF THE PRESS (A. D. 1764–1788).

WE have already alluded to the accession of King GEORGE III. to the throne of Great Britain and Ireland upon the death of his grandfather George II., October 25, 1760. George III. was the son of Frederick, Prince of Wales, an imbecile, who died nine years before his father, King George II. George III. was the first of the House of Brunswick who was born in England; and, as we have already noticed, he gloried in the name of Briton. He had received a passable education, and was a man of pleasing address and of good intentions.

Accession  
of King  
George  
III.

George III. ascended the British throne with the firm determination to rule Great Britain and Ireland in person, and he was more responsible for the policy of his reign than the first two Georges. He was a man of good morals, and of naturally small mind, without the least capacity to use greater minds than his own for the accomplishment of his designs. He hated and was jealous of the great English statesmen of his time, especially William Pitt, the Great Commoner. He was determined that such measures only as he had conceived or adopted should be carried out during his reign. He desired to govern as well as to reign, and to be entirely free from the dictation of political parties. In the pursuit of his ends, which were always well defined, but frequently very unwise, George III. was as obstinate as it was possible for a man to be.

His  
Character  
and Aims

The total collapse of Jacobitism had left the Tory party free to take an active part in British politics again, and that party now came to the king's support with a zeal equal to that which it had manifested in behalf of the Stuarts. The Tories now constituted a "King's Party," which George III. was able to strengthen by the bestowal of the patronage still left at the disposal of the crown. His mother, the Princess of Wales, had repeatedly said to him in his youth: "George, be king." But he did not desire to undo the work of the Revolution of 1688, and

George  
III.  
and the  
"King's  
Party."

called himself a "Whig of the Revolution." He did not wish to govern against law, but simply to govern—to be free from the dictation of parties and Ministers, or, in other words, to be practically his own Prime Minister.

His Use  
of the  
Public  
Patron-  
age.

The king's idea was wholly incompatible with the Parliamentary Constitution of England as it had received its final form from the Earl of Sunderland; but George III. was resolved to carry out his idea, in which resolution he was aided by the circumstances of the time. The immense patronage of the crown—all promotion in the Church, all advancement in the army, many civil appointments—all of which had been practically usurped by the Ministers of the first two Georges, was resumed and firmly held by George III., who was aided by the character of the House of Commons.

His  
Resort to  
Political  
Bribery.

Sir Robert Walpole had used bribery as a weapon to hold the Whig party together and to keep himself in power for so long a time. George III. made use of that same corrupt means to break up that same Whig party, which was now rent by that spirit of faction which comes from a long and undisputed lease of power. The Whigs were also weakened by the rising contempt with which the English nation regarded the selfishness and corruption of the leaders and politicians of that party.

British  
Political  
Corrup-  
tion.

More than thirty years before, Gay had represented the most prominent statesmen of the time on the public stage under the guise of highwaymen and pickpockets. Said the witty playwright: "It is difficult to determine whether the fine gentlemen imitate the gentlemen of the road or the gentlemen of the road the fine gentlemen." As the "fine gentlemen" were represented by such jobbers as the Duke of Newcastle, the public contempt was fiercer than ever before; so that men turned in disgust from the intrigues and corruption of party to the young king who assumed the character which Lord Bolingbroke had represented as that of a patriotic monarch.

Whig  
Dissen-  
sions and  
Weak-  
ness.

Had the Whig leaders, Mr. Pitt and the Duke of Newcastle, held together, the one being backed by the commercial class and by public opinion, and the other by the Whig families and by the whole machinery of Parliamentary management, George III. would have struggled vainly and hopelessly. But the dissensions in the Ministry and the forced resignation of Pitt in 1761 gave the king the opportunity he so much desired. Anxious to bring the Seven Years' War to a close, George III. quickly availed himself of the weakness and unpopularity of the Whig Ministry after Pitt's retirement from office to drive the Duke of Newcastle from power by a series of studied mortifications, and to place the Earl of Bute at the head of the Ministry. The other Whig Ministers—even the Duke of Devonshire, who had been made Lord Chamberlain as a reward for his exertions in behalf of the House of Brunswick—were

Tory  
Ministry  
of the  
Earl of  
Bute.

also obliged to resign; and for the first time since the accession of that dynasty a Tory Ministry was in power, as already noticed.

The Earl of Bute was a mere court favorite, with the abilities of a gentleman usher, and was a mere puppet in the king's hands, utterly willing to do the king's will, which was simply to withdraw Great Britain from the Seven Years' War at any sacrifice of the national honor. As we have seen, Great Britain under the Earl of Bute withdrew her subsidies from Frederick the Great, and concluded the Peace of Paris with France and Spain, in February, 1763, thus reducing the King of Prussia to the necessity of concluding the Peace of Hubertsburg with Austria.

The anxiety of King George III. to end the Seven Years' War sprang solely from his desire to begin the struggle for power at home by which he sought to give his undivided attention to the task of bringing the internal affairs of Great Britain under his own control. Pitt's return to office and the union of the Whigs under his guidance was a constant peril to the king's plans so long as the war lasted. The king could depend on the dissensions of the Whigs, on the support of the Tories, on the influence of the crown patronage which he had taken into his own hands, and on the corrupt character of the House of Commons.

Though the House of Commons had become the ruling power in England, the government hanging simply on its will, it had long ceased to represent the English people. The changes in the distribution of seats, which had been brought about by the natural shiftings of population since the time of Edward I., had been recognized during the civil war between Charles I. and Parliament; but the reforms of the Long Parliament were canceled at the time of the Stuart Restoration, in 1660. Thenceforth until the reign of George III. no effort was made to check the abuse of the Parliamentary system.

Great towns like Manchester and Birmingham, which had risen with the growth of trade and manufactures in Walpole's time, had no representative in the House of Commons, which was composed principally of the representatives of boroughs which were controlled by the great nobles, who returned as members of the House of Commons whom they pleased, buying and selling seats to the highest bidder. Some of these boroughs, like Old Sarum, had actually ceased to exist for a long time.

This condition of things had its origin in the efforts of the Tudor sovereigns to establish a court party in the House of Commons by a profuse creation of boroughs, most of which were mere villages then at the disposal of the crown, and resulted in the appropriation of these seats by the neighboring landowners, who bought and sold them as they did their own estates. Even in towns which had a real claim to representation the restriction of municipal privileges ever since the fourteenth

His  
Abandonment of  
Frederick  
the Great.

The  
King's  
Object  
Therein.

Unrepresentative  
Character  
of the  
House of  
Commons.

Rotten  
Boroughs.

Their  
Origin  
under  
the Tudor  
Dynasty.

century to a small proportion of the inhabitants of such towns, and in many instances the limitation of the elective franchise to members of the governing corporation, rendered their representation simply nominal.

The  
Constitu-  
encies  
and the  
Restricted  
Suffrage.

The choice of such seats in the House of Commons depended merely on the purse or influence of politicians. Some were "the king's boroughs." Others obediently returned candidates of the Ministry in power. Others were "close boroughs" in the hands of jobbers like the Duke of Newcastle, who at one time returned one-third of all the borough members of the House of Commons. The counties and the great commercial towns could alone be said to exercise any real right of suffrage, though the enormous expense of contesting such constituencies practically left their representation in the hands of the great local families. But even in the counties the suffrage was very limited and unequal. In a population of eight millions of English people, only one hundred and sixty thousand had the right of suffrage.

Seats  
in the  
House of  
Commons  
Bought  
and Sold.

We see how far such a House of Commons represented English public opinion from the fact that even so great a statesman as Pitt in the height of his popularity had great difficulty in finding a seat at all, and he only did find one at the hands of a great borough jobber like Lord Clive. The only way to enter Parliament was by purchasing a seat. Seats were bought and sold in the open market at prices as high as four thousand pounds. A few decades later the younger William Pitt declared with indignation: "This House is not the representative of the people of Great Britain. It is the representative of nominal boroughs, of ruined and exterminated towns, of noble families, of wealthy individuals, of foreign potentates."

Whole-  
sale  
Bribery  
and Cor-  
ruption  
under  
George  
III.

The meanest motives naturally actuated a House of Commons returned by such constituencies, cut off from the influence of public opinion by the secrecy of Parliamentary proceedings, and yet intrusted with almost unlimited authority. The Duke of Newcastle had made bribery and borough-jobbing the foundation of the power of the Whig party. King George III. now used the same means as the foundation of the power which he intended to give to the crown. The royal revenue was used to buy seats and to buy votes. The king daily examined the voting-list of the two Houses of Parliament, and distributed rewards and punishments as members voted in accordance with or against his will. "The king's friends" were the only ones rewarded with promotion in the civil service, preferment in the Church or rank in the army. Pensions and court places were used to influence debates. Bribery was resorted to on a scale hitherto unknown. Under the Ministry of the Earl of Bute an office was opened at the Treasury for the bribery of members of Parliament, and twenty-five thousand pounds are said to have been paid in a single day.

The result of these corrupt practices was that the very Parliament which had hitherto bowed beneath Pitt's greatness approved the Peace of Paris in 1763 by a majority of five to one in the very face of Pitt's denunciations. Thereupon the Princess Dowager exclaimed: "Now, indeed, my son is king!" The English people had cared little for the abuses or corruptions of the House of Commons so long as the sentiment of that body fairly represented the sentiment of the nation at large, but the Great Commoner's defeat disclosed the existence of a peril of which the nation had never dreamed. The English people found themselves utterly powerless in the face of a legislative body which wielded the supreme authority in their name, but which had wholly ceased to represent the nation. The nation looked on helplessly in the face of all this corruption, conducted on a scale unparalleled in English history—a corruption which enabled the king to convert that branch of Parliament which was the guardian of public rights into a means for governing by his will. Thus public opinion had no means of expressing itself in Parliament, the body recognized as the constitutional expression of public opinion.

**Helpless-  
ness  
of the  
English  
People.**

But the public opinion thus shut out from the House of Commons found its true representation and expression in the press, and newspapers now began to constitute a "Fourth Estate," which soon became more powerful than all the rest—King, Lords and Commons combined. The political power of the press began with the impulse which Pitt had given to the national spirit and with the rise of a keener interest in politics. The press had undertaken to champion the cause of the greatly-wronged people of England, and had become the recognized court of political appeal from the corrupt House of Commons, thus venturing to criticise the acts of the king, the Ministry and Parliament with a vigor which incensed the king as well as the Ministers, the Lords and the Commons.

**Public  
Opinion  
and the  
Press.**

The Peace of Paris was odious to the English people. John Wilkes, the editor of the *North Briton* and the member of the House of Commons for Aylesbury, denounced the treaty of peace with great vehemence and attacked the Earl of Bute for negotiating it, thus venturing for the first time to attack a Minister by name; and the public journals became the mouthpieces of a popular indignation which expressed itself in public disturbances and riots, and which soon arose to so high a degree that the Earl of Bute was obliged to resign in the very face of his unbroken majority.

**John  
Wilkes  
and the  
Fall of  
the Bute  
Ministry.**

King George III., who was as much frightened as his fallen Minister, and who saw that the time had not yet come for him to rule by his own partisans alone, then appealed to Pitt to form a new Ministry; but Pitt, although he had been betrayed by the Duke of Newcastle and his follow-

**Pitt's  
Refusal  
to Form  
a New  
Ministry.**

ers, saw clearly that without the support of the entire Whig party a Minister would be a mere instrument of the crown, as the Earl of Bute had been. The Great Commoner therefore refused to take the reins of office unless a purely Whig Ministry were appointed—a condition which the king refused to accept, as it would have defeated his purpose of dividing the Whig party.

Whig  
Ministry  
of George  
Grenville.

Instead of forming a Ministry from the better faction of the Whig party, headed by the Marquis of Rockingham and the Cavendishes, who were supported by the commercial classes and who sustained Pitt, the king called upon George Grenville and the Duke of Bedford, the leaders of the smaller Whig faction which retained the narrow and selfish temper of a mere oligarchy, in whom every other feeling was overmastered by greed of power. Accordingly the Ministry of the Earl of Bute was succeeded by that of George Grenville, in the very year of the Peace of Paris, A. D. 1763.

Its  
Tyrannical and  
Unpopular Acts.

Grenville's Ministry was marked by an attempt to muzzle the press and by an effort to assert the right of Parliament to tax Great Britain's North American colonies—blows aimed at popular freedom in both England and America. Grenville was as unpopular as the Earl of Bute had been, and the press was soon filled with the most virulent libels from the several factions that divided the kingdom. Even His Majesty himself was assailed in these bitter political articles in the columns of the journals which opposed the Ministry.

Prosecution of  
John  
Wilkes.

At length, in 1764, the Ministry was aroused by an article in No. 45 of the *North Briton*, John Wilkes's journal, in which it was stated the king's speech to Parliament contained a deliberate falsehood. A general warrant was issued by the Secretary of State for the arrest of the editor, printers and publishers of the *North Briton*. Mr. Wilkes was arrested and sent to the Tower as a state prisoner, and several innocent persons were also taken into custody.

Wilkes  
as a Rep-  
resentative of  
Constitutional  
Freedom.

The Ministry soon found that in their eagerness to punish a delinquent they had raised a great constitutional question. Wilkes was a worthless profligate; and, but for the mistake of the Ministry in prosecuting him, he would have died in obscurity. The government's legalized persecution of him made him the representative of a great principle of English constitutional freedom—the liberty of the press; while it also enlisted popular sympathy on his side. By a strange irony of fortune he became the chief instrument in bringing about three of the greatest advances which the English Constitution has made since the Revolution of 1688.

Triumph  
of His  
Three  
Efforts.

This first struggle ended in the establishment of the freedom of the press. At a later period he aroused the English people to a conviction of the necessity of Parliamentary reform by his defense of the rights

of constituencies against the despotism of the House of Commons, and he led in the struggle which put an end to the secrecy of Parliamentary proceedings.

The printers of the *North Briton*, arrested under the warrant, brought action against the messengers by whom they had been arrested, and recovered heavy damages for illegal arrest. Mr. Wilkes was brought by a writ of habeas corpus before the Court of Common Pleas, but was liberated, the judges having unanimously decided that his commitment was illegal, as privilege of Parliament extended to the case of writing a libel and as the warrant did not name the person to be arrested, and was not issued by a magistrate, but by an officer of state. Wilkes recovered heavy damages against the government for illegal arrest and imprisonment.

**Failure of the Prosecution of Wilkes.**

The House of Commons gave a very different decision from that of the Court of Common Pleas by voting that No. 45 of the *North Briton* was "a false, scandalous and seditious libel," and that the author of such a production was not protected by privilege of Parliament. The House of Lords also voted that a certain pamphlet found among Wilkes's papers was blasphemous, and advised a prosecution therefor. The case of the article in No. 45 of the *North Briton* was still before the civil courts, Wilkes having been prosecuted therefor on the charge of libel. Soon afterward he fought a duel with Mr. Martin, whom he had also libeled, and was severely wounded.

**Parliament's Condemnation of Wilkes.**

As soon as Wilkes had recovered from his wound he retired to France, A. D. 1764. During his absence from England he was expelled from the House of Commons by a vote of that body, and was outlawed by the Court of King's Bench for not appearing to stand his trial on the charge of libel.

**Wilkes's Expulsion and Outlawry**

The assumption of arbitrary judicial power by both Houses of Parliament, and the system of terror which Prime Minister Grenville put in force against the press by issuing two hundred injunctions against various journals, roused a storm of indignation throughout England. The English people espoused the cause of Wilkes, as they regarded the proceedings against him as a violation of popular liberty. Every street resounded with the cry of "Wilkes and Liberty," and Grenville was obliged to succumb before this outburst of public sentiment. The result of the government's action against Mr. Wilkes was the declaration of the illegality of general warrants by a resolution of both Houses of Parliament, and no such warrant has ever since been issued.

**Wilkes as a Popular Hero and His Triumph.**

The Grenville Ministry, which had attempted to throttle the press and thus aroused public sentiment against it in England, with equal recklessness excited the indignation of the English colonists in North America by carrying the famous Stamp Act through Parliament, as

**Fall of the Grenville Ministry.**

First  
Rocking-  
ham  
Ministry.

we shall see more fully hereafter. So unpopular had the Grenville administration become that it was forced to resign in 1765; and, after another unsuccessful effort on the king's part to induce Pitt to form a new Ministry, the Marquis of Rockingham and the Whig faction which he headed undertook the reins of government in July, 1765. The new Ministry secured the repeal of the Stamp Act in March, 1766.

Pitt as  
Prime  
Minister  
and as  
Earl of  
Chatham.

In the summer of 1766 Pitt succeeded the Marquis of Rockingham as Prime Minister, and became a member of the House of Lords with the title of Earl of Chatham. Pitt sought to do justice to Ireland and the Anglo-American colonies, to inaugurate Parliamentary reform in England and to secure the transfer of the government of British India from the East India Company to the British crown; but he was obliged to retire from public affairs by ill-health occasioned by nervous prostration; and, as most of his friends followed him in his retirement, his efforts to reunite the Whig party thus came to naught.

His Retirement.

The  
"King's  
Ministry"  
under the  
Duke of  
Grafton  
and Lord  
North.

After a series of changes, a new Ministry was formed of the worst faction of the Whigs and of the new Tory party known as the "king's friends." Thus George III. had finally reached his aim in the formation of a "King's Ministry," whose strength lay in the disorganization of the Whig party and the king's steady support. This Ministry lasted fourteen years, from 1768 to 1782, and was under the leadership of the Duke of Grafton during the first two years, and during the remaining twelve years under the guidance of Lord North, who was thus Prime Minister during the whole period of the War of American Independence.

Whig  
Dissen-  
sions  
and the  
"King's  
Ministry."

For the time Pitt was removed from public life and discredited. His championship of the rights of the Anglo-American colonists had caused the king to style him "a trumpet of sedition." The Whig party was rent into the two factions under the respective leadership of the Marquis of Rockingham and the Duke of Bedford. The faction under the Duke of Bedford and George Grenville had places in the "King's Ministry," and their Parliamentary support lay in the "king's friends" and the Tory party, who were the submissive instruments of the royal will. The king's influence was preëminent when the Duke of Grafton was Prime Minister, and supreme during the Premiership of Lord North, who was the king's mere mouthpiece.

Lord  
North  
as the  
Mouth-  
piece  
of King  
George  
III.

Says a careful observer concerning the king: "Not only did he direct the Minister in all important matters of foreign and domestic policy, but he instructed him as to the management of debates in Parliament, suggested what motions should be made or opposed and how measures should be carried. He reserved for himself all the patronage; he arranged the whole cast of the administration; settled the relative place and pretensions of Ministers of State, law officers and members



of the household; nominated and promoted the English and Scotch judges; appointed and translated bishops and deans, and dispensed other preferments in the Church. He disposed of military governments, regiments and commissions, and himself ordered the marching of troops. He gave and refused titles, honors and pensions."

All this immense patronage was steadily used for the creation and maintenance of the king's party in both Houses of Parliament, and the king's influence was perceived in the dependence to which his compliant Ministry was reduced; so that George III. was really sole Minister during the fifteen years which followed the organization of this Ministry—this darkest hour of modern English history, when Great Britain lost her most flourishing colonies through the arbitrary conduct of this obstinate king and his subservient Ministers.

As Grenville's Ministry had done, the "King's Ministry," at the instigation of the king himself, renewed the struggle with public opinion in England and with the English colonists in North America. As we have seen, the corrupt House of Commons had failed in its efforts to gag the press and to transform itself into a supreme court of justice. It now began the most glaring outrage on the rights of an English constituency.

As the legal term of this corrupt Parliament had almost expired, it was dissolved in 1768, and writs were issued for the election of a new House of Commons. Wilkes returned from France and offered himself as a candidate for Parliament from Middlesex, and was elected by an overwhelming majority. His election was virtually a public condemnation of the House of Commons. The Ministry shrank from a renewal of the struggle with the agitator; but King George III., who was eager for the contest, wrote to Lord North: "I think it highly expedient to apprise you that the expulsion of Mr. Wilkes appears to be very essential and must be effected." The Ministry and the House of Commons bowed to the royal will.

After his election Wilkes surrendered himself to the Court of King's Bench; and that tribunal reversed its sentence of outlawry against him, but sentenced him to pay a fine of a thousand pounds and to be imprisoned for twenty-two months. As the English people considered him a martyr in the cause of popular liberty, a subscription was opened to pay his fine, to support him during his imprisonment and to compound his debts, which amounted to more than twenty thousand pounds. Dangerous riots broke out in London and throughout the kingdom, but the government defied public sentiment.

When the new Parliament convened, the populace of London thought that Wilkes would be released from prison to take his seat in the House of Commons; and a vast multitude assembled in St. George's Fields,

George III. Practically His Own Minister.

Tyranny of the "King's Ministry."

A New Parliament Elected.

First Re-election of John Wilkes.

Reversal of His Outlawry and His Fine and Imprisonment.

Popular Sympathy.

Military  
Outrage  
and  
Popular  
Indigna-  
tion.

round the King's Bench prison, for the purpose of conducting him to the House of Commons. The Surrey justices took the alarm and read the Riot Act; but, as the crowd refused to disperse, the military were called out and ordered to fire. One man was killed outright, and many were wounded, several fatally. This outrage created intense indignation, especially as a Scotch regiment had been employed in the shooting. The various coroner's inquests returned verdicts of wilful murder against the soldiery, and on the trials which occurred afterward several of the soldiers were convicted of murder.

Govern-  
ment's  
Approval  
of the  
Outrage.

The government defied the popular feeling by granting pardons to the soldiers who had been found guilty of murder; and the Secretary of State, Lord Weymouth, sent a letter to the Surrey justices thanking them for their spirited conduct. Mr. Wilkes published Lord Weymouth's document in his journal with an indignant commentary, terming the shooting affray "a horrid massacre," and adding a virulent invective against the entire conduct of the government. Wilkes was expelled from the House of Commons for this publication on the charge of libel.

Second,  
Third and  
Fourth  
Re-elec-  
tions  
of John  
Wilkes.

The freeholders of Middlesex unanimously reelected Mr. Wilkes at the beginning of 1769. This defiance of the electors of Middlesex led the House of Commons a step farther; and it resolved, "That Mr. Wilkes, having been in this session of Parliament expelled the House, was and is incapable of being elected a member to serve in the present Parliament." The House issued a writ for another election. In answer to this insolent claim to limit the free choice of a constituency, Middlesex elected Wilkes for the third time; and the House of Commons vented its rage in a new and more outrageous usurpation by again expelling him. He was elected for the fourth time by an immense majority of the voters of Middlesex, the vote standing eleven hundred and forty-three for Wilkes and two hundred and sixty-nine for his opponent, Colonel Luttrell; but the House of Commons voted that Colonel Luttrell ought to have been elected and that he was the sitting member for Middlesex.

Indigna-  
tion and  
Remon-  
strances  
of the  
English  
People.

By its own arbitrary discretion the House of Commons had limited the free election of the constituency of Middlesex, and had also transferred the rights of that constituency to itself by seating Luttrell as a member in defiance of the deliberate choice of Wilkes by the freeholders of Middlesex. The English people at once rose indignantly against this violation of constitutional law, as they justly considered it a fatal blow at the liberties of the subject. Petitions and remonstrances of the boldest nature poured into Parliament from all parts of England; and the press was filled with virulent attacks on all constituted authorities, some even going so far as to deny the legality of the existing Parliament

and the obligation of the people to obey the laws which it enacted. Wilkes was elected an Alderman of one of the wards of London; and the Lord Mayor, the Aldermen and the Livery petitioned the king to dissolve Parliament. A remonstrance from London and Westminster asserted that "there is a time when it is clearly demonstrable that men cease to be representatives. That time is now arrived. The House of Commons do not represent the people."

An anonymous journalist named "Junius" attacked the government in his celebrated *Letters*, which were characterized by their rancorous and unscrupulous tone and by the superior brilliancy of their style, by their clearness and terseness of statement and by the terrible vigor of their invective, thus giving a new power to the literature of the press. George III. obstinately defied public sentiment. "Junius" was prosecuted, and the petitions and remonstrances of London were haughtily rejected; but the failure of the prosecution of "Junius" established the right of the press to criticise the conduct of Parliament and Ministers and even of the sovereign himself.

**Letters of  
"Junius"  
and  
Freedom  
of the  
Press.**

Early in 1770 William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, so far recovered his health that he reappeared in the House of Lords, where he at once denounced the usurpations of the Commons and introduced a bill declaring those usurpations illegal. But his genius soon made him perceive that such outrages really owed their existence to the fact that the House of Commons no longer represented the people of England. He therefore introduced a plan for the reform of that House by an increase of its county members. He could go no farther, as he was almost alone in the proposals which he made. Even the Whig faction under the Marquis of Rockingham were opposed to Parliamentary reform, and shrank with haughty disdain from the popular agitation in which public opinion was forced to express itself—an agitation which the Earl of Chatham deliberately encouraged, although he censured its extravagance.

**Pitt's  
Fruitless  
Efforts  
for Parlia-  
mentary  
Reform.**

These quarrels between Wilkes and the House of Commons were the beginning of the influence of public meetings on English politics. The gatherings of the Middlesex electors in support of Wilkes were the preludes to the great meetings of the Yorkshire freeholders which gave the question of Parliamentary reform its importance; and the power of political agitation first made itself felt in England in the movement for Parliamentary reform and in the establishment of committees of correspondence throughout the kingdom for the purpose of promoting that reform. Political societies and clubs became prominent in the creation and organization of public opinion; and the spread of political discussion, along with the influence now beginning to be exercised by the appearance of many men in support of any political movement, made it

**Rise of  
Great  
Public  
Meetings.**

evident that Parliament would soon be obliged to reckon with the sentiments of the English people at large.

**Previous  
Secrecy  
of Parliam-  
entary  
Debates.**

But the force of public opinion was brought to bear on Parliament itself by an agent far more effective than popular agitation. The secrecy of Parliamentary proceedings, which was the source of so much of the corruption of the House of Commons, was more difficult to preserve as the English people awoke to a greater interest in their public affairs. The debates in Parliament hitherto had been printed surreptitiously, as their publication was deemed a breach of privilege. The public interest in the debates on the Middlesex election induced the printers to act more boldly.

**Legal  
Struggle  
between  
Printers  
and the  
House of  
Commons.**

In 1771 a formal complaint was made in the House of Commons; and that body issued a proclamation forbidding the publication of its debates, and summoned six printers who set this proclamation at defiance to appear at the bar of the House. One printer who refused to appear was arrested by the messenger of the House of Commons; but the printer sent for a constable, who took both before the Lord Mayor of London, Mr. Crosby. The Lord Mayor and Aldermen Wilkes and Oliver set aside the proclamation of the House of Commons as without legal force, discharged the printer and required the messenger to furnish bail or go to prison on a charge of illegal arrest. The House of Commons received the news of these proceedings of the London magistrates with the most violent indignation, sent Lord Mayor Crosby and Alderman Oliver to imprisonment in the Tower and summoned Wilkes to appear at the bar of the House. The cheers of the crowds which followed the Lord Mayor to the Tower showed that public opinion was again on the side of the press; and, as Wilkes refused to appear at the bar of the House of Commons unless he were permitted to take his seat for Middlesex, the House compromised its dignity by ordering him to attend on the 8th of April, and then adjourning to the 9th, thus acknowledging its impotence and leaving the moral victory with Wilkes.

**Publicity  
of Parliam-  
entary  
Debates  
Estab-  
lished.**

Since that event no attempt has been made to prevent the publication of the Parliamentary debates, which now constitute the most important and the most interesting feature in the periodical press. Few changes have been brought about so quietly. The responsibility of members of Parliament to their constituents was made constant and effective by the publication of their proceedings, and the English nation itself was called in to aid in the deliberations of its representatives. The English people at large were roused to a new and wider interest in public affairs, and the discussion of every subject of national importance in Parliament and in the press gave them a new political education. All phases of public opinion, as represented by the public journals, became a force in practical statesmanship, influenced the course of Parliamentary de-

bates and controlled the actions of the Ministry in a closer and more constant manner than even Parliament itself had been able to do.

The press obtained an influence from the importance of its new position which it had never had before, and the first great English newspapers took their rise during this period. Journalism took a new tone of responsibility and intelligence with the rise of such great London papers as the *Morning Chronicle*, the *Morning Post*, the *Morning Herald* and the *Times*. The London *Times*—the greatest newspaper of the world—was founded January 1, 1788. Journalists of high moral temper and high literary excellence thereafter influenced British public opinion through their columns.

Rise of  
Great  
London  
News-  
papers.

## SECTION II.—TAXATION WITHOUT REPRESENTATION (A. D. 1761–1775).

DEMOCRATIC ideas had a slow and steady but solid growth in England's North American colonies from the time of the establishment of those colonies. Those who left their homes in Europe to settle in the New World were animated with a desire for the enjoyment of pure civil, political and religious freedom. The republican spirit of the English American colonists was manifested in popular resistance to obnoxious acts of the British Parliament and to the tyranny of the royal governors sent from England to America to administer the government of the colonies. The claim of the British Parliament to legislate for the colonies was boldly denied by the colonists, who finally rebelled against the Mother Country, and, after a war of seven years, achieved their political independence and established a democratic republic under the name of *The United States of America*.

Democ-  
ratic  
Ideas  
in the  
Anglo-  
American  
Colonies.

The long wars against France oppressed Great Britain with an enormous debt and exhausted the British treasury; and the Imperial Government resolved to procure money from the Anglo-American colonies by either direct or indirect taxation, on the plea that the French and Indian War had been undertaken by Great Britain for the protection of her colonies, and that therefore it was not more than right that the colonists should bear some part of the expense of that struggle. The colonists denied the right of the Imperial Parliament to tax them, as they were not allowed any representation in that body, and maintained that "Taxation without representation is tyranny."

Colonial  
Resist-  
ance to  
Parlia-  
mentary  
Taxation.

In order to fully understand the causes which led to Great Britain's loss of her thirteen North American colonies, it will be well to take a view of the relations of the colonies with the Mother Country for over half a century till the adoption of measures by the British Ministry and

Previous  
Colonial  
Relations.

Parliament which led the colonies finally to cast off their allegiance to their mother land. The American Revolution was not a sudden violent outburst caused by recent acts of oppression, but a climax produced by a final culmination of a long series of causes tending to produce such a result.

Views  
of the  
Mother  
Country.

As the colonies were passing from infancy through youth into vigorous manhood the Mother Country viewed them in a new light. More than had been anticipated was to be hoped for from them, and more than had been expected was to be feared from them. Great Britain now perceived that her flourishing North American colonies might be of great value to her in a material way by contributing largely to her national resources, and yet the colonies might consider themselves able to refuse thus to contribute. The colonists had manifested strange symptoms of insubordination toward the crown, Parliament and the British officials in the colonies, with the most amazing fearlessness. The British authorities regarded it as high time to curb the rising spirit of insubordination in the colonies and to confine them to the course demanded by the interests of the mother land.

Board of  
Trade.

The chief agency put in operation with the foregoing end in view was the Board of Trade, a body consisting of a president and seven members entitled the *Lord Commissioners for Trade and Plantations*, organized in 1696. This body was invested with functions previously exercised by committees of the Privy Council, but by this time enlarged with extensive powers of administration. It was assigned the enforcement of the Navigation Acts, to which were now added new and oppressive provisions of colonial Courts of Admiralty. It was also authorized to execute the new acts by which the administration as well as the trade of the colonies was to be brought under stricter control. Among the first steps which it took was the royal approval of all colonial governors and the conformity of all colonial laws to the statutes of Parliament. The board entered upon its mission very heartily. It proposed the appointment of a Captain-General of the colonies, clothed with power to levy and organize an army independent of all colonial authority, as early as 1697.

Its Acts.

The Board of Trade prohibited the exportation of colonial wools, even from colony to colony, in 1698. In 1701 it even went so far as to recommend the resumption of the charters still retained by some of the colonies. Repeatedly were bills introduced in Parliament declaring the colonial charters void, but for various reasons these bills were not acted upon. The Board of Trade, winning the approval of the British authorities at home by its zeal, developed into a kind of ministerial body on being attached to a Secretary of State as its chief, in 1714. But its course was not improved. The Secretary of State with the longest

official term (1724-1748)—the Duke of Newcastle—imagined New England to be an island. In short, the Board of Trade proved by their actions that they had no regard for the welfare of the colonies, considering only the interests of the Mother Country, as though the colonies were simply a broken cluster off the British coast.

About the time of the organization of the Board of Trade, the Royal African Company, hitherto a monopoly, was enlarged so as to permit general participation in its operations, its name signifying what these operations were. But the name does not make clear the near connection of the company with the English colonies, of the oppressiveness of the company or of the restiveness of the colonies. The royal instructions of Queen Anne to the royal governor of New York and New Jersey in 1702 were: "Give due encouragement to merchants, and, in particular, to the Royal African Company." In 1750 Parliament, in making the slave trade independent of the Royal African Company, declared: "The slave trade is very advantageous to Great Britain." In fact, the slave trade was a cardinal point in the treaties of Great Britain with the European powers. The Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 required Spain to provide her colonies with slaves furnished by Great Britain only. The Treaty of Aix la Chapelle was followed by a convention in 1750 indemnifying Great Britain to the amount of four hundred thousand pounds for relinquishing the slave-trade monopoly with Spain's colonies.

The Royal African Company's grip upon the English colonies was still closer. Virginia and South Carolina vainly imposed a prohibitory duty upon the importation of slaves, as their acts were annulled by the royal command. The Mother Country upheld the slave trade because the profits of the Royal African Company and of the private slave traders were enormous, and because the dependence of the colonists in agriculture, manufactures and commerce, as well as in government, was assured so long as they were confined to slave labor. This was openly avowed in England. Thus the colonies were at the mercy of the Royal African Company so long as that company was in existence, no matter how much they resisted its action and policy.

The boards and companies of the Mother Country were heartily supported in their policies and courses by the royal governors of the various English colonies. All the colonial governors, except those of Rhode Island and Connecticut, which the colonists themselves elected, were the efficient instruments of the British home authorities. There never was a more rapacious or avaricious set of officials sent forth to administer executive authority than the prodigal courtiers, broken-down officials and sycophant colonists who successively appeared in the scramble for colonial spoils.

**Royal  
African  
Company  
and the  
Slave  
Trade.**

**Its Grip  
on the  
English  
Colonies.**

**Colonial  
Govern-  
ors.**

Lord  
Cornbury  
in New  
York.

Edward Hyde, Lord Cornbury, grandson of Edward Hyde, the great Earl of Clarendon, and cousin of Queen Anne, who was the royal governor of New York for seven years (1702-1709) was a fair illustration of these royal executives sent to rule the colonies. His arrival in 1702 was hailed with delight by a faction then suffering from the reaction resulting from Leisler's cruel execution ten years before. The opponents of Leisler and his party, now obtaining the supremacy, voted an enthusiastic grant to his lordship, the governor, and also doubled his salary. Not being satisfied, he appropriated to himself a large sum voted the next year for the fortification of the Narrows. Thereupon the colonial assembly insisted upon having its own treasurer—a demand allowed by Queen Anne in 1705. Lord Cornbury became gradually more odious to those who had welcomed him so enthusiastically. He dissolved assembly after assembly for not granting his repeated requisitions. He prosecuted two Presbyterian missionaries from England on account of their creed, but they were triumphantly acquitted by the jury in 1707. His course was the same in New Jersey as in New York, and his religious and political oppression in New Jersey caused the assembly of that colony to bring charges of oppression and corruption against him in 1707. His misgovernment was disapproved by Queen Anne's government in England, and he was accordingly recalled from America in 1709.

Burnet in  
Massa-  
chusetts.

In 1732 Colonel William Cosby, then royal governor of New York, complained to the Board of Trade of "the example of the Boston people." There was good reason for complaint with his views and the views of the Board of Trade. William Burnet, formerly governor of New York, but at this time governor of Massachusetts, had from the time of becoming governor of Massachusetts, in 1728, resolved to secure a permanent salary. The assembly of that colony absolutely refused to grant his wish, adhering to their policy of an annual grant. The governor scorned this, and threatened the colony with the loss of its charter in case his will was not granted. The Boston town meeting sustained the assembly so vigorously that Burnet held the next assembly at Salem, whereupon the assembly declared that Boston was the proper place for their meetings. The governor then replied: "Then meet in Cambridge the next time." Burnet died while a commission was on its way to England to complain of his misgovernment.

Belcher in  
Massa-  
chusetts.

Jonathan Belcher, one of the commissioners sent to England to complain of Burnet, was appointed Burnet's successor as governor. But the colonists were soon involved in the same disputes with him as with his predecessor, both having acted according to instructions rather than in accordance with their own desires. After a two years' controversy, Belcher obtained permission from England to accept a salary for the



year 1731. When he opposed the further issue of paper money, in accordance with his instructions from England, even this yearly salary was withheld. Belcher wrote to the Board of Trade that a crisis was reached. The colonial assembly requested King George II. to recall the governor's instructions, A. D. 1732. When the king refused to do so, the assembly requested Parliament to recall the governor's instructions, A. D. 1733. Parliament replied: "This is high insult upon His Majesty's government, and tending to shake off the dependency of the colonies." The assembly restored the suspended salaries, but when fresh disputes arose the assembly asked for Belcher's removal, which was granted, A. D. 1740.

In 1748 Governor Clinton, of New York, failing to obtain a grant of five years from the assembly of that province, wrote to the secretary at the head of the Board of Trade "to make a good example for all America." In 1750 he requested Parliament to impose certain taxes to provide "the civil list." This was the natural result of the exactions and clamors of the first half of the eighteenth century. Even as early as 1696, when the Board of Trade was first organized, Parliament had under consideration a scheme for the taxation of the colonies.

In the meantime Parliament had interfered in the administration of the colonies by various measures, such as extending the British post-office system to America in 1710; regulating the system of naturalization in 1740, making it uniform in the colonies, by requiring a probation of seven years and an oath of allegiance and the profession of some form of Protestantism; and, finally, from 1740 to 1751, interfering with questions of currency and of banking, in which the colonies had gone to wild lengths, issuing bills which were loaned to persons as borrowed capital.

In the meantime Parliament kept control over the Board of Trade. In 1733 it went so far as to pass the *Molasses Act*, imposing duties on molasses, sugar and rum imported into the North American colonies from the British West India Islands. The New York agent in England said of this measure: "It is divesting the colonists of their rights as the king's natural-born subjects and Englishmen, in levying subsidies upon them against their consent." Parliament was also interfering more and more with manufactures in the colonies. It capped the climax by prohibiting the exportation of hats, in 1732, and by forbidding the erection of mills for slitting or rolling iron and furnaces for making steel, in 1750. Thus the commercial rule of the Mother Country over the North American colonies, begun by the Navigation Acts of the middle of the seventeenth century, was attaining its full maturity.

British military rule over the colonies was also making its appearance. The wars between England and France having involved their respective

**Clinton's  
Appeal.**

**Parliamentary  
Taxation.**

**Commercial  
Rule.**

**Military  
Rule.**

colonies in North America, the English colonists felt their subordination beneath the military and naval commanders of their mother land. The inevitable result was that the British officers assumed a superiority over the colonists, not only over the soldiers in the field, but among the citizens in the towns.

Impressment at Boston.

In 1747 Commodore Knowles attempted to recruit his fleet by the impressment of men at Boston. The Bostonians seized his officers who were on shore, held them as hostages and assumed such an attitude of fury and of strength that Governor Shirley fled to the castle in the harbor. Commodore Knowles threatened to bombard the city. The upper classes, by their representatives in the assembly, and in a town meeting of their own, disavowed all connection with the so-called populace; but those who had risen to save their brothers and their neighbors from outrage were partially successful, though wholly deserted. Most of the men impressed into the British naval service were released by Commodore Knowles, thus restoring order and tranquillity. But there was more parade at the return of Governor Shirley than at the rescue of the artisans and the sailors of the city from their captivity.

A Commander-in-chief of the Colonies.

Potentous clouds were hovering over the colonial skies in 1754, when the colonial disputes between France and Great Britain were hurrying both nations into a final struggle for supremacy in North America and India. The Board of Trade issued an order to the English colonial governors in North America directing them to raise a fund for the general expenses of the colonies in the approaching gigantic struggle. In the same year the *Mutiny Act*, which provided for the discipline and the quarters of the British army, was extended to the colonies. In 1755 the Earl of Loudon came to America as governor of Virginia and British commander-in-chief of the forces of the thirteen colonies. As the general fund to uphold his authority was not forthcoming, Parliament in 1757 addressed the colonial assemblies with the assertion that "the claim of right in an assembly to raise and supply public money by its own act alone is derogatory to the crown and to the rights of the people of Great Britain." Thus both the property and the freedom of the colonies were involved in the assumption of military rule.

Judicial Rule.

The outlook for the colonies was gloomy in every direction. Most of the colonial judges had been appointed by the crown or by its representatives, the colonial governors, and held their offices during good behavior, thus rendering them independent. But Chief Justice Pratt, of New York, was commissioned to hold office only "at the king's pleasure." Vainly did he remonstrate with the governor of the province. Vainly did the governor sustain the remonstrance in an appeal to the Board of Trade. The board replied: "Your good behavior is a pernicious proposition." Assuming the same attitude, the secretary

at the head of the board instructed the colonial governors to issue no commissions "but during pleasure." All this was more remarkable and more menacing than any previous action of the authorities in Great Britain. New York manifested its appreciation of the perilous situation by refusing any salary to the Chief Justice; but he obtained a grant from the Board of Trade, to be paid out of the royal quit-rents of the province, A. D. 1761-'62.

The British authorities held on firmly to their "acts of trade." Francis Bernard, a former governor of New Jersey, had now become governor of Massachusetts, assuring the latter colony of the "blessing from their subjection to Great Britain." But the people of Massachusetts were soon thrown into a state of alarm by an application of the custom-house officials to the Superior Court for *Writs of Assistance*, or search-warrants to persons appointed by His Majesty's government to enforce the revenue laws, thus authorizing the British officials in the colonies to search for suspected goods which had been imported into the colonies and on which the duty had not been paid—in other words authorizing search after merchandise imported in defiance of the acts of trade. The colonists firmly resisted this encroachment on their liberties. The legality of the writs was boldly questioned by the colonists; and in February, 1761, the matter was brought before the Superior Court in Boston, presided over by Chief Justice Hutchinson, who was also the Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts. This test case excited a great deal of interest.

In this test case at Boston, James Otis, then Advocate-General of the colonies and an able lawyer, appeared on the side of the Anglo-Americans and denied the right of the Imperial Parliament to tax the colonies without their consent. He was ably assisted as counsel for the Boston merchants by Oxenbridge Thacher. James Otis was alluded to as "a flame of fire," while Oxenbridge Thacher was characterized as "soft and cool." Said Otis in his argument on this occasion: "To my dying day I will oppose, with all the power and faculties God has given me, all such instruments of slavery on the one hand and villainy on the other." Said one who was present at the argument: "Every man of an immense crowded audience appeared to go away as I did, ready to take up arms against Writs of Assistance." Said John Adams, who was also present: "Then and there the trumpet of the Revolution was sounded—the independence of the colonies was proclaimed." The writs were granted, but were little used. In 1762 the same spirit that had resisted the Writs of Assistance was manifested against the projects of taxation connected with the acts of trade, or revenue laws. Said James Otis: "Government must not raise taxes on the property of the people without the consent of them or their deputies." Said Jonathan

Writs of  
Assistance.

Case  
Argued  
by  
James  
Otis.

Mayhew, a Boston clergyman: "I do not say our invaluable rights have been struck at; but if they have they are not wrested from us."

English  
Dominion.

In the very midst of these controversies at Boston the French dominion in North America was overthrown and the sway of Great Britain established over the vast region from the Atlantic ocean on the east to the Mississippi river on the west and from the Gulf of Mexico on the south to the frozen Arctic regions on the north. Thus in the north the British dominion embraced the Hudson's Bay Territory, Labrador, Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Canada; in the center were the thirteen original English colonies; in the south the British flag floated over East and West Florida and a large portion of the West India Islands. Thus the greater part of North America was placed under the British dominion by the Peace of Paris in 1763. Such was the grand result of the great struggle known in Europe as the *Seven Years' War* and in America as the *French and Indian War*. That great struggle ended forever the French dominion in North America and made Great Britain supreme on that continent for the time being, assigning most of North America forever to the Anglo-Saxon race.

Losses  
of the  
English  
Colonies.

The effects of this British triumph over the French were very great, both upon Great Britain herself and upon her North American colonies. The colonies had passed through agonizing and troublous times, when losses of friends and of resources affected every colonial household, when feelings of grief and of revenge alternately swayed every Anglo-American. As a community, also, each Anglo-American colony had sustained its trials and reverses. Notwithstanding the reimbursements obtained from England, the English American colonies had become burdened with a debt of more than two million pounds sterling, equal to more than ten million dollars, a fourth of which encumbered Massachusetts alone, at the end of the French and Indian War. Still these debts were insignificant in comparison with the diminution of the means of defraying them or of collecting new resources. The sacrifices of war could not be measured by any single schedule; as roll after roll had to be inscribed with losses, and even then the losses of the future remained to be added, if such losses could be computed.

Gains  
of the  
English  
Colonies.

The losses of the Anglo-American colonies were balanced with their gains by way of compensation. The struggle had rid the colonies of an enemy whose proximity had been a constant menace, both from French and from Indian warfare for a full century and a half (A. D. 1613-1763). The English American colonists had shown their strength in frequent efforts and frequent successes. Far better than that, they had learned their own strength by union amongst themselves, especially in the final conflict, which united all the thirteen English colonies in one grand effort to break forever the power of the French

and their savage allies. Best of all, they had demonstrated their patriotism, their love of their own country, theretofore overbalanced by their affection for their mother land across the billowy deep, but now rising forth in proven strength from the battles and the agonies by which they had defended their country and made it the first object of their devotion.

The Mother Country had its losses and their compensations from the struggle likewise—its marks of sorrow and calamity, which were compensated for in the blaze of glory which appeared to have been kindled. Said King George III., in alluding to the Peace of Paris in 1763: "England never signed such a peace before." The ruling aristocracy thought as did the king. The ruling powers in Great Britain were dazzled by their success, thinking that their rule was irresistible, that their colonies were to be ruled, encumbered and trampled upon with impunity. A few English statesmen, of clearer foresight and of sounder principle, perceived that the British conquest of the French American colonies, if resulting in the issues to which it appeared to be inevitably leading, would bring about Great Britain's loss of her original thirteen flourishing North American colonies, which would thus become an independent nation among the powers of the earth.

For the time being, however, the English of England and the English of North America were united in sentiment. The English on both sides of the broad Atlantic were thus practically one people, in consequence of their united exultation of triumph over a common foe; the assurance of prosperity under a common king, who had just ascended the British throne in his young manhood; along with the ties of a common law, a common literature, a common language, a common ancestry. New hopes and new aspirations were appearing for the English on both sides of the ocean as a result of the subversion of the French power in the New World. The humbling of the savage red man, the conquest of a rival race from Europe—both these made the English the undisputed owners and occupants of the vast continent of North America north of the Gulf of Mexico and the Spanish possessions to the south.

The temporary unity of the English race in Europe and America was of short duration. As we shall see, the old troubles between Great Britain and her North American colonies not only remained, but were extended. The British fleet upon the North American coast was converted into a revenue squadron to enforce the commercial rule of Great Britain; and the colonies were organized in divisions, with a British commander-in-chief, British officers and British troops—in short, with a British standing army—to keep up British military rule in the colonies. The British authorities soon adopted more serious measures to maintain their whole commercial and military system in the colonies.

**Losses  
and Gains  
of the  
Mother  
Country.**

**Tempo-  
rary  
Unity.**

**Old  
Troubles  
Extended.**

Parties  
in the  
Mother  
Country.

The vast majority of the people of Great Britain considered the American colonists as countrymen, who suffered as they themselves suffered or prospered as they themselves prospered. But the ruling classes in the Mother Country, whether Whig or Tory, regarded the colonists as subjects. This was the position assumed by the king, the Ministry and Parliament. Thus it was the ruling classes, not the masses, in Great Britain that were prepared to deal rigorously with the colonies.

Views  
of the  
Colonists.

This stand of the British ruling classes was readily perceived by the Anglo-American colonists. For whatever occasional liberal acts they had thanks to offer they gave them to the British people, knowing that the British nation must be united in any liberal measures. But if they had any complaints to offer or any outcries of indignation to utter they must be presented to the British government itself. The colonists were very well aware that the British masses, as a whole, were on the side of their American kinsmen, and that the king, the Ministry and Parliament deserved all the reproach to be offered for any arbitrary or oppressive measures.

Parties  
in the  
Colonies.

The colonists were not united in their resistance to the arbitrary system of taxation imposed upon them by the British Parliament. The thirteen Anglo-American colonies had a population of almost two millions in 1763, of whom very many were negro slaves and servants scattered in different proportions throughout the colonies. A large portion of the free inhabitants themselves were more accustomed to subjection than to independence. There were many who were wholly unfit to defend their liberty, and many who were wholly unfit to raise it to a position of security.

The  
Two  
Sides.

Thus, in the account of the provocations which led to the rebellion of the Anglo-American colonists against the British government, we find the case to be not so much the colonies against the Mother Country as the better class of the colonists against the ruling class in the Mother Country. This distinction is very important, as nothing else can explain the amount of blundering on the one side, or the amount of wisdom, comparatively speaking, on the other side. Nor can anything else so clearly indicate the difference between the principles at stake—the principles of the old British aristocracy on the one hand, and the principles of a new commonalty on the other, all fervent with vigor and with hope. The principle of *no taxation without representation*, for which the Anglo-American colonists contended, was a time-honored English principle centuries old, and was first forcibly and effectively asserted by the English people, through their representatives in Parliament, during the reign of Edward I., five centuries before the period under consideration, when arbitrary taxation by the king was forbidden and when the

sound principle was established that the English people could be taxed only by their legally-chosen representatives.

As we have perceived, Great Britain was heavily burdened by the increased debts resulting from the Seven Years' War. The ruling classes in Great Britain maintained that it was not reasonable or just that the Mother Country alone should be encumbered with this heavy indebtedness, but that her North American colonies should bear their proper share of it, as the war had been waged by Great Britain largely in the interest of the colonies and for their benefit. But the colonies were already bearing their full share of the debts and difficulties resulting from the war. Still the ruling powers in England resolved to ease the burdens of the British people at home by the taxation of the colonies by acts of Parliament. The colonists had always borne British taxation of a certain sort, such as taxes for the so-called regulation of trade. But the British Ministry and their adherents in Parliament now resolved to impose upon the colonies taxes for revenue as well as taxes for the regulation of trade. Though substantially there was no difference between the two kinds of taxes, the colonists held that there was a vital difference between the two.

Therefore, when, in the beginning of 1764, Parliament asserted that it had "a right to tax the colonies," implying in any manner whatever, the colonists became alarmed. The Massachusetts assembly appointed a committee of correspondence with the other colonies. James Otis, in a pamphlet entitled *The Rights of the British Colonies*, asserted "that by this constitution [meaning the British Constitution] every man in the [British] dominions is a free man; that no part of His Majesty's dominions can be taxed without their consent." Said the celebrated Lord Mansfield, Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench: "The book is full of wildness." But many of the colonists were dissatisfied, and their assertions of independence were so positive that Lord Chief Justice Mansfield would have considered them as wilder still. In a short time the colonists boldly denied the right of Parliament to impose any taxes whatsoever upon the colonies, as they were not represented in that body, thus asserting that "Taxation without representation is tyranny."

However, for the time being the colonists were willing to endure taxation under the name of trade regulation, provided it was not levied under the name of revenue. But the Ministry adopted the very style which was obnoxious to the colonists, by securing the passage by Parliament of an act imposing duties on sugar and other articles imported into the colonies, with the expressed declaration that "it is just and necessary that a revenue be raised in America for defraying the expenses of defending, protecting and securing the same." Thus both

Point of  
Taxation.

Discus-  
sion.

Sugar  
Act.

the commercial rule and the military sway over the colonies was to be maintained and enforced by a policy and system of taxation by the Imperial Parliament at Westminster. This was the course decided upon by Prime Minister George Grenville and his party by the Sugar Act of 1764. It was a step fraught with the most serious consequences for Great Britain and her North American colonies. The remonstrances of the colonists, especially those of New York and Rhode Island, were in vain, and tended only to precipitate measures in England, as a series of acts far more decisive were passed ten months after the Sugar Act.

Stamp  
Act and  
Other  
Obnoxious  
Measures.

In February, 1765, George Grenville, who was still at the head of the British Ministry, introduced into Parliament a bill requiring the Anglo-American colonists to purchase for specified sums, and to place on all written documents, stamps furnished by the British Imperial Government. This was a measure which no former British Ministry had the courage to attempt. In 1732 Sir Robert Walpole said: "I will leave the taxation of America to my successors, who have more courage than I have." In 1759 Pitt said: "I will never burn my fingers with an American Stamp Act." At the same time the jurisdiction of the Admiralty Court was extended, to the exclusion, therefore, of juries in many cases hitherto brought before them; while a *Mutiny Act*, or a *Quartering Act*, was also passed, requiring the colonists to furnish supplies and quarters for the British troops quartered amongst them; but neither the Admiralty Court Act nor the Quartering Act had the significance implied in the passage of the *Stamp Act*, above alluded to.

Indigna-  
tion in  
America.

The passage of the Stamp Act, in 1765, produced universal indignation in America. Most of the colonial legislatures passed resolutions denouncing the measure, and James Otis in Massachusetts and Patrick Henry in Virginia thundered forth eloquent denunciations of the act. Said James Otis, in denouncing the Stamp Act: "Arbitrary principles, like those against which we now contend, have cost one King of England his life, another his crown, and they may yet cost a third his most flourishing colonies." While speaking in the Virginia assembly, at Richmond, of the fate of tyrants of former periods, Patrick Henry exclaimed: "Cæsar had his Brutus, Charles I. his Cromwell, and George III."—Here the speaker was interrupted by cries of "Treason! treason!" from some of the members; and Hr. Henry, after pausing a moment, said: "May profit by their example. If that be treason, make the most of it." A part of some bold resolutions which Henry had introduced were adopted; and the colonists were aroused to a firm stand to defend their rights, and the determination was made to resist the execution of the odious Stamp Act.

James  
Otis and  
Patrick  
Henry.

General  
Colonial  
Resist-  
ance.

The young Colonel George Washington, who had been a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses for six years, called the Stamp Act



“this unconstitutional method of taxation.” The Rev. Jonathan Mayhew, of Boston, characterized it as “that unparliamentary procedure.” Speaking of Patrick Henry and the Virginia assembly, Oxenbridge Thacher, of Massachusetts, wrote: “Those Virginians, those Virginians are men.”

Associations called *Sons of Liberty* were formed; and the stamps were seized on their arrival in the colonies, and secreted or burned. The officers, called “Stamp Distributors,” who had been appointed to sell the stamps, were so much despised and insulted that they soon relinquished their business; and on the day appointed for the Stamp Act to go into effect there was not an officer who had the courage to attempt the enforcement of the law.

**Sons of  
Liberty.**

On motion of James Otis, the Massachusetts assembly invited the other Anglo-American colonies to send committees of their assemblies to meet in a colonial congress in New York city. Under the leadership of Christopher Gadsden, South Carolina was the first colony to appoint a committee, or delegation, to the proposed colonial congress, or convention.

**Colonial  
Congress  
Called.**

This convention of delegates, known as the *Stamp Act Congress*, assembled in New York city, October 7, 1765, and remained in session for fourteen days. Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Maryland and South Carolina were represented in this colonial congress, or convention, by committees of their respective assemblies, according to the original plan. New York, New Jersey and Delaware were represented by committees otherwise appointed. New Hampshire and Georgia were not represented in the congress, but promised to adhere to the decisions it would reach. Virginia and North Carolina were not represented, but sympathized with the movement which led to the assembling of the congress. Timothy Ruggles, of Massachusetts, a military officer in the French and Indian War, was chosen president of the congress; and among the delegates to the congress were James Otis, of Massachusetts, and Christopher Gadsden, of South Carolina, the prime movers in the calling of the congress. The Massachusetts delegation had instructions from their colonial assembly “to insist upon an exclusive right in the colony to all acts of taxation.”

**Stamp  
Act  
Congress.**

The Stamp Act Congress issued a petition to King George III. and addresses to the two Houses of the British Parliament; but by far the most important of their documents was a *Declaration of Rights*, which, while acknowledging the allegiance which the colonists owed to the crown of Great Britain, laid particular stress upon their claim “to all the inherent rights and liberties of natural-born subjects within the Kingdom of Great Britain.” The rights which this declaration especially demanded for the colonies were the rights of taxation only

**Its  
Declara-  
tion of  
Rights.**

by their own legislative assemblies and of trial by their own juries—two rights which were assailed by the Stamp Act. The declaration noted the injustice and impolicy of the recent proceedings of the Ministry and Parliament in the Mother Country, and earnestly demanded that the Stamp Act and the other obnoxious Parliamentary statutes should be repealed at once. This Declaration of Rights, dated October 19, 1765, though preferring no claim to independence, was the forerunner of the celebrated Declaration of Independence, issued almost eleven years later.

Effect  
of the  
Declara-  
tion.

This Declaration of Rights was signed by the representatives of six colonies—Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Maryland; and it was practically the act of eleven of the thirteen colonies, the two exceptions being Virginia and North Carolina. As the declaration of eleven colonies it went forth to convince the Mother Country, as well as the colonies themselves, that the thirteen colonies were no longer separate settlements, but that they were one country. In fact, the whole course of this congress was so audacious, so startling was the effect in English eyes, that Lord Chancellor Northington exclaimed: "I declare, as a lawyer, that they have forfeited all their charters." All their bold work was done in a three weeks' session.

Colonial  
Mob  
Spirit  
and Law-  
lessness.

Thus far the colonists seemed to have been able to restrain their feelings, bearing all their provocations with all the composure of men who felt conscious that they had right on their side; but this state of things did not continue, and the colonists now gave vent to their long-pent-up indignation. When a New Jersey delegate to the Stamp Act Congress who had refused to sign the acts of the congress returned to his home he was hanged and burned in effigy by his constituents. The spirit of lawlessness, the mob spirit, had manifested itself in Boston and in Providence for some months, effigies being paraded and houses being sacked there amidst scenes of violence which were abhorrent to all the law-abiding classes of the Anglo-American people in the towns, many sincere opponents of the principle of "no taxation without representation" deeply regretting the riotous action of their lawless fellow-countrymen. In fact, it is much wiser to look back upon such lawless and anarchistic actions with regret than to regard them as the actions of heroes, as such actions to-day would be condemned well-nigh universally as lawlessness and mob rule, as anarchy, no matter what the provocation. Besides, that mob spirit, instead of intimidating the Mother Country, had the opposite effect of increasing her oppressiveness, as would be the natural effect upon any government upon the face of the earth, so that the British government was not peculiar in that respect.

On the 1st of November, 1765, the appointed day for the Stamp Act to go into effect, universal silence prevailed in English America; all business was suspended; the courts were closed; the bells were muffled and tolled; and the vessels in the harbors displayed their flags at half-mast. Not a stamp officer remained to execute the law, and a great riot occurred in New York city on that day. Suddenly the Anglo-Americans manifested their indignation in an open disregard of the law. The houses of British officials in American cities were assailed by mobs, and loyalists were burned in effigy.

**American  
Resist-  
ance.**

The colonists agreed to import no more goods from the Mother Country until the obnoxious law should be repealed. This arguement was strengthened by a resolution to encourage domestic manufactures, even by such means as eating no lamb or mutton, so that there might be sufficient wool for the Anglo-American people. This was communicated to all the colonies from New York city by a Committee of Correspondence, thus causing a general abstinence from the use of British goods throughout the colonies. The watchwords of the colonists were non-importation and non-consumption, and this course was renewed repeatedly during the following years. The great change that resulted in the external appearance of society coincided with the change of feelings perceptible throughout the colonies.

**Non-im-  
portation.**

As we have already seen, the Grenville Ministry had been succeeded by another Whig Ministry under the Marquis of Rockingham in July, 1765. In the meantime the want of stamp officers and the disinclination of the colonial authorities themselves to enforce the Stamp Act had the effect of making the obnoxious law a dead letter everywhere; and the determination of American merchants not to import British goods into America alarmed the British merchants so much that they united with the colonists in petitioning Parliament to repeal the Stamp Act. The new British Ministry under the Marquis of Rockingham found that it must either compel the colonists to submission or have the odious act repealed. William Pitt and Edmund Burke, the greatest English statesmen of that time, championed the cause of the colonists on the floor of the House of Commons. As the obnoxious law had increased the expenditures of the British government without augmenting its revenues, the liberal Whig Ministry of the Marquis of Rockingham heeded the general clamor for repeal from both sides of the Atlantic. Amidst the throngs of tradesmen and merchants, politicians and statesmen, discussing the question of repeal, the agents of the colonies in England were fully alive to the interests with which they were charged. The foremost among these colonial agents was the one from Pennsylvania—Dr. Benjamin Franklin—who, when called before the House of Commons, assured that body that the colonies never would

**Repeal  
of the  
Stamp  
Act.**

submit to the Stamp Act or to any similar Parliamentary statute, however much they might yield upon the point of duties to regulate commerce. Pitt said in a speech in the House of Commons: "In my opinion this kingdom has no right to lay a tax on the colonies. \* \* \* America is obstinate! America is almost in open rebellion! Sir, I rejoice that America has resisted. Three millions of people so dead to all feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves would have been fit instruments to make slaves of the rest." In the House of Lords, Lord Camden said in a speech in favor of the repeal of the Stamp Act: "Taxation and representation are inseparably united. God has joined them. No British Parliament can separate them. This position I repeat, and will maintain to my last hour. It is founded on the law of nature. It is itself an eternal law of nature." After long and angry debates in Parliament the act was repealed on the 6th of March, 1766.

Anglo-American Rejoicings.

The repeal of the odious Stamp Act was hailed with manifestations of joy in both England and America. The colonists testified their gratitude to William Pitt and Edmund Burke, the great friends and champions of the Americans in Parliament. Other friends of the Americans were John Wilkes and Colonel Barre, whose two names were given to the town of Wilkes-Barre, in Pennsylvania. These rejoicings of the Anglo-American colonists in the spring of 1766, unmingled with any apparent misgivings as to the future, demonstrated the depth of their attachment to their mother land. The colonists voted statues to William Pitt and King George III., with indemnities to those who had suffered from the riots of the previous year, amidst a turbulence of congratulations unprecedented in English America.

Declaratory Act.

The fires of discord were soon kindled anew. For the purpose of securing the repeal of the Stamp Act, Pitt had accompanied the repeal with a *Declaratory Act*, which asserted that Parliament had the right to bind the colonies in all cases whatsoever, the declared purpose of the act being "for the better securing of His Majesty's dominions in America upon the crown and Parliament of Great Britain in all cases whatsoever." This was Parliament's answer to the colonial demand for the repeal of the Stamp Act. Parliament repealed the Stamp Act, but did not relinquish its claimed right to tax the colonies without representation from them.

Mutiny Act and Other Oppressive Measures.

Under the sanction of the Declaratory Act, the British Parliament passed new acts as obnoxious in principle to the Anglo-Americans as the Stamp Act had been. To intimidate the colonists, British troops were sent to America in June, 1766; and Parliament passed a *Mutiny Act*, requiring the colonists to furnish food and shelter to these royal troops. In June, 1767, a tax was imposed on several articles imported

into the colonies. In July of the same year an act was passed creating a board of trade and commissioners of customs in the colonies, independent of the colonial assemblies; and another act was passed which suspended the legislative power of the assembly of New York, because that body had refused to supply the royal troops in that colony with food or quarters. These tyrannical measures highly exasperated the Americans.

New non-importation leagues were now formed in the colonies; and pamphlets and newspapers instigated the American people to oppose the oppressive measures of the British Ministry and Parliament. John Dickinson, a native of Maryland and then a resident of Pennsylvania, in his *Letters from a Farmer*, wrote thus: "Let us complain to our parent, but let our complaints speak at the same time the language of affliction and veneration."

Early in the next year—February, 1768—the Massachusetts assembly issued a *Circular Letter* to the assemblies of the other Anglo-American colonies, soliciting their coöperation in endeavors to procure a redress of grievances; and before the close of the year almost every colonial assembly had asserted that the Imperial Parliament had no right to legislate for the colonies. The British Ministry, highly exasperated at this boldness, ordered the Massachusetts assembly, in the name of the king, to rescind the Circular Letter; but the assembly, by an almost unanimous vote, refused to rescind. James Otis and Samuel Adams were the principal leaders of the assembly on this occasion.

The spirit of resistance in Massachusetts was manifested by all classes. The students of Harvard College declared the proceedings of their tutors unconstitutional, and named a tree *Liberty Tree*. The new commissioners of customs, who arrived in Boston, in May, 1768, were detested by the colonists. The Boston Cadets—a volunteer guard of the royal governor of Massachusetts—refused to appear in a procession if the commissioners were invited therein. In June, 1768, the commissioners seized a sloop belonging to John Hancock, because that individual had refused to pay the duty on the cargo on the arrival of the vessel. When the seizure had become known, the commissioners were assailed by a mob and compelled to flee for refuge to Castle William (now Fort Independence), in Boston harbor.

In consequence of the rebellious temper of Massachusetts, British troops were ordered to Boston. The Bostonians thereupon called a town meeting, which requested the royal governor, Francis Bernard, to convene the colonial legislature. As he refused their request, the town meeting called upon the people to arm themselves, to be in readiness on account "of an approaching war with France," and summoned a colonial convention of delegates from the entire colony of Massa-

Anglo-American  
Resist-  
ance.

Circular  
Letter.

Commis-  
sioners  
of  
Customs  
at  
Boston.

Massa-  
chusetts  
Conven-  
tion.

chusetts. The convention assembled in due time and requested the royal governor to summon the colonial assembly. The governor refused this request and accused the convention of treason. The convention deprecated the governor's displeasure and addressed a petition to King George III.

British  
Troops  
in Boston.

The colonial convention of Massachusetts was just adjourning when, at the call of Francis Bernard, the royal governor of the colony, seven hundred royal troops, under General Thomas Gage, were brought to Boston, in order to frighten the people into submission. On a quiet Sunday in September, 1768, these troops entered the city, with charged muskets and fixed bayonets, with drums beating and flags flying, and with all the insolence of a conquering army taking possession of a captured city. As the indignant Bostonians refused to furnish the troops who had been sent among them as instruments of slavery with provisions or quarters, Governor Bernard caused some of them to be quartered in the State House, some in Faneuil Hall and others in tents on the city common. Josiah Quincy, Jr., one of the sturdiest young men of Boston, exclaimed: "O my countrymen! what will our children say when they read the history of these times, should they find we tamely gave way, without one noble struggle, the most invaluable of earthly blessings? To banish folly and luxury, correct vice and immortality, and stand immovable in the freedom in which we are free indeed, is eminently the duty of each individual at this day."

Act Con-  
cerning  
Trials in  
England.

To cap the climax of oppression, early in 1769 the British Parliament revived an old law of the time of Henry VIII., which required the royal governor of Massachusetts to send the leaders of the late disturbances in Boston to England for trial on a charge of treason. This was worse than any of the taxation measures of Parliament, worse than any extension of the Admiralty Courts, worse than any demands for quarters for royal troops, worse than any creation of commissioners of customs, worse than any suspension of colonial assemblies, as it struck a direct blow at the safety of the person as well as at the freedom of British subjects. George Washington, the young planter of Mt. Vernon, Virginia, indignantly declared: "Our lordly masters in Great Britain will be satisfied with nothing less than the deprivation of American freedom." He also wrote as follows: "That no man should scruple or hesitate a moment to use arms in defense of so valuable a blessing is clearly my opinion. Yet arms, I would beg to add, should be the last resource." At that time Washington was a member of the Virginia assembly, which passed resolutions expressive of his sentiments. In Massachusetts the Suffolk grand jury indicted the royal governor and the commissioners of customs for libeling the colony to the Ministry. Joseph Hawley, member of the Massachusetts assembly

from Northampton, declared in the assembly that he knew not "how Parliament could have acquired the right to legislation over the colonies."

The New York assembly now submitted to the Mutiny Act, thus giving great offense to many of the people of that colony, one of them being imprisoned for his violent denunciation of the assembly. Thus the colonists were divided into parties, these divisions becoming more and more distinct with the progress of time. There were five parties at the time in question: 1. The royalists, who unqualifiedly supported the Mother Country. 2. The neutrals, who did not side with either the Mother Country or the colonial opponents of Parliament's policy. 3. The resistant colonists who opposed the system of Parliamentary taxation without resorting to lawlessness and mob violence. 4. The Sons of Liberty, consisting of turbulent and excited spirits. 5. The rioters, consisting of the lawless class who resorted to mob violence. The third mentioned class, who opposed the Parliamentary encroachments on colonial rights without resorting to mob violence were the most numerous class and were the class upon whom the issue depended, and they were obliged to steer a course between the royalists and neutrals on one side and the Sons of Liberty and the rioters on the other side.

**Colonial  
Divisions.**

The situation at Boston was a very serious one from the time the royal troops were quartered there, and it was with the utmost difficulty that the better class and the law-abiding citizens restrained the lawless class and the rioters from assailing the troops. The wiser and law-abiding Bostonians were seeking to procure the peaceful withdrawal of the troops from the city, but the gravity of the situation increased daily to the boiling point, as the exasperated people of Boston could with difficulty be restrained from committing acts of violence. The soldiers and the more excitable citizens quarreled almost daily; and on the 2d of March, 1770, several citizens were beaten by some of the troops. This created great excitement among the inhabitants; and on the evening of the 5th (March, 1770) several hundred collected in the streets for the avowed purpose of driving the troops from the city. A fight ensued, in which three of the citizens were killed and two badly wounded. The mob retired before the troops. The city bells rang an alarum, and very soon several thousand of the citizens assembled under arms. Governor Hutchinson made his appearance, and appeased the excited people by promising that justice should be rendered in the morning. At the demand of the Bostonians, the soldiers were removed from the city; and Captain Preston and eight of the troops, who had fired on the mob, were tried for murder. Thus a new burden was placed on the shoulders of the moderate and law-abid-

**Boston  
Riot and  
Massacre.**

ing citizens. The authorities in England had to be convinced that the violence of the mob was as much deplored by the better class of Bostonians as was the action of the soldiery. Captain Preston and his eight accused troops were defended at the trial by two of the popular leaders, John Adams and Josiah Quincy, Jr., both of these young Boston lawyers being censured by their more excitable and lawless fellow townsmen for acting as counsel for the accused soldiers. Happily, for the good name of Boston, Captain Preston and six of the troops were acquitted. The other two were found guilty of manslaughter, and were branded in one hand and then discharged. Those Bostonians who were killed in the riot were considered martyrs to liberty; and "The Boston Massacre," as the affray was called, was for many years kept alive by anniversary orations in Boston and its vicinity.

Repeal of  
Tax  
Laws.

The disturbances in America, and the complaints of the British merchants, whose interests were injured by the operation of the American non-importation leagues, induced the British Ministry to propose, on the very day of the Boston Massacre, the repeal of all the obnoxious tax laws, except the duty on tea. The tax on tea was retained for the double purpose of aiding the English East India Company and maintaining the right of the Imperial Parliament to tax the colonies. Lord North, who was then Prime Minister of Great Britain, not comprehending the fact that the colonists were contending for a great principle, and that they considered the imposition, by the British Parliament, of a tax on a single article as a stroke at their liberties just as much as if a hundred articles were taxed, believed that they would not complain of a small duty on one article of luxury. The Anglo-Americans therefore continued their non-importation leagues against the purchase and use of tea.

Tea  
Tax.

Regula-  
tors of  
North  
Carolina

In 1771 the exactions of British government officials produced rebellion in the interior of North Carolina. The insurgents, whose object was to redress the grievances of the people, called themselves *Regulators*. In a bloody skirmish on the Alamance Creek, on the 16th of May, 1771, the Regulators were conquered by Governor Tryon, and six of their number were hanged for treason; but the spirit of opposition among the people was not crushed, and was frequently manifested in popular outbreaks. On the 9th of June, 1772, a party of sixty-four armed men from Providence, Rhode Island, burned the British schooner *Gaspé*, which had run aground while cruising in Narragansett bay for the purpose of enforcing the revenue laws.

The  
Gaspé.

In consequence of the destruction of the royal military storehouses at Portsmouth, in New Hampshire, by a mob, Parliament passed an act for the trial in England of any incendiaries who burned the royal



stores or ships in America. The lawless colonists were not pleased to think that they had brought this Parliamentary legislation upon themselves by their incendiarism. The more violent the course of events, the fewer moderate men in America. The prudent were finding less fault with the violent, and a common sympathy was fusing all American parties except the royalists, also called loyalists, or Tories. The Boston town meeting issued a memorial not only against the acts of which it had to complain, but also against those it appeared to have to apprehend.

The year 1773 brought forth new developments in the struggle between Great Britain and her North American colonies, demonstrating how fast the colonies were uniting in their common cause of offering a united resistance to the taxation policy of the Mother Country. Resolutions from Virginia, where a committee was appointed to correspond with the other colonies looking to united action, brought forth a favorable response from Rhode Island, without leading to immediate results; but with the progress of the year the colonies found themselves the better prepared to combine in resistance to the introduction of large quantities of tea, the article still subject to duty. Before the close of the year these Committees of Correspondence in some of the colonies were diligent in their work of uniting the colonies by an interchange of views and intelligence. By this time the Anglo-Americans had become divided into but two great parties. The majority, who opposed the taxation policy of the British government, were called *Whigs*; and the minority, who sustained the Mother Country, were called *Tories*.

As the Americans refused to use or purchase tea so long as a duty remained on that article, Lord North, who was still unwilling to relinquish the right of Parliament to tax the colonies, agreed to permit the East India Company to send over their tea on terms that would make it cheaper in America than in England. This attempt to bribe the colonists into submission by means of cheap tea only aroused their indignation so much the more, and they refused to receive a cargo of tea. Governor Hutchinson of Massachusetts, in defiance of the popular will, ordered the landing of several cargoes which arrived at Boston in December, 1773. The people of Boston held meetings in Faneuil Hall and resolved that no tea should be landed; and on the night of the 16th of December, 1773, a party of about sixty men, disguised as Indians, went on board of the tea-ships and broke open three hundred and forty-two chests of tea and emptied their contents into the waters of the harbor. This lawless destruction of private property was a melancholy proceeding for many even of the more resolute citizens; but the majority, under the leadership of Samuel Adams, was now com-

**Additional Act Concerning Trials in England.**

**Committees of Correspondence.**

**Whigs and Tories**

**Tea Ships Sent to America.**

**Destruction of Tea at Boston.**

posed of the rash as well as the resolute; and a party from the country had been the most active in destroying the tea. In February, 1774, a small quantity of tea landed at Boston, imported to private order, was also destroyed.

Refusal  
to Receive  
Tea at  
Other  
Colonial  
Ports.

Tea was also destroyed at New York city and at Annapolis, in Maryland. But most of the tea landed at New York and all landed at Philadelphia was quickly returned to England. All tea landed at Charleston, in South Carolina, was stored in damp cellars, where it was spoiled. The returning of the tea or the storing of it where it lost its virtue was a far wiser course than destroying it, the latter course being also less bold, as it was effected by men who were disguised or so maddened as to scorn disguise.

Slave  
Trade.

We have already observed how small a portion of the provocations complained of by the Anglo-American colonies consisted of mere measures of taxation. The repugnance of the colonies to the slave trade brought out renewed expressions of opposition and abhorrence. In 1770 the Virginia assembly attempted to restrict the traffic, but her royal governor received instructions from the authorities in England to veto all colonial acts affecting the interests of the slave dealers. The efforts of other colonies in this direction encountered similar obstacles. Bill of colonial assemblies and petitions to the king, caused by startling development of the infamous traffic, were alike ineffectual, and over six thousand slaves were imported into South Carolina alone from Africa and the West Indies in less than nine months. A public meeting in Fairfax county, Virginia, in 1774—of which young George Washington was chairman—passed the following resolution: "It is the opinion of this meeting that during our present difficulties and distress no slaves ought to be imported into any of the British colonies on this continent; and we take this opportunity of declaring our most earnest wishes to see an entire stop forever put to such a wicked, cruel and unnatural trade."

Boston  
Port Bill  
and Other  
Retaliatory  
Measures.

The breach between Great Britain and her North American colonies was rapidly widening. So highly exasperated at the destruction of tea in Boston harbor was Lord North's Ministry that it resolved upon retaliatory measures; Massachusetts, and Boston in particular, being singled out for special punishment; the Ministry being also incensed by disturbances occasioned by royal salaries to the governors and the judges of the colonies. The *Boston Port Bill*—passed by Parliament on March 7, 1774—ordered the port of Boston to be closed against all commerce, and removed the seat of the colonial government of Massachusetts to Salem. Another act—passed by Parliament on March 28, 1774—virtually subverted the colonial charter of Massachusetts, by providing that the councilors and superior judges should all be

appointed by the crown; that the inferior judges and other officers should be appointed by the governor, who was to be invested with well-nigh absolute authority; that no town meetings should be held, except for elections, unless the governor chose to make any additional exceptions; and that no juries should be summoned, except by the sheriffs, who were appointed by the governor. A third act—passed by Parliament on April 21, 1774—provided that persons charged with murder in the colonies in support of the British imperial government should be sent to another colony or to England for trial—a shrewd precaution in view of the certainty of collision between the colonists and the imperial government under the system about to be put in force. A fourth act provided for the quartering of royal troops in the colonies.

These four tyrannical acts of the British Parliament—by which Massachusetts was to be crushed and by which the other colonies were to be overawed—aroused the most intense indignation in English America, which was increased when General Thomas Gage, who had just been appointed governor of Massachusetts, went to Boston with troops to enforce the obnoxious acts of Parliament. Under his direction the port of Boston was closed on the 1st of June, 1774. The people of Massachusetts and her sister colonies deeply sympathized with the suffering Bostonians, whom they regarded as martyrs to the cause of freedom.

Another act of the British Parliament at this time was designed to separate the thirteen original English colonies from the newly-acquired French province of Canada to the north. The French colonists in the Mississippi Valley had exhibited an inclination to sympathize with the English colonists on the Atlantic coast, being actuated by the same irrepressible longings for liberty. The French settlers in the Illinois country had petitioned the British authorities for a form of government in which they could have some share, but their petition was ignored by a political system in which only royal officials had any part, whereupon these French colonists vehemently protested, A. D. 1773. To overawe such spirits, particularly to prevent them from combining with the rebellious spirits of the English colonies to the east of them, Parliament passed what was called the *Quebec Act*, by which the province of Canada was extended from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Mississippi river and was placed under a government mainly of royal officials; but these French colonists were conciliated by the restoration of their French laws and of their Roman Catholic Church, A. D. 1774.

Being thus separated from their French neighbors to the north and west of them, the inhabitants of the thirteen English colonies on the Atlantic coast were quickly combining against their mother land. A

**Colonial  
Indigna-  
tion.**

**General  
Thomas  
Gage at  
Boston.**

**Quebec  
Act.**

**Conventions and Provincial Congress in Massachusetts.**

circular from Boston to the towns of Massachusetts called upon them to make common cause in resisting the oppressive measures which had recently been enacted by Parliament. Several of these towns, or, more properly, counties, were represented by delegates in a colonial convention at Boston, in which measures of defense were adopted, amongst which "the military art" and "a Provincial Congress" were prominent. In August, 1774, a convention of Middlesex county at Concord resolved that to obey the recent acts of Parliament "would be to annihilate the last vestiges of liberty in this province." In September of the same year a convention of Suffolk county at Milton recommended that the detested acts of Parliament "should be rejected as the attempts of a wicked administration to enslave America." In October the Massachusetts assembly resolved itself into a Provincial Congress. This decisive step of Massachusetts was hastened by the sympathy of her sister colonies and the rapidly-growing spirit of unity which inspired all the thirteen original English colonies.

**National Spirit in America.**

Young George Washington, of Mt. Vernon, Virginia, had written almost three months previously concerning the lately-passed acts of Parliament and the actions of General and Governor Gage at Boston: "Has not this, has not this exhibited an unexampled testimony of the most despotic system of tyranny that was ever practiced in a free government? \* \* \* Shall we supinely sit, and see one province after another fall a sacrifice to despotism? \* \* \* My nature recoils at the thought of submitting to measures which I think subversive of everything that I ought to hold dear and valuable." Such was the sentiment pervading the majority of the people of the old thirteen English colonies in the year 1774. A national spirit was thus aroused amongst the Anglo-Americans by the arbitrary and oppressive enactments of the British Parliament.

**A Continental Congress Called.**

As early as 1773 Dr. Benjamin Franklin—at that time the agent for Massachusetts, New Jersey and Georgia as well as for Pennsylvania—wrote officially to the Massachusetts assembly recommending a Continental Congress consisting of delegates from all the thirteen original English colonies of North America. Almost a year later Rhode Island acted upon Franklin's recommendation, being the first colony to do so. In May, 1774, Virginia followed Rhode Island's example, recommending that the Congress should meet annually and voting that "an attack upon one colony was an attack upon all British America." Rhode Island was the first colony to appoint delegates, and her action in this respect was almost immediately followed by Massachusetts, and all the other colonies, excepting Georgia, doing the same in a very short time. Some of the colonies appointed their delegates by vote of their assemblies, some by vote of colonial conventions,

and others by committees, either single colonial committees or committees of towns or counties.

The First Continental Congress convened in Carpenter's Hall, in Philadelphia, September 5, 1774, all the thirteen colonies, with the single exception of Georgia, being represented. The Congress chose Peyton Randolph, of Virginia, for its president, and Charles Thomson, of Pennsylvania, for its secretary. Some of the popular leaders in their respective colonies were delegates to the Congress, such as Samuel Adams and John Adams, of Massachusetts; John Jay, of New York; John Dickinson, of Pennsylvania; George Washington, Patrick Henry and Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia; Christopher Gadsden and John Rutledge, of South Carolina. Said Patrick Henry, the recognized orator of the Revolution: "If you speak of eloquence, Mr. Rutledge is by far the greatest orator; but if you speak of solid information and sound judgment, Colonel Washington is unquestionably the greatest man on that floor." The exigencies of the situation required all that the leaders and all that the members as a body could do. The Stamp Act Congress of 1765 had an insignificant work to perform in comparison with the work of this Continental Congress.

**The First  
Conti-  
nental  
Congress.**

The First Continental Congress approved the conduct of Massachusetts in her opposition to the oppressive measures of the British Ministry and Parliament; agreed upon *Declaration of Rights*; recommended non-intercourse with Great Britain so long as the obnoxious laws of Parliament remained unrepealed; and voted a petition to King George III. and addresses to the people of Great Britain, British America and Canada, besides letters to Newfoundland, Nova Scotia and the two Floridas. Four acts of Parliament—the Sugar Act, the Stamp Act, the Tea Act and the act creating commissioners of customs—had embraced the principle of taxation. The other arbitrary and oppressive acts were the Quartering or Mutiny Act, the act suspending the legislative functions of the New York Assembly, the act concerning trials for treason and incendiarism, the Boston Port Bill, the act suspending the charter of Massachusetts, the act for sending accused persons to England or to another colony for trial, the new act for quartering troops in the colonies, the Quebec Act and those portions of the Stamp Act relating to Admiralty Courts and royal salaries.

**Its  
Action.**

In its celebrated Declaration of Rights the First Continental Congress took much the same ground as to the allegiance and the general rights of the colonies as that taken by the Stamp Act Congress nine years before. In its paper called the *American Association*, recommending commercial non-intercourse with Great Britain and her dependencies so long as the obnoxious acts of Parliament remained on the British statute-books, was the following declaration: "We will

**Declara-  
tion of  
Rights  
and  
American  
Associa-  
tion.**

neither import nor purchase any slaves imported after the first day of December next; after which we will neither be concerned in it ourselves, nor will we hire our vessels nor sell our commodities or manufactures to those who are concerned in it." In signing the American Association, October 20, 1774, the First Continental Congress showed itself humane as well as courageous, considerate for their inferiors as well as resolute toward their superiors, or those claiming to be such. The meeting of the First Continental Congress, in September, 1774, may be regarded as the first step in the formation of the present American Union.

Adjourn-  
ment  
of the  
Congress.

After adopting the various documents just mentioned and described, amid the most earnest and lively debates and with some lack of unanimity, the First Continental Congress finally adjourned, October 26, 1774, after a session of a little over seven weeks, to meet on the ensuing 10th of May (1775), unless the British government in the meantime should redress the grievances complained of by the colonists.

Peace  
or War.

During the session of the Congress young George Washington wrote thus: "More blood will be spilled on this occasion, if the Ministry are determined to push matters to extremity, than history has ever yet furnished instances of in the annals of North America." Joseph Hawley, of Massachusetts, wrote to John Adams in Congress: "After all, after all, we must fight." Adams read the letter to the Virginia delegates in Congress, whereupon the fervid Patrick Henry exclaimed: "I am of that man's mind!" Not every Virginia delegate shared that opinion, as Richard Henry Lee said to Adams on parting with him: "All the offensive acts will be repealed. \* \* \* Britain will give up her foolish project."

American  
Prepara-  
tion.

The Americans were prepared for whatever the future had in store for them, whether peace or war—not, very true, with armies or fortresses, not with the material resources which seemed so requisite for an armed conflict, but, with what was of greater importance, that spirit which was the source of all outward strength and success. This spirit had its intellectual and physical supports. The controversies with the Mother Country had thrown to the surface, in the colonies, orators and statesmen whose minds were making daily fresh contributions to the thought and power of humanity. Physically, the Anglo-Americans were augmenting their stores and expanding their domains. The highway to the great Western wilderness was opened with the first settlement made in the territory comprised in the present State of Tennessee as early as 1768, when Fort Loudon was founded. Though old weaknesses lingered, though disputes between colony and colony continued, in consequence of boundary disputes or in consequence of doctrine, all these controversies were sunk into insignificance as a re-

sult of the union that the greater controversy with the Mother Country had called forth.

In a speech in the House of Lords on January 20, 1775, the Great Commoner, William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, said, in allusion to the First Continental Congress: "For myself, I must declare and avow that in all my reading and study of history, and it has been my favorite study—I have read Thucydides, and have studied and admired the master states of the world—that for solidity of reasoning, force of sagacity and wisdom of conclusion, under such a complication of difficult circumstances, no nation or body of men can stand in preference to the general congress at Philadelphia."

**Pitt's  
Estimate  
of the  
First  
Conti-  
nental  
Congress.**

During the summer of 1774 the people of English America, and particularly those of Massachusetts, were earnestly preparing for the inevitable struggle with the Mother Country. They engaged daily in military exercises, chose leaders and held themselves ready to fly to arms at a moment's warning. On this account they were called *Minute-men*. Martial exercises continued throughout the ensuing autumn and winter, and public speakers everywhere encouraged the colonists to resist the tyrannical measures of the British Parliament. General Gage, governor of Massachusetts, and British commander-in-chief in America, becoming alarmed, fortified Boston Neck, and seized great quantities of ammunition found in the New England colonies. A false rumor, which spread over New England in September (1774), that British warships were cannonading Boston, produced such excitement that within two days thirty thousand armed men were on their way to that city. Gage's course in Massachusetts excited such temper in the First Continental Congress that Christopher Gadsden, of South Carolina, proposed an immediate attack upon Gage in Boston, under the authorization of the Congress.

**Minute-  
men.**

**Gage's  
Warlike  
Action at  
Boston.**

As we have already seen, the Massachusetts assembly had resolved itself into a Provincial Congress in October, 1774. Meeting at Cambridge, this Provincial Congress chose Joseph Warren as its president; and on October 26, 1774—the very day of the adjournment of the first session of the Continental Congress at Philadelphia—this Provincial Congress took a decisive step in the arming of Massachusetts which rendered war inevitable. This decisive step was the organization of the colonial militia, consisting of all the able-bodied men of the colony, one-fourth of them being Minute-men. Soon afterward the Provincial Congress made provision for supplying the equipments and munitions of an army, and the whole was placed under the direction of a *Committee of Safety*, of which John Hancock was chairman. The crisis had now plainly arrived, as the British authorities would not sit quietly while such warlike proceedings were in progress, nor could they

**Arming  
of Massa-  
chusetts.**

undertake any repressive measures without arousing the colonists to fly to arms at once.

Arming  
of Other  
Colonies.

The example of Massachusetts was soon followed by her sister colonies. All the other twelve colonies, either by act of assembly or by colonial convention, or by individual resolution, assumed a state of defense or resistance toward the British imperial government. All this time the American national spirit was fostered by the American Association and by the committees appointed to enforce the policy of non-intercourse with the Mother Country. Though not universally prevalent the American Association had extended itself more widely and more deeply than any previous bond of union amongst the colonies. Eager to maintain their ties and their rights, the Anglo-Americans drew out their lines. In point of courage and of sacrifice this display of spirit was sublime, though it was no great show in a military point of view.

A New  
British  
Parlia-  
ment.

The end of the year 1774 found a new Parliament in session in Great Britain, in which Lord North and his Ministry had an irresistible majority of supporters. Amongst the members of this new British House of Commons was Henry Cruger, a native of New York, who, after having settled as a merchant at Bristol, in England, was elected mayor of that great city and also chosen a member of the House of Commons. In the prime of manhood, flushed with generous feelings toward his native America, though opposed to her revolutionary action, he took the floor of the House of Commons to make his maiden speech against the severities which the Ministry were threatening to inflict upon the English colonies in North America. Said he: "Can it be believed that Americans will be dragooned into a conviction of this right of Parliamentary taxation?" His plea was reëchoed by some of the greatest men in the House of Commons, among them Edmund Burke; while in the House of Lords the great William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, also pleaded the American cause.

Parlia-  
ment's  
New  
Oppres-  
sive Acts.

With the opening of the year 1775 the Earl of Chatham and Edmund Burke exerted themselves to their utmost—the former in the House of Lords and the latter in the House of Commons—to obtain justice for the colonies; but vainly, as the petition of the Continental Congress to King George III. was refused a hearing, and Parliament declared Massachusetts to be in a state of rebellion and the other colonies to be abetting her action. Parliament accordingly rejected the Earl of Chatham's conciliatory proposals, and, instead, passed the *New England Restraining Act*, which prohibited the New England colonies from fishing on the banks of Newfoundland, and cut them off from all trade, except to Great Britain, Ireland and the British West Indies, thus striking a severe blow at the prosperity of New England.



Parliament soon extended the provisions of this act to the other colonies, excepting New York, North Carolina and Georgia, which three colonies were excepted on account of their expected submission to the Mother Country.

At the same time Lord North introduced into Parliament what he called a conciliatory proposition, which provided that Parliament should not tax the colonies if the colonies would tax themselves and thus raise the sums which Parliament should consider necessary. To this proposal Edmund Burke replied: "They complain that they are taxed without their consent. You answer that you will fix the sum at which they shall be taxed. That is, you give them the very grievance for the remedy." As the Prime Minister's proposition was thus clearly understood by the greatest orator and statesman in the House of Commons, it was not likely to be misunderstood by the exasperated colonists. Outside of Parliament there were few Englishmen who took any active part in relation to American affairs, one of the few being Dr. Tucker, Dean of Gloucester, who suggested that Parliament should declare the colonies separated from the Mother Country until they humbly asked for forgiveness and restoration.

**Lord North's Pretended Conciliation.**

As Parliament refused justice to the colonists, they saw that they must either defend their rights and liberties by force of arms or slavishly submit to the oppressive acts of Parliament. They chose the former alternative; and, convinced of the justice of their cause, they resolved to bid defiance to the military and naval power of Great Britain.

**American Resistance.**

On February 26, 1775, a detachment of one hundred and fifty British troops was sent from Boston to seize some cannon at Salem, but as they did not find it there they proceeded toward Danvers. On their march thither they arrived at a bridge, at first occupied by a few country people, but soon defended by a company of militia under Colonel Pickering. The draw being up, the British troops endeavored to cross the stream in boats, and in doing so they wounded, by a free use of their bayonets, the men who prevented them from getting the boats. A serious conflict was prevented only by the mediation of the Rev. Mr. Barnard, of Salem, who persuaded the British officer, Lieutenant-Colonel Leslie, to return to Boston provided the troops were permitted to cross the bridge. The colonial militia consented to this; and the troops crossed the bridge, advanced a few rods, then faced about and retired without obtaining the cannon which they had come to seize.

**Collision near Danvers.**

In the meantime, while affairs were rapidly approaching a crisis in New England and while Massachusetts was arming for the inevitable conflict with the Mother Country, the great orator, Patrick Henry,


**Patrick Henry's Great Speech.**

was arousing the Virginians to action by his fiery eloquence and his amazing boldness. In his ever-memorable speech in the Virginia assembly at Richmond, in March, 1775, he called upon his fellow Virginians to imitate their brethren in New England. He concluded this masterly speech thus: "It is in vain to extenuate the matter. Gentlemen may cry *peace, peace*; but there is no peace. The war is actually begun. The next gale that sweeps from the north will bring to our ears the clash of resounding arms! Our brethren are already in the field! Why stand we here idle? What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what course others may take; but as for me, *give me liberty or give me death.*"

### SECTION III.—WAR OF AMERICAN INDEPENDENCE (A. D. 1775–1783).

Bloodshed  
at  
Lexington  
and  
Concord.

ON the 1st of April, 1775, there were three thousand British troops in Boston; and on the night of the 18th General Gage sent eight hundred troops, under Lieutenant-Colonel Smith and Major Pitcairn, to destroy the stores of ammunition which the colonists had gathered at Concord, about sixteen miles north-west from Boston. Although this movement was made secretly, the people were aroused by the vigilant Dr. Joseph Warren and Paul Revere, who had obtained a knowledge of the designs of Gage. So thoroughly had the people been aroused by "the midnight ride of Paul Revere" that when, on the morning of the 19th (April, 1775), Pitcairn approached the village of Lexington, six miles from Concord, he found eighty armed Minute-men ready to oppose him. Pitcairn, riding forward, exclaimed: "Disperse, you rebels! lay down your arms and disperse!" And when they refused obedience, his troops, according to his orders, fired upon the patriots, killing eight of them. This was the first bloodshed in the great *American Revolution*. After the short skirmish at Lexington, the British immediately proceeded to Concord, killed several more Minute-men in a skirmish there, and destroyed the stores of ammunition. The king's troops then hastily retreated to Boston, fired upon along the whole route of their retreat by the people from behind trees, stone-fences and buildings; and by the time they reached Boston, in the afternoon of the same day (April 19, 1775), they had lost in killed and wounded two hundred and seventy-three men, while the American loss was only one hundred and three men. This day's affray is often called *The Battle of Lexington*.



MONUMENT TO NATHAN HULL, U.S. SENATOR, 1800-1858. THE STATUE IS BY JAMES H. RAY, AND THE MONUMENT BY JAMES H. RAY. THE MONUMENT IS IN THE GARDEN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.



Concerning the bloodshed at Lexington and Concord and the retreat to Boston, Dr. Joseph Warren, the president of the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, wrote to the Committees of Safety, of that province: "An inhuman soldiery, enraged at being repulsed from the field of slaughter, will, without the least doubt, take the first opportunity in their power to ravage this devoted country with fire and sword. We conjure you, therefore, that you give all assistance possible in forming an army." Massachusetts voted that no less than thirty thousand men ought to be sent into the field by New England, herself furnishing almost half that number. The other three New England colonies—New Hampshire, Rhode Island and Connecticut—soon followed her example, though not responding so liberally as the leading New England colony desired. In the other Anglo-American colonies outside of New England the agitation was in similar proportions. George Washington, of Virginia, wrote from Philadelphia as follows: "The once happy and peaceful plains of America are either to be drenched with blood or inhabited by slaves. Sad alternative! But can a virtuous man hesitate in his choice?"

The intelligence of the bloodshed at Lexington and Concord produced the greatest excitement throughout the Anglo-American colonies and everywhere aroused the colonists to action. The Revolution made rapid progress in the Southern colonies, and before the close of the summer of 1775 the power of every royal governor from New England to Georgia was utterly destroyed. When Lord Dunmore, the royal governor of Virginia, seized a quantity of powder belonging to the colony Patrick Henry demanded and obtained full indemnity, and Dunmore was forced to seek refuge on a British man-of-war in Norfolk harbor.

The news of the affrays of Lexington and Concord, traveling slowly, reached the town of Charlotte, the county-seat of Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, where a county convention was then in session. The county convention issued what has been called *The Mecklenburg Declaration*, which has sometimes been called a declaration of independence, but which, in its more authentic form, simply declared the colonial constitution, in its regular form, to be suspended, and the legislative and executive power of the colony to be vested in the Provincial and Continental Congresses for the time, May 20, 1775. The Mecklenburg Declaration was communicated to the Provincial Congress of North Carolina, but it did not obtain the sympathy of that assembly. It was likewise forwarded to the North Carolina delegates in the Continental Congress at Philadelphia, but they took so little interest in it that they did not lay it before their colleagues in the Congress.

**Its Effect.****The Revolution in the Southern Colonies.****Mecklenburg Declaration.**



the army of the United Colonies. \* \* \* And you are hereby vested with full power and authority to act as you shall think for the good and welfare of the service." Washington's devotion to the American cause was fully attested by his refusal to accept any pecuniary compensation for his services, and his acceptance of the commission of commander-in-chief was in itself the greatest act of sacrifice that he could make.

In the meantime, a Committee of Safety, appointed by the Provincial Congress of Massachusetts, held its sittings in Cambridge, regulated military operations, and appointed General Artemas Ward commander-in-chief of the provincial forces, and Richard Gridley chief engineer. On the 25th of May, 1775, large reinforcements for General Gage arrived from England, under the command of Generals William Howe, Henry Clinton and John Burgoyne. The British army in Boston, thus increased to twelve thousand men, prepared to drive the rebellious provincials from the vicinity of the city. Gage issued a proclamation declaring all Americans in arms to be rebels and traitors, and offering an amnesty to all who would submit to British authority, except Samuel Adams and John Hancock, whom he intended to seize and send to England to be hanged.

On the night of the 16th of June, 1775, General Artemas Ward sent one thousand provincial troops, under Colonel William Prescott, to take possession of and fortify Bunker's Hill, in Charlestown. By mistake, in the darkness of the night, Prescott and his troops ascended Breed's Hill, on which they erected a strong redoubt before morning. When the astonished British commanders saw this redoubt on the morning of the 17th (June, 1775) they opened upon it from Copp's Hill, in Boston, and from the ships-of-war in the harbor, a fierce cannonade, which continued until noon with little effect. The Americans had received a reinforcement of five hundred troops during the forenoon, thus increasing their force in the redoubt to fifteen hundred men.

On the same day (June 17, 1775), about noon, three thousand British troops, under Generals Howe and Pigot, crossed the Charles river from Boston and marched up the hill to attack the redoubt, firing cannon as they ascended. When the British column had approached within ten rods of the redoubt Colonel Prescott gave the order to fire, which his troops executed with such terrible effect that the advancing enemy was driven back with heavy loss. The British again advanced and assailed the redoubt, but met with a second disastrous repulse. They ascended the hill a third time; and the battle raged fiercely until the Americans, having exhausted all their ammunition, were driven from the redoubt and compelled to retreat across Charlestown Neck. As the Americans retreated, one of their number, the heroic General

Com-  
mittee  
of Safety.

British  
Reinforce-  
ments.

Gage's  
Procla-  
mation.

American  
Redoubt  
on  
Breed's  
Hill.

Battle of  
Bunker  
Hill.

Death of  
General  
Warren.

Joseph Warren, was shot dead. Among the killed on the British side was Major Pitcairn, who commanded at Lexington. The British took possession of and fortified Bunker's Hill, while the Americans intrenched themselves on Prospect Hill. The Americans lost four hundred and fifty men in killed, wounded and missing; while the British lost one thousand and fifty-four. During the battle Charlestown was set on fire by order of General Gage, and five hundred houses were destroyed. Although fought on Breed's Hill, this memorable engagement, which was the first real battle of the War of the American Revolution, is known as the *Battle of Bunker Hill*.

Washing-  
ton Takes  
Command  
of the  
American  
Army.

General Washington received news of the battle of Bunker Hill while in New York city, on his way to take command of the American army at Cambridge, Massachusetts, which was then closely besieging the British army under General Howe in Boston. Hastening on his journey, he arrived at Cambridge, his headquarters, and assumed command of the army July 3, 1775, and the following day, exactly one year before the American Declaration of Independence, he issued an order to his troops in which he said: "The Continental Congress having now taken all the troops of the several colonies which have been raised or which may be hereafter raised for the support and defense of the liberties of America into their pay and service, they are now the troops of the United Provinces of North America; and it is hoped that all distinctions of colonies will be laid aside, so that one and the same spirit may animate the whole. \* \* \* The general requires and expects of all officers not engaged on actual duty a punctual attendance on divine service, to implore the blessings of Heaven upon the means used for our safety and defense." Thus appealing to their patriotism and their obligations to Providence, Washington asked his countrymen to do their duty in the great struggle just begun.

His Diffi-  
culties.

Not all Americans were disposed to listen to him. As a matter of fact, very few reached the standard of the commander-in-chief, either as soldiers or as citizens. When we consider their deficiencies and his embarrassments we must recollect that he and those like him represented the better class of the Anglo-American people, already mentioned as most wise and most prominent during the years of agitation against arbitrary taxation without representation. On the other hand, those who did not measure up to the demands of the situation were of the other classes, the rash and the timid, the over-presumptuous or the over-submissive.

Siege of  
Boston.

Washington contemplated besieging the British army in Boston, his first object being merely to shut up the enemy in the city, July, 1775. In August he vainly tried to draw an attack from the British on his own lines. In September he designed attacking the enemy in



their own lines, but deferred the contemplated assault in response to the objections of his officers, without, however, relinquishing his purpose.

During all this time Washington's army had no arms, no ammunition, no pay from the Continental Congress; and the commander-in-chief had no support from his officers or troops, and at times even no obedience from his troops or from the crews of the American armed vessels in Boston harbor acting in concert with his army. It was very difficult to fill the American ranks to any degree at all proportioned to the operations of the siege of Boston. Washington wrote to the president of the Continental Congress thus: "There must be some other stimulus besides love for their country to make men fond of the service." To a personal friend he thus expressed himself: "Such a dearth of public spirit and such want of virtue, such stockjobbing and fertility to obtain advantages of one kind and another, I never saw before, and pray God's mercy that I may never be witness to again. \* \* \* I tremble at the prospect. \* \* \* Could I have foreseen what I have experienced and am likely to experience, no consideration upon earth should have induced me to accept this command." It was under such circumstances and such conditions that the American commander-in-chief conducted the siege of Boston in 1775.

**Deficiencies of His Army.**

By this time the Americans had a general government as well as an army. The Continental Congress, declaring themselves to be acting "in defense of the freedom that is our birthright," adopted measures adequate to the demands of the cause, military, financial, diplomatic. Congress continued the organization of the army and attempted to organize the militia; appointed a naval committee and called a navy into existence; provided hospitals; issued several million dollars of *Continental Money*; created a treasury department; organized a post-office department; recommended to the several colonies to frame governments for themselves; reduced the relations with the Indian tribes to a system; sent a last petition to King George III. and addresses to the people of Great Britain and Ireland, and also to the people of the city of London and the people of the island of Jamaica; and, finally, more significant than all else, Congress appointed a committee of secret correspondence with Europe. In short, the Continental Congress assumed all the functions of a general government for all the thirteen revolted Anglo-American colonies, and its authority was readily recognized throughout the colonies.

**American General Government.**

Early in August, 1775, Georgia joined the other twelve colonies in the revolt against the Mother Country. A fourteenth colony offered itself in the new "Colony of Transylvania," the present Kentucky, within whose limits the first permanent settlements were made by James

**Proposed New Colony of Transylvania.**

Harrod at Harrodsburg in 1774 and by Daniel Boone at Boonesboro' in 1775, Lexington being also founded the same year and named after the village in Massachusetts where the first blood in the American Revolutionary War was shed. But the Continental Congress refused to admit a delegate from the new "Colony of Transylvania," as Virginia claimed full jurisdiction over the territory of this would-be new colony. The American confederation accordingly remained as the Thirteen United Colonies.

New  
England  
Towns  
Bom-  
barded.

Besides the siege of Boston there were other military operations in New England. A British detachment was repulsed in an effort to land at Gloucester, Massachusetts. British ships bombarded Falmouth, now Portland, in Maine; Bristol, in Rhode Island, and Stonington, in Connecticut. The Americans sent out privateers, those commissioned by Washington, especially the "famous Manly," as he called one of his captains, doing effective work in Massachusetts bay. A projected expedition against Nova Scotia was abandoned because of the friendly attitude of its people.

American  
Privateers.

American  
Invasion  
of  
Canada.

During the summer of 1775 some New England and New York troops, under General Philip Schuyler, went down Lake Champlain. Owing to illness, Schuyler was obliged to relinquish the command of his troops to General Richard Montgomery, who, on the 3d of November, captured St. John, on the Sorel, or Richelieu river, after a siege of more than a month. While the siege of St. John was progressing, Colonel Ethan Allen, who, with eighty men, had attacked Montreal on the 25th of September, was made a prisoner and carried to England in irons. Colonel Bedell, with some American troops captured Chambly; and, on the 13th of November, Montgomery took possession of Montreal.

Capture of  
St. John,  
Chambly  
and  
Montreal.

Arnold's  
Expedi-  
tion.

At Point au Trembles, twenty miles above Montreal, Montgomery was joined by seven hundred and fifty Americans under Colonel Benedict Arnold, who had left Cambridge, Massachusetts, in September, 1775, and marched along the Kennebec and Chaudiere rivers to the St. Lawrence, suffering almost incredible hardships on the way. On the 5th of December the American forces, under Montgomery and Arnold, laid siege to Quebec. For three weeks the Americans had besieged Quebec, when, on the 31st of December (1775), they attempted to take the city by assault. Montgomery was killed and Arnold wounded, and their troops were repulsed with great loss. In the month of June, 1776, the American invaders were entirely driven out of Canada.

American  
Repulse  
at Quebec.

While the Americans were suffering misfortunes in Canada, the Virginians were prosecuting the Revolution with zeal and success. Governor Dunmore, at the head of a force of Tories and negroes,

ravaged South-eastern Virginia, but was repulsed in an attack upon Hampton on the 24th of October (1775); and, after proclaiming open war, he was defeated by the Virginian militia in a severe battle near the Dismal Swamp, twelve miles from Norfolk. For the purpose of revenging himself upon the rebellious Virginians, Dunmore burned the city of Norfolk on the 1st of January, 1776; but, after committing other atrocities on the sea-board, he was finally driven away and went to England.

Governor  
Dun-  
more's  
Defeat in  
Virginia.

Burning  
of  
Norfolk.

In North Carolina the Americans won a brilliant victory in February, 1776, when a thousand American militia under Colonel Moore defeated a force of fifteen hundred Scotch Highlanders and North Carolina Regulators who had enlisted under the royal banner, thus preventing the reestablishment of royal authority in that province.

American  
Victory  
in North  
Carolina.

The American people were very far from being unanimous in their rebellion against the British government. From the first there had been a very large and powerful party in open sympathy with the Mother Country, consisting of those who had never opposed the taxation and other colonial measures of the British Ministry and Parliament, and also of those who had opposed those measures until the outbreak of hostilities, but who were unwilling to go the lengths of armed rebellion. Some were on the British side from conviction, some from fear and others from self-interest. These American partisans of Great Britain were called *Tories*, or *Loyalists*, or *Royalists*. They were very roughly handled and persecuted by the *Whigs*, or rebellious Americans. The Quakers and German plain sects of Pennsylvania were generally averse to the Revolution because they were opposed to bearing arms or to resisting constituted authority, "the powers that be," according to Scripture. The Tories in America and the Tories in Great Britain were practically one party, while the Whigs of America and the Whigs of Great Britain had a fellow feeling. The *Sons of Liberty* were an American organization furthering the Revolutionary cause.

Tories, or  
Loyalists.

After the struggle had commenced, companies and regiments of loyal, or royal Americans, or Tories, began to abound. Some of these Tories were very roughly handled by their Whig neighbors, who did not respect their persons or their property. Isaac Sears, one of the New York Sons of Liberty, who was impatient at the moderate course pursued by the Committee of Safety, brought in an armed force from Connecticut, to destroy the press of *Rivington's Gazetteer*, a Tory journal. Such unwarrantable proceedings did not have a salutary effect upon the American cause.

Armed  
Tories  
and  
Their  
Hard-  
ships.

Isaac  
Sears's  
Violent  
Action.

Great Britain herself was determined and was, for the most part, united in the determination to crush the American rebellion against

**Great  
Britain's  
Vigorous  
Action.**

her authority, though William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, along with Edmund Burke and a few others still plead for the Americans, and one of these American sympathizers in Parliament said: "The time will come when the Americans will celebrate the glorious Revolution of 1775 as we do that of 1688." The last petition of the American Congress to King George III. was rejected; and Parliament passed a bill of confiscation against the trade, the merchandise and the shipping of the Anglo-American colonists; providing for the impressment of all captured American crews into the British naval service. Parliament also made gigantic preparations to crush the American rebellion, augmenting the British army in America to forty thousand men, the increase being partly by British and partly by German troops, seventeen thousand Hessians being hired by the British government from the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel and other petty German princes. The employment of these hirelings was severely denounced by Lord Camden, the Earl of Shelburne and the Duke of Richmond in the House of Lords, and by Sir John Cavendish in the House of Commons.

**Hessian  
Mercen-  
naries.**

**Siege of  
Boston.**

All this time Washington was closely besieging General Howe's army in Boston, but his attention was not wholly centered there, his voice being heard in all directions—in the expedition to Canada, in the posts of New York, on board the American cruisers, at the meetings of committees and assemblies, in the colonial legislatures, in the halls of Congress itself—everywhere directing what was to be done and the spirit in which it was to be done. His military ability, his executive talents, his intellectual greatness, were all fully tested during these trying months of the winter of 1775-'76. His activity, his judgment, his executive power, and, more than all, his moral power, were no more conspicuous in all his long and memorable career than in those momentous months when he was holding the British army shut up in Boston. The difficulties of his situation were increased by the expirations of enlistment of his troops and the supplying of their places with new recruits, as well as by the inadequate supply of munitions of war.

**British  
Works  
Cannon-  
aded.**

As the British government early in 1776 made such extensive arrangements to crush the rebellion against its authority in North America, the Continental Congress urged General Washington to attack the British army under General Howe in Boston. On the evening of the 2d of March, 1776, Washington, having fourteen thousand men under his command, opened a heavy cannonade upon the British works around that city; and on the night of the 4th a portion of Washington's army, under General John Thomas, intrenched itself upon Dorchester Heights, now South Boston. The siege continued until the 17th, when Howe and his troops were allowed to evacuate the city.

**Howe's  
Evacua-  
tion of  
Boston.**

The British army sailed to Halifax, in Nova Scotia, with the families of fifteen hundred Tories; and Washington's army immediately took possession of the city, to the great joy of its delivered inhabitants.

The recovery of Boston by the American army was certainly a remarkable victory. Washington wrote to his brother concerning the event thus: "I have been here months together, with what will scarcely be believed, not thirty rounds of musket cartridges to a man. \* \* \* We have maintained our ground against the enemy under this want of powder, and we have disbanded one army and recruited another within musket shot of two and twenty regiments, the flower of the British army, whilst our force has been but little, if any, superior to theirs; and at last have beaten them into a shameful and precipitate retreat out of a place the strongest by nature on this continent, and strengthened and fortified at an enormous expense." Washington and his countrymen had just cause for their elation and exultation over this victory, as it was the first instance thus far in which the British and the Americans encountered each other as actual armies.

In the face of the victory at Boston, the Americans found themselves confronted by new perils, and the spring of 1776 opened with greater apprehensions than the preceding year, the whole coast being defenseless and New York and Charleston threatened with attack.

During the winter General Charles Lee had been sent by Washington to take command of troops for the defense of New York against any attack which might be made upon that city by Sir Henry Clinton, who had left Boston in January with a part of Howe's army. After the evacuation of Boston, Washington proceeded to the Hudson and fortified the passes of the Highlands.

In the meantime Sir Henry Clinton, with British land troops, in conjunction with a fleet from England under Sir Peter Parker, was on his way to attack Charleston, South Carolina. The South Carolinians made ample preparations to defend their chief city against any attack of the enemy. On Sullivan's Island, near the city, a fort was built of plametto logs and garrisoned by five hundred Americans under the gallant Colonel William Moultrie; and before the British were prepared to attack the city General Charles Lee arrived in Charleston and took the chief command of the American troops there. The British fleet under Parker and the land troops under Clinton opened a furious assault upon Fort Moultrie on the 28th of June, 1776. During the conflict a beautiful flag which had been presented to Moultrie's regiment by the ladies of Charleston had its staff broken by a cannon-ball from the British fleet, and a brave sergeant named Jasper leaped down from one of the bastions, and, in the midst of the iron hail that was pouring from the fort, had a sponge staff brought to him, fastened the

Washington's  
Remark  
on the  
Victory.

New  
Perils.

Lee and  
Washington  
in  
New  
York.

British  
Attack  
on Fort  
Moultrie  
Repulsed.

flag to it, stuck the staff in the sand, ascended the bastion and took his place in the fort. After a stubborn conflict of ten hours, the British army was repulsed with heavy loss, and sailed away for New York, leaving the Southern colonies free from the turmoil of war for more than two years. General Clinton joined Howe's army at New York on the 1st of August.

The  
Issue of  
American  
Independ-  
ence.

A few days after the repulse of the British at Charleston, the Continental Congress, sitting in the old State House in Philadelphia, immortalized itself by a glorious act—that of declaring the Anglo-American colonies politically independent of Great Britain, transforming these colonies into independent States and thus laying the foundation of an American republic that was soon to take its place among the nations of the earth. The Congress had been discussing the question of independence for some time, and the result was now a declaration to that effect. As a full account of this event and the developments leading thereto will be necessary, we will now proceed to give an account of this important and decisive change in the political condition of English America—how the thirteen Anglo-American colonies became transformed from dependencies of Great Britain into the independent Republic of the United States of America.

Transfor-  
mation of  
Colonies  
to States.

Thus far the colonies had been fighting simply for a redress of grievances while still acknowledging themselves as dependencies of Great Britain—as British subjects in armed rebellion against their sovereign, King George III., and his Ministry and the British Parliament. This attitude was a decided disadvantage. The fact that the resources of the colonies, in a military point of view, were inferior to those of their powerful antagonist was a minor consideration. To the more moderate and order-loving portion of the American population the fact that they were simply armed rebels seeking to obtain a redress of grievances by an appeal to arms was especially repugnant, and to this class the simplest way out of so unpleasant a dilemma was the transformation of these British colonies into independent States. After the bloodshed at Lexington and Concord the people of Massachusetts all along thus far had been trying to prove that the British were the aggressors by being the first to fire and that the revolted colonists were simply defending, not transgressing their rights.

Slow  
Growth  
of Inde-  
pendence  
Sentiment.

The public sentiment in favor of American independence was one of slow growth among the colonists. As we have observed, the famous Mecklenburg Declaration in North Carolina, in May, 1775, did not meet with popular approval among the revolted colonists, who still hoped for reconciliation with the Mother Country, to which they were still attached by the traditions of a common ancestry. The general American public sentiment was still in favor of reconciliation. Said

John Jay in later years: "During the course of my life, and until after the second petition of Congress in 1775, I never heard an American of any class or of any description express a wish for the independence of the colonies." But when that petition of Congress to King George III. was rejected, and when the British government, in consequence, decided to persevere in its policy of oppression and of coercing the revolted colonies into submission, then the colonists became gradually educated to the idea of independence, which idea grew all the stronger for being delayed.

Meanwhile all hopes for a reconciliation with the Mother Country had passed away. The British Parliament had not repealed its obnoxious acts. The British Ministry had sent large armies to America to force the colonists to submit, and hired seventeen thousand Hessians from Germany to assist in crushing liberty in America. These proceedings widened irreparably the breach between Great Britain and her North American colonies; and a pamphlet called *Common Sense*, written by Thomas Paine, who had come from England several years before, had prepared the Anglo-Americans for independence.

Almost a year had passed since the convention of Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, made their famous declaration when the people of the whole colony of North Carolina authorized their delegates in the Continental Congress to concur with those of the other twelve revolted Anglo-American colonies in declaring independence, April 23, 1776. A few weeks later, May 15, 1776, the Virginians instructed their delegates in Congress to propose a declaration of independence to that body.

Already the Continental Congress had committed itself. Its recommendations of the previous year to some of the colonies that they should frame State governments for themselves had just been extended to all the thirteen colonies. On May 15, 1776, Congress voted "that the exercise of every kind of authority under the crown should be totally suppressed." This action was virtually assuming that the revolted colonies were already independent States, and subsequent resolutions and declarations were simply enforcing the decision already practically made.

But, as the action of Congress had been made with hesitation, so it was finally carried out with hesitation. Some earnest spirits whose aspirations were for final American independence regarded the sudden tendency in that direction as premature. On April 1, 1776, General Washington wrote thus: "My countrymen, from their form of government and their steady attachment hertofore to royalty, will come reluctantly into the idea of independence; but time and persecution bring many wonderful things to pass." His prophecy was soon veri-

**No Hope for Reconciliation.**

**Thomas Paine's "Common Sense."**

**Action of North Carolina and Virginia.**

**Commitment of Congress.**

**Hesitation in Congress.**

fied, as the spirits and numbers of those who were determined upon immediate independence increased apace. The popular sentiment produced by the circulation of Thomas Paine's *Common Sense* and by the obstinate persistence of the British government in its policy of coercion, which put an end to all hopes of final reconciliation with the Mother Country, was gradually more and more reflected among the American people's representatives in the Continental Congress.

Richard  
Henry  
Lee's  
Resolu-  
tion.

Virginia's instructions to her delegates in the Continental Congress were soon obeyed. Upon the journals of Congress, under date of June 7, 1776, is an affecting entry of "certain resolutions respecting independency being moved and seconded." No names are mentioned and no words of the resolution are recorded, thus implying that Congress had felt its own weakness, in comparison with the solemnity of the occasion, so deeply as here to hesitate and to give no indication of what was in contemplation. The author of this resolution of independence was Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, who moved its adoption, and his motion was seconded by John Adams, of Massachusetts. Lee's resolution was as follows: "*Resolved*, That these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent States; that they are absolved from all allegiance to the British crown; and that all political connection between them and the State of Great Britain is, and ought to be, totally dissolved."

Debate  
on Lee's  
Resolu-  
tion.

Lee's resolution encountered immediate and resolute opposition and was warmly debated in Congress, many of the delegates opposing it as premature and others as treasonable; the most conspicuous of these opponents of the resolution being John Dickinson, of Pennsylvania, who considered it as premature and whose ten years' championship of colonial rights in his celebrated *Letters from a Farmer* was a guarantee of his faithfulness to the American cause. His argument that the resolution was premature was not wholly a mistaken one. There were thus far only seven colonies—the barest possible majority—to unite in favor of action so decisive, June 10, 1776. The advocates of the resolution did not then press their views, but very wisely postponed final consideration of the resolution for a few weeks; while the opponents of the resolution did not arouse the people against it, but wisely consented to let it have fair consideration, apparently satisfied with the delay which they had interposed for its deliberation if the colonies which had rejected it could be induced to favor it. Pennsylvania was especially slow to accept the resolution, because of her Quaker and German non-resistant population.

Commit-  
tee on  
Declara-  
tion of  
Independ-  
ence.

On the very day of the vote on Lee's resolution—June 10, 1776—a committee of five was appointed in Congress to draft a declaration of independence in accordance with the resolution; this committee consist-



ing of Thomas Jefferson, of Virginia; John Adams, of Massachusetts; Dr. Benjamin Franklin, of Pennsylvania; Roger Sherman, of Connecticut, and Robert R. Livingston, of New York. The declaration was written by Jefferson, who was the chairman of the committee. Said he in after years: "Whether I had gathered my ideas from reading or reflection, I do not know. I know only that I turned to neither book nor pamphlet while writing it. I did not consider it as any part of my charge to invent new ideas altogether and to offer no sentiment which had never been expressed before." In fact, there was neither originality nor novelty in this celebrated document. Its facts were peculiar to the cause at issue, so far as they related to the course of Great Britain and her king; but the principles of human and of colonial rights were substantially such as Englishmen for centuries had asserted and which were reflected in Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights. The merit of this great document was its appropriateness, its harmony with the ideas of a people who had risen to defend their birthright rather than to acquire any new rights.

The committee reported the declaration of independence to Congress on June 28, 1776, the very day of the British repulse at Charleston. The adoption of the declaration depended upon the adoption of the resolution of which it was but the expression. Accordingly, Lee's resolution was called up in Congress on July 1st, and was debated that day, four colonial delegations opposing its adoption on that day. The New York delegation opposed it because they had received no instructions as to their vote on so grave a subject. The Pennsylvania, Delaware and South Carolina delegations opposed it because of their own reluctance. The South Carolina delegates asked for the postponement of a definitive vote until the next morning, and when the morning arrived they withdrew their opposition. The Pennsylvania and Delaware delegations—some delegates retiring and others coming in—also voted for the resolution, which thus received the unanimous vote of the delegates of all the colonies, except those of New York, on July 2, 1776. A few days later (July 9–15, 1776), after receiving instructions to concur with the vote of the other colonies, the New York delegation recorded their vote for independence.

Two days after the adoption of Lee's resolution—July 4, 1776—the Continental Congress adopted the immortal *Declaration of Independence*, which proclaimed the Anglo-American colonies free and independent States under the name of *The United States of America*, and which also defined the rights of all mankind. It was ordered to be engraved on parchment, and on August 2, 1776, the names of all but two of the fifty-six signers were placed upon it. These two were added afterward. This decisive action of Congress changed the whole

Adoption  
of Lee's  
Resolu-  
tion.

Declara-  
tion of  
Independ-  
ence and  
Its Sig-  
nificance.

character of the armed struggle with Great Britain. Before the adoption of the Declaration of Independence the Americans fought simply for a redress of grievances, while still acknowledging themselves as British subjects. After its adoption they fought for complete national independence, having renounced all allegiance to Great Britain.

Popular  
Rejoicing.

The action of Congress in adopting the Declaration of Independence was approved everywhere in the revolted colonies and was hailed with the very wildest demonstrations of popular enthusiasm; and the 4th of July, 1776, has since been celebrated ever since by the American people as their country's birthday, and the annual recurrence of *Independence Day*, or every anniversary of American independence, has always been celebrated with every demonstration of public enthusiasm.

Independence  
Day.



The Old  
Liberty  
Bell.


By a strange coincidence, the old Liberty Bell on the State House (or Independence Hall, as it has since been called)—the bell which "rang out Independence" after the immortal Declaration was adopted by the Continental Congress on July 4, 1776, and which, in its cracked condition, has since been preserved in Independence Hall as a great national relic—has on it the following inscription from Deuteronomy: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land, unto all the inhabitants thereof."

"That old State House bell is silent,  
Hushed is now its clamorous tongue;  
But the spirit it awakened  
Still is living—ever young;  
And when we greet the smiling sunlight  
On the Fourth of each July,  
We will ne'er forget the bellman  
Who, betwixt the earth and sky,  
Rung out, boldly, 'Independence';  
Which, please God, shall never die."

General  
Washington's  
Action  
on the  
Declara-  
tion.

The Declaration of Independence was transmitted to the American commander-in-chief, with the request of Congress to "have it proclaimed at the head of the army." This was what both the commander and the army had been waiting for. On July 9th he issued the following order of the day: "The general hopes that this important event will serve as a fresh incentive to every officer and soldier to act with fidelity and courage, as knowing that now the peace and safety of his country depend, under God, solely on the success of our arms, and that he is now in the service of a state possessed of sufficient power to reward his merit and advance him to the highest honors of a free country." On the same day he wrote to the President of Congress as follows: "I caused the Declaration to be proclaimed before all the army under my immediate command, and have the pleasure to inform Congress that the measure seemed to have their most hearty assent;





the expressions and behavior, both of officers and men, testifying their warmest approbation of it." The army's support was one thing. Their obedience to the inspiration suggested by its commander was another thing. But a new impulse seemed to be felt by all, for the moment.

Thus Great Britain's thirteen colonies on the Atlantic coast of North America south of Canada and south-west of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick were converted into an independent republic known as the United States of America. As stated by the Declaration, "as free and independent States, they have full power to levy war, conclude peace, contract alliances, establish commerce, and to do all other acts and things which independent States may of right do." So, according to the Declaration, the Anglo-Americans had ceased to be subjects of Great Britain and had become an independent nation, no longer acknowledging themselves as subjects in rebellion and in arms against their sovereign. When the British commanders—the brothers, Admiral Lord Howe and General Sir William Howe—in the name of King George III., offered amnesty to all Americans who would return to their allegiance to Great Britain, Congress regarded the offer as a national insult.

**The New Nation.**

On June 12, 1776, the Continental Congress appointed a committee to prepare *Articles of Confederation*, as a constitution of government for the new nation. This committee reported a plan of confederation a month later, July 12, 1776, but Congress then took no action upon it, as circumstances necessitated a postponement of so important a step; and it was more than a year before Congress actually adopted the Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union (November 15–17, 1777), as we shall presently see. And after Congress had adopted them and recommended them to the several States for ratification, it was four years before all the States complied.

**Plan of Confederation.**

In the meantime Congress continued to be the uniting power as well as the governing authority of the infant republic. Its members, re-elected repeatedly by their respective constituencies, assembled as the representatives not only of the several States, but of the nation at large. As we shall observe, Congress served very imperfectly as a central power; as its treaties, its laws, its finances, its armaments, all depended upon the consent and coöperation of the States; but it continued to be the body which represented the Union of the States, however imperfectly.

**Unity in Congress.**

Meanwhile the States were forming governments of their own, and were more thoroughly organized than the nation. Massachusetts formed a State government early in the summer of 1775. Early in 1776 New Hampshire organized her assembly and council, with a

**State Constitutions.**

president of the latter body. During the same year State governments were established in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina and South Carolina. Rhode Island and Connecticut were satisfied to continue under the governments established by their colonial charters. In 1777 New York and Georgia adopted new State governments. But the original State governments experienced frequent modifications and alterations, each State amending its constitution or framing a new one as required by changing conditions or circumstances. As a general thing, each State had a Governor, with or without a Council, as its executive; a General Assembly, or State Legislature, to enact laws, consisting of a Senate and a House of Representatives, and a judiciary consisting of Supreme and Superior Courts and inferior Courts of Quarter Sessions and Common Pleas. In Massachusetts the Legislature was called the General Court. In Maryland the lower branch of the Legislature was called the *House of Delegates*, and in Virginia the same branch was called the *House of Burgesses*.

**American  
Dissen-  
sions.**

Both the Declaration of Independence and the State Constitutions had arisen amidst the most distracting dissensions. The divisions in Congress and amongst the leading classes in the United States were insignificant compared with the distractions among the masses of the American people. There were fiery patriots who thought that outcry and force were necessary for the accomplishment of any results. On the other hand, there were selfish and abject spirits who thought that nothing whatever should be done. Rioters and marauders held sway in some places; while Tories, or Loyalists, prevailed in other localities. In every part of the country dark plots were laid and dark deeds were perpetrated. In fact, the country was in a desperate condition; and almost superhuman work fell to the lot of those few wise and devoted souls who steered the young nation safely through its great struggle for independence.

**British  
Forces  
near  
New  
York.**

A few days before the Declaration of Independence, General Howe appeared on Staten Island with a powerful British force. There, on the 12th of July, he was joined by his brother, Admiral Lord Howe, with a large fleet from England; and on the 1st of August by Sir Henry Clinton and his land forces from Charleston. In August thirty thousand British troops stood opposed to the American army of seventeen thousand men. Admiral and General Howe were jointly commissioned to treat for peace, but only on the condition that the Americans should lay down their arms and submit to the authority of the British government; and, as the Americans refused to agree to such a peace, the British officers prepared to crush the rebellious colonists at one blow.

**British  
Peace  
Proposi-  
tions.**

On the 22d of August, 1776, a British force of ten thousand men landed on Long Island, near Brooklyn; and on the 27th (August, 1776) a bloody battle was fought between British and Hessians, commanded by Generals Grant, Cornwallis, Clinton and De Heister, and several thousand Americans under the chief command of General Israel Putnam. Clinton moved under cover of the night, and before dawn on the morning of August 27, 1776, he had secured Jamaica Pass, near the present East New York; while General Grant was pressing forward along the shore of New York Bay, and at daybreak encountered the Americans under William Alexander, Lord Stirling, on the site of the present Greenwood cemetery. De Heister, with his Hessians, advanced from Flatbush at the same time and attacked the Americans under General Sullivan, who were also soon assailed in the rear by Clinton's troops and were finally forced to surrender. Cornwallis descended the port-road to Gowanus and fell upon Lord Stirling's rear and compelled Stirling to surrender. General Nathaniel Woodhull was also taken prisoner. The Americans lost five hundred killed and wounded and eleven hundred prisoners, who were soon suffering untold horrors in the *Jersey* and other British prison-ships and in prisons in New York. The British loss was three hundred and sixty-seven. Thus the battle of Long Island ended in a disastrous defeat for the Americans.

**Battle of  
Long  
Island.**

**Defeat  
of the  
Ameri-  
cans.**

Several days after this disastrous battle General Putnam was joined by Washington, with the main body of the American army, from New York city; but on the 30th (August, 1776) the whole American army recrossed from Brooklyn to New York. On the 15th of September, Washington's army evacuated New York city and retreated up the Hudson for the purpose of seizing and fortifying Harlem Heights, on the upper end of Manhattan Island. The British pursued, and on the same day a severe skirmish occurred on Harlem Plains, in which the Americans were victorious, but at the cost of the lives of Colonel Knowlton, of Connecticut, and Major Leitch, of Virginia.

**Washing-  
ton's  
Evacua-  
tion of  
New  
York.**

**Skirmish  
on Harlem  
Plains.**

In order to ascertain the exact condition of the British army, Washington engaged Captain Nathan Hale, a young Connecticut officer of Knowlton's regiment, to visit the British camps on Long Island as a spy. After getting the information he wanted, and, as he was about to return, he was detected, taken to General Howe's headquarters at New York, and hanged as a spy the next morning by the brutal provost-marshal Cunningham. He was refused a Bible or a clergyman during his last hours, and was not allowed to send letters to his friends. A humane British officer had given him pen, ink and paper to write a letter; but the brutal provost-marshal took them from him and tore his letter to pieces, saying afterward that his reason for so doing was

**Captain  
Nathan  
Hale.**

that he "did not want the rebels to know that they had a man who could die with such firmness." Hale was a young man of liberal education and accomplished manners, and had taught school. His last words were: "I regret that I have but one life to lose for my country."

Battle of  
White  
Plains.

On the 28th of October, 1776, Howe defeated Washington in the battle of White Plains; after which Washington retreated farther northward; and on the 4th of November he crossed the Hudson river into New Jersey, for the purpose of saving Philadelphia, where the Continental Congress was sitting. On the 16th of November, 1776, Fort Washington was captured by the Hessian general Knyphausen, after a furious assault, in which he lost one thousand men. The two thousand American troops under Colonel Magaw, who had garrisoned the fort, became prisoners to the victorious Hessians.

Capture  
of Fort  
Wash-  
ington.

Wash-  
ington's  
Retreat  
to the  
Delaware.

Two days after the fall of Fort Washington (November 18, 1776) Lord Cornwallis, with six thousand British troops, crossed the Hudson into New Jersey in pursuit of Washington's shattered army. For three weeks Washington, with only three thousand men under his command, retreated before the pursuing hosts of Cornwallis, until he reached the Delaware, on the 8th of December, and crossed that stream into Pennsylvania. Cornwallis, in quick succession, occupied Newark, Elizabeth, New Brunswick, Princeton and Trenton, where he halted. General Howe ordered Cornwallis to wait until the river was frozen over and then cross on the ice. In the meantime General Charles Lee was surprised and captured by the British near Morristown, New Jersey.

American  
Disasters  
on Lake  
Cham-  
plain and  
in Rhode  
Island.

In the meantime, while Washington's army was suffering such disasters in the vicinity of New York, the Americans also met with misfortunes in other quarters. The little American flotilla under Benedict Arnold on Lake Champlain was twice defeated and driven from the lake, and the American garrison was also driven from the fortress of Crown Point, October 11-14, 1776. On the very day that Washington crossed the Delaware from New Jersey into Pennsylvania—December 8, 1776—a British fleet and army took possession of Newport, Rhode Island, and the little American flotilla under Commodore Whipple at Providence was blockaded there by the British fleet under Sir James Wallace. Wallace had written to Whipple as follows: "You, Abraham Whipple, on the 9th of June, 1772, burned His Majesty's armed vessel, the *Gaspé*. Sir, I will hang you at the yard-arm." To this threat Whipple replied: "Sir, always catch a man before you hang him."

In consequence of Washington's disastrous defeats his army was further weakened by wholesale desertions, while many Americans, thor-



oughly dispirited, deserted the American cause and took the oath of allegiance to Great Britain, thus accepting the British protection offered to them in General Sir William Howe's proclamation. During his retreat across New York, Washington wrote thus: "Between you and me, I think our affairs are in a very bad condition—not so much from the apprehension of General Howe's army as from the defection of New York, the Jerseys and Pennsylvania. In short, the conduct of the Jerseys has been most infamous. \* \* \* If every nerve is not strained, \* \* \* I think the game is pretty nearly up."

**Defection  
of New  
Jersey.**

Taking advantage of the delay of the enemy, and having increased his army to five thousand men, Washington secretly recrossed the Delaware into New Jersey on Christmas night; and on the following morning (December 26, 1776) he attacked and captured one thousand Hessians at Trenton. The Hessian commander, Colonel Rahl, fell mortally wounded in the streets of the city. This sudden victory raised the spirits of the desponding patriots and alarmed General Howe, who had supposed that the rebellion was at an end. Howe immediately sent Cornwallis with a considerable force to capture Washington's army.

**Battle of  
Trenton.**

On the evening of the 2d of January, 1777, Lord Cornwallis appeared at Trenton with a strong British force and encamped close to Washington's army, which he expected to capture on the following morning. Washington, however, escaped secretly during the night; and the next morning (January 3, 1777) he defeated a British detachment under Colonel Mawhood at Princeton. Among the Americans who were killed was the heroic General Hugh Mercer, a born Scotchman, who had been a surgeon in the Pretender's army on the field of Culloden, and who had been twice wounded while fighting against the Indians among the frontier settlements of Pennsylvania during the French and Indian War.

**Battle of  
Princeton.**

All the time that Washington was retreating and advancing he was enforcing the lesson of his experience on the American general government. He was unable to do very much, as he frequently informed Congress, for want of an efficient army. During the late campaign the American forces had consisted of both regular, or Continental, troops and militia, all raised on different terms by the different States—that is by different bounties and under different appointments. What Washington wanted and what the American cause needed was an army recruited, officered, equipped and paid upon a national system. Congress was conscious of the necessity. Before the Declaration of Independence, Congress had chosen a Board of War and of Ordnance from its members to direct military affairs. When the disasters of the fall of 1776 were weighing heavily, Congress ordered the organization of

**Army  
Organiza-  
tion.**

a full Continental army. But the wants which thus needed to be supplied continued. It was left wholly to the States to raise the troops and to appoint all but the general officers, while the pay and the term of enlistment proposed by Congress were entirely inadequate to the demands of the situation on which Washington insisted. He wrote to his brother concerning this action as follows: "The measure was not commenced till it was too late to be effected, and then in such a manner as to bid adieu to every hope of getting an army from which any services are to be expected." His complaints of the lack of army organization are shown by such expressions as "the unhappy policy of short enlistments," the need of "some greater encouragement" in pay, "the different States nominating such officers as are not fit to be shoe-blacks," the reliance on the militia, "a destructive, expensive, disorderly mob."

Wash-  
ington's  
Tempo-  
rary  
Dictator-  
ship.

Alarmed by the disasters of the time, and after adjourning for a short time to Baltimore on the approach of the pursuing enemy to the Delaware, December 12, 1776, Congress resolved "that General Washington shall be, and he is hereby, invested with full, ample and complete powers" to raise, officer and equip an army. To provide for the necessities of this army, Washington was authorized "to take, wherever he may be, whatever he may want for the use of the army, if the inhabitants will not sell it, allowing a reasonable price for the same." He was commissioned also "to arrest and confine persons who refuse to take the Continental currency or are otherwise disaffected to the American cause." This commission of a Dictatorship to Washington was granted by Congress on December 27, 1776, and was the last resort of that ineffective body and yet one of its wisest actions, and was to last six months, but was afterwards renewed in nearly the same terms. But these dictatorial powers were too despotic for Washington to exercise fully, and even his partial use of these powers did not effect an efficient organization of the American army.

Conti-  
nental  
Money.

The want of an efficient American army was largely the result of the lack of an adequate treasury. Congress voted all sorts of appropriations, but could meet them only by continued issues of Continental paper money. These bills of credit soon began to depreciate, and the depreciation demanded the issue of larger amounts, thus adding to the depreciation. When this paper money had become almost worthless an effort was made to restore the currency by recalling the old issues and replacing them with new ones, but these latter also depreciated very quickly. Lotteries were then resorted to, as were loans also, both at home and in Europe. The States were called upon to assist in restoring the finances, and taxes raised by the States were substituted for the Continental bills. But the embarrassments of the finances

were irreparable, and the public debt and the poverty of the infant nation increased yearly.

After the battle of Princeton, Washington marched to the hills of North-eastern New Jersey and established his camp at Morristown. He sent out detachments, which, by a system of guerrilla warfare, so annoyed the British that they soon left New Jersey. In the meantime Congress had returned to Philadelphia.

**Guerrilla Warfare.**

On the approach of a British detachment from New York, General MacDougall burned the American stores in his charge at Peckskill, on the Hudson, March 23, 1777, and fled to the hills. About the middle of April (1777) Lord Cornwallis went up the Raritan river and attacked the Americans under General Benjamin Lincoln at Bound-brook, New Jersey, with little effect.

**British Raids.**

Toward the close of April, 1777, Governor Tryon, at the head of two thousand British and Tories, invaded Connecticut and devastated the southern part of that State. The Connecticut militia, under Generals Wooster, Silliman and Arnold, attacked Tryon's force at Ridgefield on the 27th of April (1777). Wooster was killed in the engagement, but the enemy were compelled to retreat hastily to New York.

**Tryon's Raid in Connecticut.**

At two o'clock in the morning of April 23, 1777, one hundred and seventy Americans under Colonel Meigs, after crossing Long Island Sound from Connecticut, surprised a British provision post at Sag Harbor, on the eastern end of Long Island, burned a dozen vessels, the store-houses and their contents, and returned without losing a man. On the night of July 10, 1777, Colonel William Barton with some men in whaleboats crossed Narragansett bay to Newport, Rhode Island, stole quietly to the quarters of the British General Prescott, took him from his bed and carried him away a prisoner. General Prescott was afterward exchanged for the American General Charles Lee.

**Bold American Exploits.**

In the midst of the trials and discouragements of the America cause, a thrill of hope and inspiration filled the hearts of the despondent Americans when the young Marquis de Lafayette, a wealthy French nobleman only nineteen years old, made his appearance on American soil to aid the American people in their struggle for independence. Afterwards, in recalling his early inspirations, he wrote of this struggle thus: "It was the last combat of liberty." While he was hastening his departure from his home the news of the American disasters around New York reached France, thus throwing the American cause into the shade even in the eyes of the American commissioners who had been sent to France to obtain supplies from that country. They tried to dissuade the young French nobleman from his project, but he replied: "We must be of good cheer. It is in danger that I like best to share your fortunes." Escaping the vigilance of the French government,

**Arrival of Lafayette.**

which endeavored to prevent a French nobleman of so exalted a rank from compromising France with Great Britain by aiding the latter's revolted colonies, and leaving a brilliant home and a wife as young in years as himself, Lafayette crossed the Atlantic in his own vessel, landing safely at Charleston, in South Carolina, whence he hastened to Philadelphia and offered his services to the Continental Congress, which gave him a cold welcome through its Committee of Foreign Affairs, concerning which he thus wrote: "The coldness was such as to amount to a rejection; but, without being disconcerted by the manner of the members, I begged them to return to the hall and to read the following note: 'After the sacrifices which I have made, I have the right to demand two favors. One is to serve at my own expense; the other to commence as a volunteer.'" Congress was touched, and it appointed the generous young foreign nobleman a major-general, July 31, 1777. He received a most hearty welcome from General Washington when first meeting him, the American commander-in-chief saying to the generous young French nobleman: "Make my headquarters your home." The American army and people followed Washington's example in giving their confidence to the noble young foreigner who had espoused their cause.

Other  
Foreign  
Officers in  
America.

Besides the young Marquis de Lafayette there were other distinguished foreigners who arrived in America during the summer of 1777 to serve the cause of American independence—the Baron de Kalb, a German-Frenchman from Alsace, and two brave Poles, Count Pulaski and Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the last-named, as we have seen, afterwards so valiantly but vainly defending his own native Poland against its ruthless Russian and Prussian despoilers. The following year, 1778, the Baron de Steuben, a skillful Prussian military officer who had served in the armies of Frederick the Great, arrived in America, and afterward brought efficiency to the main American army, of which he was made Inspector-General. Count Pulaski and the Baron de Kalb both lost their lives in fighting for American independence, as we shall see presently.

Move-  
ments of  
Howe and  
Wash-  
ington.

The main armies of the British and the Americans commenced active operations in June. In the latter part of that month Howe's army left New Jersey, and was conveyed by the British fleet down the Atlantic to the mouth of the Chesapeake bay, and up that bay to its head, where it disembarked August 25, 1777; after which it marched eastward, in the direction of Philadelphia. Washington, in the meantime, had crossed the Delaware river, and advanced westward to meet Howe. Washington had written thus: "If General Howe can be kept at bay and prevented from effecting his purposes, the successes of General Burgoyne, whatever they may be, must be partial and temporary."



ANTHONY WAYNE

COMMODORE HOPKINS

LAFAYETTE

PAUL JONES

NATHANIEL GREENE

HENRY KNOX

JOHN SULLIVAN

HORATIO GATES

AMERICAN OFFICERS OF THE REVOLUTION



At Chadd's Ford, on the banks of the Brandywine creek, in Chester county, Pennsylvania, a bloody battle was fought on the 11th of September, 1777, between the armies of Washington and Howe. The Hessians under General Knyphausen attacked the American left wing under Washington in person at Chadd's Ford, while Howe and Cornwallis assailed the American right wing under General John Sullivan near the Birmingham meeting-house. Washington was defeated, with the loss of twelve hundred men in killed, wounded and prisoners; while Howe lost only eight hundred men. The next day the shattered American army retreated to Philadelphia. In this battle the young Marquis de Lafayette was severely wounded. Count Pulaski also fought in this battle. Five hundred wounded American soldiers were taken to the Seventh Day Baptist settlement at Ephrata, in Lancaster county, where about a hundred and fifty of them died, and where a fine monument was erected to their memory in 1902.

**Battle of  
Brandy-  
wine.**

On the night of the 20th (September, 1777) General Anthony Wayne, with fifteen hundred American troops, was attacked at Paoli by a British force under General Grey. Wayne lost three hundred men. This is known as the *Massacre of Paoli*.

**Massacre  
of Paoli.**

After the battle of Brandywine, Washington made another stand for the defense of Philadelphia against Howe's advancing forces, crossed the Schuylkill, and had a skirmish with Howe's army twenty miles west of Philadelphia; but a heavy rain prevented a general battle, and Washington retreated to Reading. The Congress left the city, and went first to Lancaster and then to York, where it assembled on the 30th of September (1777), and where it remained in session until the following summer. General Howe took military possession of Philadelphia on the 26th of September, 1777, and the British army established its winter-quarters in the Quaker City.

**Howe's  
Occupation  
of  
Phila-  
delphia.**

On the 4th of October (1777) a severe battle was fought at Germantown, near Philadelphia, between the armies of Washington and Howe. A part of the British army occupied Judge Chew's stone mansion and from its windows poured deadly volleys into the ranks of the Americans, who were also inconvenienced by a thick fog. The Americans were defeated with the loss of twelve hundred men, while the British lost only half that number.

**Battle of  
German-  
town.**

The campaign between the main armies closed with the battle of Germantown, and Washington went into winter-quarters at White-marsh, where he was attacked by Howe, December 4, 1777; and, after a skirmish with the Pennsylvania militia and a spirited engagement at Edge Hill, Howe retired to Philadelphia without executing his threat to "drive General Washington over the Blue Mountain." Washington's army soon afterwards removed to Valley Forge, on the Schuyl-

**Both  
Armies  
in Their  
Winter  
Quarters.**

kill river, twenty miles north-west from Philadelphia, which city was occupied by the enemy until the following June. So demoralized did Howe's army become in Philadelphia that it became greatly weakened, and Dr. Franklin remarked: "Howe did not take Philadelphia; Philadelphia took Howe."

Unsuccessful British Attacks on Forts Mifflin and Mercer.

While the events just related were occurring on land, the British fleet sailed round to Delaware bay, which it afterward ascended on its way to Philadelphia; but its passage was obstructed by Fort Mifflin on the Pennsylvania shore of the Delaware river, Fort Mercer on the New Jersey shore, and heavy *chevaux-de-frise* in the channel of the river. The forts were unsuccessfully assailed by land troops sent by General Howe to coöperate with the fleet. Fort Mifflin, which was defended by a small American force under Colonel Christopher Greene, repulsed an attack of two thousand Hessians under Count Donop, who was mortally wounded during the attack. Fort Mercer, garrisoned by a body of American troops under Lieutenant-Colonel Smith, also repulsed the assaults of the enemy; but about the middle of November (1777) both forts were evacuated by their garrisons, and the British fleet sailed up to Philadelphia.

"Battle of the Kegs."

On January 5, 1778, occurred what Francis Hopkinson ridiculed in his ballad of "The Battle of the Kegs," when the British ships hurled broadsides at a number of machines resembling kegs filled with explosives and having spring locks so contrived as to explode on coming in contact with a vessel, these machines being sent down the Delaware from Burlington, New Jersey, by the little Pennsylvania fleet for the purpose of destroying the British fleet in the river.

Burgoyne's Invasion of New York.

While the Americans met with misfortunes in Pennsylvania, General Burgoyne, with ten thousand British troops, was marching southward from Canada, along the western coast of Lake Champlain, toward Albany. Burgoyne took possession of Ticonderoga on the 6th of July; the American troops under General Arthur St. Clair, who had garrisoned the fortress, having fled, on the invader's approach, to Fort Edward, which was then held by three thousand American troops under General Philip Schuyler. St. Clair's rear division was defeated by the enemy at Hubbardton, in the present State of Vermont. The shattered forces of St. Clair joined General Schuyler at Fort Edward on the 12th of July (1777); and the whole American army of the North, then under the command of Schuyler, retreated to the Mohawk river and established a fortified camp in the vicinity of Cohoes Falls.

Schuyler's Retreat to the Mohawk.

Battle of Bennington.

Burgoyne, after reaching Fort Edward, on the 30th of July, sent out a body of Hessians under Colonel Baum to seize provisions and cattle which the Americans had collected at Bennington, in the present State of Vermont. Baum's Hessians were defeated on the 16th of



August, 1777, by the Green Mountain Boys under Colonel John Stark, about five miles from Bennington. Just before the battle Colonel Stark said to his troops: "Boys, we conquer today, or Molly Stark will be a widow." On the same day another British detachment was defeated by a small American force under Colonel Seth Warner.

While Burgoyne was advancing from the North, a strong force of Canadians, Tories and Indians, under Colonel St. Leger, John Johnson, John Butler and Joseph Brandt, the famous Mohawk chieftain, invaded the Mohawk Valley, and besieged Fort Schuyler (now Rome) on the 3d of August. General Herkimer, while hastening with a body of New York militia to the relief of Fort Schuyler, was defeated and killed in the battle of Oriskany. When Colonel Benedict Arnold approached Fort Schuyler with an American relief force, the besiegers were driven away and dispersed.

In the meantime General Horatio Gates superseded General Schuyler in the command of the American army in the North, which had been increased, by a heavy reinforcement of New England militia under General Benjamin Lincoln, to thirteen thousand men. On the 19th of September, 1777, a bloody but indecisive engagement was fought at Bemis's Heights, near Saratoga, between the armies of Gates and Burgoyne. On the 7th of October (1777) another sanguinary battle took place between the same armies, at Saratoga. The Americans were victorious, but General Benedict Arnold was wounded. He had fought bravely, and when the British gave way he exclaimed: "The victory is ours; Saratoga is won!" The British General Fraser was mortally wounded, soon dying.

Ten days after his defeat at Saratoga (October 17, 1777) Burgoyne surrendered his whole army of six thousand men to the American general. Burgoyne had boasted that he would eat his Christmas dinner in Albany. He did eat his Christmas dinner there, but as a prisoner, not as a conqueror. A strong British force under Sir Henry Clinton was marching up the Hudson river to coöperate with Burgoyne. Clinton captured Forts Clinton and Montgomery, at the passes of the Highlands; but when he heard of Burgoyne's surrender he hastily retreated down the Hudson to New York.

The surrender of Burgoyne produced the liveliest joy in America, and fell like a bomb-shell into the midst of the war party in the British Parliament. It strengthened the peace party in England, very greatly influenced the French court in favor of the struggling Americans, and practically decided the question of American independence. After returning to England, Burgoyne resumed his seat in Parliament and opposed the war. William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, the great champion of the Americans, in a speech in the House of Lords, said:

**Invasion  
of the  
Mohawk  
Valley.**

**Battle of  
Oriskany.**

**Battles of  
Bemis's  
Heights  
and  
Saratoga.**

**Surrender  
of  
Burgoyne.**

**Clinton's  
Move-  
ments.**

**Effects  
of Bur-  
goyne's  
Surren-  
der.**

Pitt's  
Great  
Speech.

"You can not, my lords, you can not conquer America. \* \* \* If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop remained in my country, I never would lay down my arms—never, never, never!" In a burst of indignant eloquence he thundered against the employment of the savage Indian allies with their tomahawks and scalping-knives for the slaughter of England's own children in America. But his proposals to win back the colonists by measures of reconciliation were haughtily rejected by the obstinate king and his Ministers, who blindly persisted in their determination to reduce the revolted colonists to submission.

Washington's  
Embarrassments.

The contrast between the Gates's capture of Burgoyne's army and Washington's inability to prevent Howe's capture of Philadelphia was made a matter of reproach to the American commander-in-chief, who said in his own defense: "I was left to fight two battles, in order, if possible, to save Philadelphia, with less numbers than composed the army of my antagonist. \* \* \* Had the same spirit pervaded the people of this and the neighboring States, \* \* \* as the States of New York and New England, \* \* \* we might before this time have had General Howe nearly in the situation of General Burgoyne, with this difference—that the former would never have been out of reach of his ships, whilst the latter increased his danger every step he took." Besides, Washington conducted his operations in a region where great disaffection to the American cause cut off supplies for his army and information concerning the enemy. His task was appreciated at the time. Said the Count de Vergennes, the French Minister, to the American commissioners in France: "Nothing, nothing has struck me so much as General Washington's attacking and giving battle to General Howe's army. To bring an army raised within a year to this promises everything."

The Stars  
and  
Stripes.

The American flag, composed of thirteen stripes alternately red and white, to represent the thirteen original States, with a blue field in one corner with as many white stars as there were States, was finally adopted by the Continental Congress at Philadelphia, June 14, 1777.

Articles  
of Confederation.

In November, 1777, the American Congress, at York, in Pennsylvania, agreed to an instrument of union, known as the *Articles of Confederation*. By these articles the American States were united into a confederacy for common defense; and the power of declaring and carrying on war, and also the right of concluding treaties, were delegated to Congress. Under this form of government the United States continued until the adoption of the present National Constitution in 1789—a period of nearly twelve years.

During the severe winter of 1777-'78 Washington's army was encamped at Valley Forge, on the banks of the Schuylkill river, twenty

miles north-west from Philadelphia. There the American troops suffered indescribable hardships during the severe winter encampment. The soldiers endured the pangs of hunger and cold, being without much food, without blankets and clothes. Many of the troops were without shoes, and left bloody footprints in the snow. But having faith in the justice of their cause, the patriots patiently endured all their hardships, and were resolved to sacrifice everything for the liberties of their country. Washington thus described the sufferings of his army in his remonstrances to Congress:

**Washington's  
Encampment at  
Valley Forge.**

“Without arrogance or the smallest deviation from truth, it may be said that no history now extant can furnish an instance of an army's suffering such hardships as ours has done, bearing them with the same patience and fortitude. To see men without clothes to cover their nakedness; without blankets to lie on; without shoes, for the want of which their marches might be traced by the blood from their feet; and almost as often without provisions as with them; marching through frost and snow, and at Christmas taking up their winter quarters within a day's march of the enemy, without a house or hut to cover them, till they could be built, and submitting without a murmur, is a proof of patience and obedience which, in my opinion, can scarce be paralleled.”

**Washington's  
Account of His  
Army's  
Hardships.**

Washington reported that when his army went into camp at Valley Forge “no less than 2,898 men were unfit for duty because they were barefoot and otherwise naked.” They frequently sat up all night by the fires to keep warm. Provisions were scarce, the soldiers not having meat or bread for many days at a time. Washington had issued a proclamation ordering that half the grain in store within seventy miles of his camp should be threshed out before February 1st and the other half before March 1st. The farmers sent their provisions to the British army in Philadelphia, as they preferred the British gold to the Continental bills. Horses and wagons were scarce, so that the American soldiers yoked themselves to little wagons which they themselves made, or carried their wood and provisions on their backs. They were even without straw to lie down on the cold, wet ground in their rude cabins. There was sufficient food and clothing in the country, but the mismanagement of Congress prevented the American army being supplied with them. Washington's keen feeling for his suffering troops is fully attested by his prayer to the Lord of Hosts from his headquarters in the house of Isaac Potts. Said Mr. Potts to his wife: “If there is one man on the earth to whom the Lord will listen it is George Washington.”

**The  
Army's  
Terrible  
Distress.**

In the meantime, while the American army was suffering untold hardships in the camp at Valley Forge, during the severe winter of

**Conway  
Cabal.**

1777-78, a cabal was formed against its great commander-in-chief for his removal from his post and the substitution of General Gates or General Charles Lee as his successor. The leader in this conspiracy was General Conway, an Irishman, for which reason it was called the *Conway Cabal*. The other conspirators were Generals Mifflin and Gates, and the plot was secretly supported by many members of Congress, but it ended in ignominious failure. Generals Gates and Charles Lee and Thomas Paine had come from England a few years before the war. Generals St. Clair and Mercer and John Paul Jones had come from Scotland, and Generals Conway and Edward Hand had come from Ireland.

**American  
Dissen-  
sions.**

The American army was full of quarrels, the Northern men distrusting the Southern, and the Southern distrusting the Northern; while the American officers distrusted the foreign, and the foreign officers distrusted the American. Besides there were angry feelings in the American army against Congress, at times for its interference, at other times for its neglect. Much ill will on both sides was aroused by the question of half pay for life to the officers; opposition thereto manifesting itself in Congress, and the question being settled only by a compromise of half pay for seven years after the end of the war. Washington earnestly protested against the jealousies entertained by Congress against the army, saying: "The prejudices of other countries have only gone to them [the troops] in time of peace. \* \* \* It is our policy to be prejudiced against them in time of war; though they are citizens, having all the ties and interests of citizens."

**Washing-  
ton's  
Experi-  
ence.**

But the experience of the year had given Washington more confidence in his troops. He had time to learn their better points, their enthusiasm, their endurance, their devotion. The winter of the encampment at Valley Forge, with its cruel sufferings and the heroic fortitude and patriotic devotion with which those sufferings had been endured, formed a new bond of union between the American soldiers and their beloved commander-in-chief. His remonstrances against the jealousies of the Congress were accompanied by his account of the sufferings of his army, already referred to. Amid the clouds of despair and apparent hopelessness, his hopeful soul looked forward with bright anticipations of a more cheerful future for his country.

**Degener-  
acy of the  
American  
Congress.**

The Congress neglected the national interests, though finding time to abet Washington's enemies. Great changes had occurred in the membership of that body, many of the earlier members having retired, some to the offices of their respective States, some to the army, some to diplomatic posts, some to private life. Only a very few members attended the sessions, about twenty-five or thirty making what was then considered a full Congress. Alexander Hamilton, one of Washing-

ton's aids, wrote from headquarters as follows: "America once had a representation that would do honor to any age or nation. The present falling-off is very alarming and dangerous."

At the close of 1777 Lafayette wrote to Washington as follows: "I see plainly that America can defend herself if proper measures are taken; but I begin to fear that she may be lost by herself and her own sons. When I was in Europe I thought that here almost every man was a lover of liberty, and would rather die free than live a slave. You can conceive my astonishment when I saw that Toryism was as apparently professed as Whigism itself." Washington replied thus: "We must not, in so great a contest, expect to meet with nothing but sunshine."

**Lafayette's Complaint.**

The naval operations of the Americans in the War of American Independence do not occupy a conspicuous place in history, but they were by no means insignificant. Early in the war the Continental Congress took measures for the creation and organization of a navy, and Esek Hopkins, of Rhode Island, was placed at the head of the American naval department as Admiral. American vessels under Captains Biddle, Manly, McNeil, Wickes and John Paul Jones performed many gallant exploits, capturing many British vessels as prizes and inflicting great injury upon British commerce. In 1776 Benedict Arnold commanded an American flotilla on Lake Champlain, and Commodore Abraham Whipple another at Providence, Rhode Island.

**The American Navy.**

The boldest American cruises were those of Captain Wickes and John Paul Jones. After gaining prominence in West India waters, Captain Wickes, of the cruiser *Reprisal*, sailed for France in the fall of 1776. Encouraged by his successes in making prizes in the Bay of Biscay, Wickes started for a cruise around Ireland in the summer of 1777. With the *Reprisal*, the *Lexington* and the *Dolphin*, he cleared the Irish and English seas of their merchantmen; but while returning to America the *Lexington* was captured, and the *Reprisal*, with the brave Wickes and his entire crew, was lost on the Newfoundland coast. It was for the navy, of which the heroic Wickes was so honored an ornament, that the American flag was adopted on June 14, 1777.

**Cruise of Captain Wickes in British Waters.**

The question of alliances with Continental European Powers engaged the attention of the American Congress even before the Declaration of Independence. The scheme had encountered considerable opposition among the American people at first, as the more earnest spirits regarded it as humiliating to seek the protection or court the alliance of European monarchies, and as they feared that it was more likely to increase the perils of their cause than to add to its resources to be drawn into the interests and intrigues of the Old World. But as time went on and the difficulties of the Americans grew apace, American

**American Efforts at Foreign Alliances.**

**Silas  
Deane  
Sent to  
France.**

sentiment in favor of alliances with foreign powers gathered added strength. Early in 1776 the Continental Congress sent Silas Deane, of Connecticut, to France as an agent to obtain the alliance of that nation; and before he reached his destination the French government had promised a secret subsidy to the Americans.

**American  
Envoys to  
France.**

In June, 1776, the Continental Congress appointed a committee "to prepare a plan of treaties to be proposed to foreign powers." Congress adopted its committee's plan and appointed Silas Deane, of Connecticut; Dr. Benjamin Franklin, of Pennsylvania, and Arthur Lee, of Virginia, as envoys, or commissioners, to France, in September, 1776; soon afterward sending other commissioners to Spain, Prussia, Austria and Tuscany, December, 1776. In the embassy to France, Silas Deane was soon succeeded by John Adams, of Massachusetts, and this embassy devoted more time to quarreling among themselves than to the negotiations which they were appointed to conduct with France. But the disposition of France, as England's old enemy, did not need much diplomacy on the part of the Americans, and early in 1778 the desired result was finally attained.

**Franco-  
American  
Alliance.**

The surrender of Burgoyne convinced the French court and government that the Americans were able to defend their liberties; and accordingly that government concluded a treaty of alliance with, and recognized the independence of, the United States of America. Thus the efforts of Silas Deane of Connecticut, and of Dr. Franklin, with the Count de Vergennes, the Prime Minister of Louis XVI., were successful. This act of the French government led to a war between France and Great Britain; and a French fleet was sent to aid the Americans, conveying M. Gerard, the first French Minister to the United States. Even the British Ministry was now convinced of the hopelessness of the effort to conquer the revolted colonies, and Lord North introduced two conciliatory bills into Parliament granting the colonists all that they had claimed before their Declaration of Independence. King George III. was as obstinate as ever, but his influence broke down before the general despair. The country, however, sent fifteen thousand recruits to reinforce the British army in America.

**Its Effect  
in Great  
Britain.**

**Lord  
North's  
New Op-  
ponents.**

In the debates that ensued in Parliament, Lord North found that some of his former supporters were more virulent in their opposition to his Ministry than his political foes. These former partisans of his taunted him for abandoning the high principles of prerogative and British supremacy which he had hitherto maintained, and complained bitterly of the deception by which he had obtained their support. Lord North's conciliatory bills passed the House of Commons, but their progress through the House of Lords was marked by a memorable incident.

The Duke of Richmond and many others of the Whig party openly advocated the purchase of peace even at the cost of acknowledging American independence. The venerable William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, sinking under the weight of years and from the gout, appeared in his seat in the House of Lords for the purpose of protesting against the dismemberment of the British Empire, to whose greatness he had so largely contributed. He was in favor of reconciliation with the colonies, but was resolutely opposed to the acknowledgment of American independence, deprecating such a proceeding with great warmth and eloquence. After the Duke of Richmond had answered his speech, the venerable Earl of Chatham rose in reply; but his powers of nature were exhausted, and he fell on the floor of the House of Lords in a swoon, uttering in a few broken sentences his protest against acknowledging American independence. Among the words he murmured were these: "His Majesty succeeded to an empire as great in extent as its reputation was unsullied. Seventeen years ago this people was the terror of the world. Shall we fall prostrate before the House of Bourbon?" He then sank to the floor unconscious, and in that condition he was removed to his country-seat at Hayes, where he died in a few days, May 11, 1778, in the seventieth year of his age.

**Pitt's  
Last  
Speech.**

**His Last  
Illness  
and  
Death.**

Thus died the ablest and the most successful statesman that hitherto had wielded the destinies of Great Britain. Parliament paid merited honor to his memory, granting the sum of twenty thousand pounds for the liquidation of his debts, and settling a pension of four thousand pounds on his heirs. His remains were interred with great pomp in Westminster Abbey, and a monument was erected to his memory at the public expense.

**Honors  
to His  
Memory.**

Lord North sent commissioners to America to induce the Americans to consent to a peace on the condition that they should return to their allegiance to the British government, and that Parliament in return should repeal all its obnoxious acts and surrender its pretensions to legislate for the Americans. But the Americans now refused to treat for peace unless Great Britain should withdraw her fleets and armies, and unconditionally acknowledge the independence of the United States; and so the war continued. One of these British commissioners, Colonel Johnstone, attempted to bribe several members of the American Congress. General Joseph Reed, who had been approached thus, replied: "I am not worth buying; but, such as I am, the King of Great Britain is not rich enough to do it."

**British  
Peace  
Proposals.**

When it was known that a powerful French fleet under the Count D'Estaing was on its way to the Delaware, the British army, under Sir Henry Clinton, who in the meantime had succeeded General Howe as British commander-in-chief, evacuated Philadelphia on the 18th of

**Howe's  
Evacua-  
tion of  
Phila-  
delphia.**

**Battle of  
Mon-  
mouth.**

June, 1778, and fled into New Jersey, toward New York. Washington pursued Clinton with twelve thousand men; and at Monmouth Court House, on a hot Sabbath day, June 28, 1778, a sanguinary but indecisive battle was fought. General Charles Lee began the battle on the American side, and he and his troops were fleeing in a panic from the field, when Washington reprimanded him and checked the retreat. Lee was afterward court-martialed, suspended for one year and afterward dismissed. The British General Monckton was killed. An American artilleryman was killed at his cannon, whereupon his wife, who was returning with a pitcher of water, took his place at the cannon and remained there to the end of the battle, being thereafter known as "Molly Pitcher." The battle had continued nearly the entire day, and after midnight Clinton and his army fled to New York. Washington crossed the Hudson into New York, and encamped at White Plains until late in the autumn, when he again passed into New Jersey, and went into winter-quarters at Middlebrook, on the Raritan river. In the meantime Congress had returned to Philadelphia.

**Arrival  
of the  
French  
Fleet.**

The French fleet under the Count D'Estaing appeared in the Delaware early in July, 1778; but too late to surprise the British fleet under Lord Howe, as it had already sailed to New York. The French vessels were of too great draught to penetrate New York harbor and cooperate with Washington's army in an attack upon New York city. Thus disappointed in his first designs, D'Estaing sailed to Rhode Island to cooperate with the American army under Generals Sullivan, Greene and Lafayette in an attempt to expel the British from that State. This effort failed, not through the French alone, but also largely through the tardy arrival of the American troops, who entered the northern end of the island of Rhode Island, August 10, 1778, the very day on which the French fleet left its position at the southern end of the island to meet the British fleet under Lord Howe, which appeared off the island on the same day. After a partial engagement both fleets were disabled by a terrible storm and were obliged to seek port for repairs. After returning to Newport when Sullivan was near, August 20, 1778, D'Estaing refused to aid the American general, but sailed to Boston to repair his damaged fleet; whereupon Sullivan retreated northward, and was pursued by the British, who attacked him at Quaker Hill, August 29, 1778. Sullivan repulsed the enemy's attacks; but he was obliged to evacuate the island, as the British had just been reinforced by four thousand troops under General Clinton.

**Battle of  
Quaker  
Hill.**

**American  
Anger at  
D'Es-  
taing**

The Americans accused the Count D'Estaing of deserting them and of inefficiency, thus offending the faithful Lafayette. At the same time many Americans were guilty of the same thing of which they



accused the French admiral, as they deserted their own army. D'Estaing's orders from his own government were peremptory that he must repair his fleet in case of damage. He was so far from avoiding action on personal grounds that when Lafayette hurried to Boston to persuade him to return to Rhode Island the French admiral offered to serve as a volunteer until his fleet could be repaired. D'Estaing was soothed by the language of those whom he respected, but he was angered by the hostility of the American masses, both soldiers and citizens; and his disgust was kept up by collisions between his men and the Bostonians, and when his fleet was repaired he sailed to the West Indies to engage the British fleets there, to the chagrin and disappointment of the Americans.

During the year 1778 the Mohawk, Schoharie and Cherry Valleys, in New York, and the Wyoming Valley, in Pennsylvania, were the scenes of the most shocking cruelties perpetrated by the Indians under Joseph Brandt and the Tories under Colonels John Johnson and John Butler. At the beginning of July eleven hundred Indians and Tories under John Butler entered the lovely valley of Wyoming. Four hundred soldiers and settlers under Colonel Zebulon Butler, the cousin of Colonel John Butler, were utterly routed by the invaders, July 4, 1778. The few soldiers and settlers who had sought refuge in Forty Fort, near Wilkes-Barre, were forced to surrender, July 5, 1778; and about three hundred of the inhabitants of the valley, who had fled in the night to the neighboring mountains, were hunted by the savages and their white allies and massacred in cold blood. The Indians spread death and desolation over the beautiful valley, setting fire to dwellings and massacring several hundred men, women and children. This horrible tragedy is known as the *Massacre of Wyoming*. In November (1778) Cherry Valley, in New York, was visited by a band of Tories and Indians under Butler and Brandt; and many of the inhabitants were killed or carried into captivity.

**Massacre  
of Wyo-  
ming.**

**Massacre  
of Cherry  
Valley.**

Thus far the chief campaigns of the War of American Independence had been in the North, and the fall of 1778 found the British still in possession of New York and Newport, with their respective vicinities, the Americans in the meantime having recovered Philadelphia, their national capital. Washington wrote as follows from his camp at White Plains: "It is not a little pleasing, nor less wonderful to contemplate, that, after two years' maneuvering and undergoing the strangest vicissitudes that perhaps ever attended any one contest since the Creation, both armies are brought back to the very point they set out from, and that the offending party at the beginning is now reduced to the use of the spade and pickaxe for defense. The hand of Providence has been so conspicuous in all this that he need be worse than an

**Situation  
in the  
North.**

infidel that lacks faith and more than wicked that has not gratitude enough to acknowledge his obligations."

Desperate  
State of  
American  
Affairs.

But at the close of 1778 American affairs were in a very desperate state; and the Congress and the officials at Philadelphia, as well as the American people in general, exhibited a spirit which gave little ground for encouragement. Concerning the gloomy state of affairs Washington wrote as follows: "The common interests of America are mouldering and sinking into irretrievable ruin. If I were called upon to draw a picture of the times and of men, from what I have seen, heard and in part know, I should in one word say that idleness, dissipation and extravagance seem to have laid fast hold upon most of them; that speculation, speculation and an insatiable thirst for riches seem to have got the better of every other consideration and almost of every order of men; that party disputes and personal quarrels are the great business of the day; whilst the momentous concerns of an empire, a great and accumulating debt, ruined finances, depreciated money and want of credit, which, in its consequences, is the want of everything, are but secondary considerations, and postponed from day to day, from week to week, as if our affairs wore the most promising aspect. After drawing this picture, which from my soul I believe to be the true one, I need not repeat to you that I am alarmed and wish to see my countrymen aroused."

Conti-  
nental  
Money.

The American finances were now in a most wretched condition, as the two hundred million dollars of Continental money issued by the Continental Congress since 1776 had rapidly depreciated, and had become almost worthless by the close of 1778. The Baron de Steuben, the skillful disciplinarian and veteran from the armies of Frederick the Great of Prussia, was made Inspector-General of Washington's army, which still remained encamped at Middlebrook, New Jersey.

Baron de  
Steuben.

Daniel  
Boone  
and  
Major  
Clarke in  
the West.

During 1778 and 1779 important events were occurring in the vast wilderness west of the Allegheny mountains. For several years Daniel Boone, the great pioneer, had struggled with the Indians in the territory embraced in the present State of Kentucky. Kaskaskia, on the Mississippi, July 4, 1778, and Vincennes, on the Wabash, were wrested from the British by the Americans under Major George Rogers Clarke, of Virginia. Vincennes was recaptured by the enemy, but Clarke again obtained possession of that post in February, 1779, through the aid of its French inhabitants. The country north of the Ohio, embracing the southern parts of the present States of Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, was organized as a part of Virginia, under the name of Illinois county.

From the time of the repulse of the British in their attack upon Fort Moultrie, in the harbor of Charleston, South Carolina, June 28, 1776,

until the close of 1778 there had been no warfare in the Southern colonies except border-raiding expeditions along the frontier between Georgia and East Florida, the British sending out marauding expeditions from their garrisons, and the Georgians and Carolinians mustering their militia, so that nothing thus far was accomplished in that quarter except alarm and bloodshed.

In November, 1778, Sir Henry Clinton sent two thousand of his troops under Colonel Campbell to invade Georgia, thus transferring the seat of actual war to the Southern States. On the 29th of December (1778) Campbell entered Savannah, the American troops under Colonel Robert Howe having evacuated the town on the approach of the British and fled up the Savannah river. Royal authority was now temporarily reestablished in Georgia, and that State remained under the power of the British until near the end of the war.

On the 9th of January, 1779, the British army under General Prevost captured Sunbury, in Georgia. On the 14th of February (1779) a band of Tories under Colonel Boyd was annihilated by a Whig force under Colonel Andrew Pickens in the battle of Kettle Creek. The British, under Colonel Campbell, who had just marched up the Georgia side of the Savannah river, then fled toward the sea-coast, pursued by two thousand American troops under General James Ashe. At Brier Creek, Ashe was defeated on the 3d of March, 1779, by the British under General Prevost. After the battle of Brier Creek, Prevost invaded South Carolina and marched against Charleston. An American army under General Benjamin Lincoln hastened to the relief of Charleston, whereupon Prevost retreated with great haste toward Savannah. On the 20th of June (1779) a severe battle took place at Stono Ferry between detachments of the two armies, which resulted in the repulse of the Americans.

An expedition composed of fifteen hundred British and Hessian troops under Governor Tryon made a destructive raid into Connecticut in April, 1779. After defeating the Americans under General Putnam at Greenwich, Tryon retreated westward to New York, pursued by Putnam, who retook some of the enemy's plunder. In the beginning of July, of the same year, Tryon, with two thousand British troops, made another destructive invasion of Connecticut, laying the beautiful towns of East Haven, Fairfield and Norwalk in ashes.

In May, 1779, Sir George Collier, with a small British squadron, and General Matthews, with an English land force, ravaged the country around Norfolk, in Virginia. On the 31st of May, Stony Point, on the west side of the Hudson river, was taken by the British under Sir Henry Clinton, who, on the following day (June 1, 1779), also captured Verplanck's Point, on the opposite side of the river.

**Border  
War  
in the  
South.**

**Invasion  
of Georgia  
and  
Capture of  
Savan-  
nah.**

**Battles of  
Kettle  
Creek,  
Brier  
Creek  
and Stono  
Ferry.**

**Tryon's  
Raids in  
Connect-  
icut.**

**British  
Raids in  
Virginia  
and  
New  
York.**

Wayne's  
Recapture  
of Stony  
Point.

About midnight, July 16, 1779, General Anthony Wayne, with a small American force, recaptured Stony Point, after a short but desperate fight, and made the British garrison, commanded by Colonel Johnson, prisoners of war. The loss of the British in killed, wounded and captured was about six hundred men. On the 19th of the same month (July, 1779) Major Henry Lee, at the head of a small body of Americans, captured Paulus Hook (now Jersey City), opposite New York city, after killing, wounding and capturing two hundred of the enemy. In August a British fleet destroyed an American flotilla off Castine, on the coast of the present State of Maine.

Major  
Lee's  
Capture  
of Paulus  
Hook.

Sul-  
livan's  
Chastise-  
ment of  
the Six  
Nations.

In the summer of 1779 the Americans sent an expedition under General John Sullivan to punish the New York Indians for their raids and massacres in the Wyoming and Cherry Valleys in the previous year. At the head of nearly five thousand men, Sullivan invaded the country of the Six Nations, in Western New York, where, in the battle of Chemung, near the site of Elmira, August 29, 1779, he defeated the Indians very severely, and then, in the space of three weeks, he destroyed the crops of the Indians and forty of their villages, and thoroughly humbled their leading chief, Cornplanter.

Siege of  
Savan-  
nah.

The American army under General Lincoln, aided by the French fleet under the Count D'Estaing, commenced to besiege the British at Savannah on the 23d of September, 1779. A heavy assault upon the British works, on the 9th of October, was repulsed after five hours of fighting, in which the Americans and French lost one thousand men; the brave Pole, Count Pulaski, being mortally wounded. The brave Sergeant Jasper, whose gallant act during the defense of Fort Moultrie in 1776 we have noticed, was also slain while holding aloft the colors presented to Moultrie's regiment by the ladies of Charleston. After his repulse D'Estaing sailed with his fleet to the West Indies, and Lincoln was obliged to raise the siege and retreat to Charleston. As in Rhode Island the year before, the Americans accused D'Estaing of deserting them, thus blaming him for depriving them of victory a second time.

Siege  
Raised.

Cruises  
of John  
Paul  
Jones in  
British  
Waters.

The operations of the American navy now extended to the very coast of Great Britain itself. Following in the track of the gallant Captain Wickes, John Paul Jones sailed in the *Ranger* from France to the coasts of England and his native Scotland, entering Whitehaven, England, where he took the fortifications and burned the shipping of the fort, in the spring of 1778. In the summer of 1779 he sailed from France and cruised along the coasts of Scotland with seven vessels, descended along the eastern shore of England, and encountered a merchant fleet under convoy of two British war vessels, the *Serapis* and the *Countess of Scarborough*, off Flamborough Head, September 23, 1779. Jones's

vessel, the *Bonhomme Richard*, engaged the *Serapis*, commanded by Captain Pearson; while the *Pallas*, under Captain Cottineau, a Frenchman, engaged the *Countess of Scarborough*. After a bloody fight of several hours, both British vessels surrendered. The *Bonhomme Richard* was so badly injured that she sunk sixteen hours after the engagement.

**His Great Victory off Flamborough Head.**

Another power was now added to the enemies of Great Britain. With the hope of recovering the rock of Gibraltar, Spain declared war against Great Britain in June, 1779. A combined French and Spanish armament attempted an invasion of England in August, and a united French and Spanish naval force laid siege to Gibraltar.

**War between Great Britain and Spain.**

At the close of 1779 Sir Henry Clinton sailed, with five thousand troops, in Admiral Arbuthnot's fleet, from New York, for Charleston, South Carolina, which city was then garrisoned by the American army under General Lincoln. On the 9th of April, 1780, Arbuthnot, with the British fleet, passed up Charleston harbor, and both he and Clinton, who landed troops on the islands below Charleston, laid siege to the city. On the 14th of April (1780) a party of Americans under Colonel Huger was defeated by the British cavalry under Colonel Tarleton, at Monk's Corner, some distance north from the city. After the siege had lasted a month, and after the city had suffered heavy bombardments and been on fire in many places, Lincoln surrendered Charleston, together with his army and many citizens, six thousand in number, and four hundred pieces of cannon, to Clinton, on the 12th of May, 1780. Early in the following month Clinton sailed with the greater part of the British army for New York, leaving Lord Cornwallis with a small force to complete the subjugation of the Southern States.

**Siege and Capture of Charleston.**

Already Cornwallis had marched up the Santee to Camden; Lieutenant-Colonel Cruger, with a small British force, marched to and garrisoned Fort Ninety-Six; and Lieutenant-Colonel Smith, with another British detachment, marched to and garrisoned the town of Augusta, in Georgia. At the Waxaw Creek the British cavalry under Colonel Tarleton captured and massacred a small force of American infantry under Colonel Buford. All of South Carolina was now at the mercy of the British, and Cornwallis prepared for the reestablishment of royal authority in that State. Soon, however, when it was known that General Horatio Gates was advancing southward with an American army for the aid of the patriots of the Carolinas, guerrilla leaders like Thomas Sumter, Francis Marion, Andrew Pickens and General Elijah Clarke appeared in the field at the head of small detachments, falling upon and annoying bands of British and Tories. Sumter was repulsed at Rocky Mount on the 30th of July, but he afterward almost annihilated Tarleton's cavalry at Hanging Rock, August 6, 1780,

**Invasion of South Carolina by Lord Cornwallis.**

**American Guerrilla Bands.**

**Battle of Hanging Rock.**

but he could not follow up his victory because his troops stole the enemy's liquors and became intoxicated.

**Battle of Sanders' Creek.**

In August, 1780, the American army under General Gates entered South Carolina from the North. On the 16th of that month Gates's army was thoroughly defeated and dispersed by the British forces under Lords Cornwallis and Rawdon in the battle of Sanders' Creek, near Camden. The Americans lost one thousand men, the brave Baron De Kalb being among the slain, his last words being: "To die for liberty is sweet"; and General Gates fled to Charlotte, North Carolina. Two days after the defeat of Gates (August 18, 1780), Colonel Sumter's force was almost broken up by the British cavalry under Colonel Tarleton, on Fishing Creek. These American misfortunes again prostrated South Carolina at the feet of the enemy.

**Battle of Fishing Creek.**

**Battle of King's Mountain.**

Cornwallis attempted to restore British authority in South Carolina by harsh measures; but his tyranny prevented a reconciliation, and inflamed the patriots with deadly hatred of British rule. On the 7th of October (1780) a body of fifteen hundred Tory militia under Major Patrick Ferguson was completely defeated by backwoods patriots under Colonels Campbell, Shelby, Cleveland, Sevier, Winston, McDowell and Williams, on King's Mountain, in the south-western part of North Carolina; the patriots taking eight hundred prisoners and fifteen hundred stand of arms, and Major Ferguson being among the slain.


**American Guerrilla Warfare.**

The ceaseless and annoying activity of the guerrilla leaders, Colonels Sumter, Marion, Pickens and Clarke, alarmed Cornwallis and caused him to retire from North Carolina, which State he had just invaded, and to return to South Carolina. Sumter won a victory over a British detachment under Colonel Wemys at Fishdam Ford, November 12, 1780, and defeated Tarleton's cavalry at Blackstock's Plantation, November 20, 1780. The discomfited Colonel Tarleton called Sumter the "Carolina Game Cock," and designated Marion as the "Swamp Fox." A British officer visiting Marion's camp, observing his men roasting sweet potato roots for their meal, said it was useless to attempt to conquer a people who were willing to live on such a fare.

**Sumter's Victories.**

**Contemplated Abandonment of the South.**

It seemed as if the British conquest of the Southern colonies was complete, as so little exertion was made by the Americans in the Northern colonies to defend their Southern brethren, and a rumor was circulated that the American authorities were about to abandon South Carolina and Georgia altogether, as Lord Cornwallis ruled South Carolina without opposition, and Sir James Wright, the royal governor of Georgia before the war, returned and resumed his functions as chief magistrate of that extreme Southern colony. The French Minister to the United States—the Marquis de la Luzerne—wrote to his govern-



MARION AND THE BRITISH OFFICER





ment that the British proposed to acknowledge the independence of the ten other revolted colonies if the United States authorities would surrender the two Carolinas and Georgia to the British. The sectional jealousies in and out of Congress were so great that many Northern men were willing to abandon the far South to the enemy.

But there were many more who appreciated the necessity of defending and holding fast to the Southern as well as the Northern States. Washington turned an anxious eye to the affairs of the South, as expressed in a letter which he wrote to the president of the Continental Congress as follows: "The affairs of the Southern States seem to be so exceedingly disordered and their resources so much exhausted that whatever may be undertaken there must chiefly depend on the means carried from hence. If these fail we shall be condemned to a disgraceful and fatal inactivity."

The year 1780 found American affairs dark also in the North. Washington hoped for an active campaign at the opening of the year 1780, but his hopes faded away one by one. Lafayette, upon his return from a year's absence in France, where he had been ceaselessly upholding the interests of the struggling Americans, announced the coming of a French land and naval armament to aid the Americans.

In June, 1780, a British force of five thousand men under General Matthews invaded New Jersey from New York city. After being defeated in a skirmish at Springfield by the Americans under General Nathaniel Greene, the invaders again retired from New Jersey and returned to New York. In July, 1780, the French fleet under Admiral de Ternay, carrying six thousand French land troops under the Count de Rochambeau, landed at Newport, Rhode Island.

After its arrival at Newport, Rhode Island, in July, 1780, the French fleet and army was blockaded there by a British fleet, and General Washington's plans for a combined French and American attack upon the British under Sir Henry Clinton at New York was frustrated. The Count de Rochambeau wrote to his government as follows: "Upon our arrival here the country was in consternation. The paper money had fallen to sixty for one. \* \* \* I landed with my staff without troops; nobody appeared in the streets; those at the windows looked sad and depressed. \* \* \* Send us troops, ships and money, but do not depend upon this people or upon their means." Soon afterward Washington wrote: "If either the temper or the resources of the country will not admit of an alteration, we may expect soon to be reduced to the humiliating condition of seeing the cause of America in America upheld by foreign arms." Again he wrote: "But I give it as my opinion that a foreign loan is indispensably necessary to the continuance of the war."

Defense  
of the  
South.

Darkness  
in the  
North.

British  
Invasion  
of New  
Jersey.

French  
Fleet and  
Army.

Proposed  
Franco-  
American  
Attack on  
New  
York  
Foiled.

**Northern  
Border  
Raids.**

In October, 1780, detachments of British troops, American Tories and Indian warriors ravaged the fields and surprised the fortresses of Northern New York. The Americans suffered a succession of disasters, when Congress, in compliance with the requests of Washington, again gave its attention to the organization of the American army, proposing enlistments of troops to continue during the war and half pay of officers to continue afterwards and for life, but no action was taken on the proposition. More effective were the exertions of the women of Pennsylvania, under the direction of the wife of General Joseph Reed; and the women of New Jersey, under the leadership of Mrs. Dickinson, who raised generous subscriptions to supply the wants of the American army. Washington wrote to the ladies of Philadelphia on the death of Mrs. Reed: "The spirit that animated the members of your association entitles them to an equal place with any who have preceded them in the walk of female patriotism. It embellishes the American character with a new trait."

**Inaction  
of  
Congress.****American  
Female  
Exer-  
tions.****Benedict  
Arnold's  
Defection.**

While General Washington was in New England, conferring with the French officers, General Benedict Arnold was bargaining with Sir Henry Clinton for the surrender of the important post of West Point, on the Hudson river, into the hands of the enemy. Arnold, who had incurred vast debts by his extravagance, had been charged by Congress with fraudulent transactions while military governor in Philadelphia. As a punishment, Congress sentenced him to a reprimand from Washington. Arnold determined to have revenge by plotting treason against his country and aiding its enemies. His correspondence with Sir Henry Clinton was carried on through the young and accomplished Major John Andre, Clinton's adjutant-general. The treasonable correspondence between Arnold and Clinton had been carried on for more than a year, when, in September, 1780, Arnold and Andre met personally for the first time at Havrestraw, on the west side of the Hudson river. When their bargain was closed, Major Andre prepared to return to Clinton's headquarters at New York. On his way, Andre was stopped and made a prisoner by three young American militia-men; and on the 2d of October (1780) he was hanged as a spy by the Americans. Arnold succeeded in making his escape to the enemy; and he received a commission of brigadier-general in the British army and fifty thousand dollars, as a reward for his treason to his country. Major Andre, like General Burgoyne, was a descendant of the French Huguenots who had settled in England after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes by Louis XIV. in 1685.

**Arnold  
and  
Andre.****Andre's  
Capture  
and Exe-  
cution.**

When it became known to the British Ministry through the capture of Henry Laurens, of South Carolina, the American commissioner to the Dutch government, that a secret commercial treaty had been con-

cluded between Holland and the United States, the British Parliament declared war against Holland, on the 20th of December, 1780. Thus Great Britain had now to contend, without any assistance, against France, Spain, Holland and her rebellious colonies in North America. At about the same time the Empress Catharine II. of Russia induced the governments of Sweden, Denmark, Prussia, Germany and Portugal to unite with her in a maritime alliance called the *Armed Neutrality*. The alleged object of this powerful league was the defense of the neutral powers against the right of search claimed by Great Britain, but its real object was to deprive Great Britain of her maritime superiority.

War  
between  
Great  
Britain  
and  
Holland.

Armed  
Neu-  
trality  
against  
Great  
Britain.

The *Articles of Confederation and Perpetual Union between the States*, adopted by the Continental Congress near the close of 1777, were not yet accepted by all the thirteen States. The States to which they were sent for approval had found many objections to the plan of union. Some of the larger States did not like the right of the smaller States to an equal vote with themselves in Congress. The smaller States opposed the claims of the larger States to the unoccupied lands of the country, asserting that what was gained by common exertion should be diverted to common advantage. New Jersey wisely objected on the ground that the Congress, or the general government, was not clothed with sufficient power, especially as to regulating the trade of the country. These and other difficulties were overcome very slowly. When all the others had been removed, the question of the unoccupied lands still delayed the adoption of the Articles of Confederation. The magnanimity with which this last obstacle was removed is a bright episode in the annals of the period. New Jersey was the first of the smaller States to accept the Articles of Confederation, relying upon the justice of the more powerful States (November 20, 1778). New York was the first State to cede her Western landed claims to the general government (February 19, 1780). New York's generosity and New Jersey's confidence induced the other States to enter the Confederation, and with the accession of the hitherto-reluctant Maryland the Union was complete (March 1, 1781).

Final  
Adoption  
of the  
Articles  
of Confed-  
eration.

Congratulations were general, and so far as they related to the closer union of the States they were well founded, but on the score of a national government nothing had been gained. As a matter of fact, something had been lost, as the powers of Congress had been curtailed rather than augmented by the Articles of Confederation. Before the adoption of the Articles a majority of the States decided a question, but under the Articles nine out of the thirteen had to be agreed in order to carry any measure. For instance, the half pay for life that the Congress had voted for the army officers was reconsidered and refused

Ineffi-  
ciency  
of the  
Confed-  
eration.

by the Congress under the Articles of Confederation, as less than nine States voted for its fulfillment. All this had been foreseen and regretted. Concerning this action Washington wrote: "A nominal head, which is at present but another name for Congress, will no longer do." His aide-de-camp, Alexander Hamilton, wrote that the Congress must be clothed with proper authority, "by resuming and exercising the discretionary powers originally vested in them," or "by calling immediately a convention of all the States, with full authority to conclude finally upon a general confederation." Just before the adoption of the Articles of Confederation the New York Legislature presented a formal memorial to Congress, saying: "We shall not presume to give our opinion on the question whether Congress had adequate powers or not. But we will without hesitation declare that if they have not they ought to have them, and that we stand ready to confer them." A proposal of Congress to impose import duties illustrated the inefficiency of the Confederation. Rhode Island refused to grant the necessary power to the general government, and Virginia retracted it after granting it, December, 1782. Such was the weakness of the Union of the States under the Articles of Confederation.

**Mutiny of Pennsylvania Troops.**

On the 1st of January, 1781, about thirteen hundred Pennsylvania troops left Washington's camp at Morristown, New Jersey, and marched toward Philadelphia, for the purpose of compelling the Congress to provide the soldiers with pay and clothing, which duty had long been neglected. General Wayne, whom Washington had sent to force the mutineers to return to camp, boldly faced them with loaded pistols in his hands, whereupon they pointed their bayonets at his breast and said: "We love and respect you, but if you fire you are a dead man. On the contrary, we are not going over to the enemy. Were they to come out now we would fight under your orders with as much alacrity as ever." When the mutineers arrived at Princeton, British emissaries sent by General Clinton tried to bribe them to enter the king's service; but the mutineers, indignant at the implied doubt of their patriotism and devotion to the cause of freedom, handed the emissaries over to General Wayne for punishment as spies. When offered a reward for this exhibition of loyalty and patriotism they refused it, saying: "Our necessities compelled us to ask justice from our government. We ask no reward for doing our duty to our country against its enemies." At Princeton the mutineers were also met by a committee from the Congress, promising that that body would provide for their necessities as soon as they returned to duty. The Pennsylvania mutineers accepted the promise and returned to camp. On the 18th of the same month (January, 1781) some of the New Jersey troops at Pompton, in the same State, also mutinied; but this disorder was sup-

**Their Resolution.**

**Their Loyalty and Patriotism.**

**Mutiny of New Jersey Troops.**

pressed by military force, and two of the ringleaders were hanged as a punishment for their mutiny.

Warned by these events, Congress and the American people put forth greater exertions to ameliorate the condition of the troops; and Robert Morris, of Philadelphia, was appointed by Congress to the post of financial agent of the American government, and it was largely by his efforts that the Americans were enabled to continue the struggle.

**Robert  
Morris.**

Early in January, 1781, Arnold the traitor, with sixteen hundred British and Tories, invaded Virginia, went up the James river and destroyed much property at Richmond. In March, General Lafayette was sent with twelve hundred Americans to oppose Arnold's farther advance in Virginia; but the traitor was soon reinforced by two thousand British troops under General Phillips, when he went up the James river on another marauding expedition. Soon afterward Arnold left Virginia, and Phillips died at Petersburg.

**Arnold's  
Raid in  
Virginia.**

The Southern States were the chief theater of war in 1781. General Nathaniel Greene was entrusted with the command of the American armies in the South at the close of 1780. On the 17th of January, 1781, a part of Greene's army, under General Daniel Morgan, defeated Tarleton's cavalry in the battle of the Cowpens, in the north-western part of South Carolina, on which occasion Colonels William A. Washington, of Virginia, and John Eager Howard, of Maryland, behaved very gallantly. After the battle Morgan retreated toward Virginia with his five hundred prisoners, and was pursued by the British army under Lord Cornwallis. Greene soon joined Morgan, and the whole American army made a safe retreat across North Carolina into Virginia. After the Americans had crossed the Dan river, Cornwallis, greatly dispirited, gave up the pursuit, and took post at Hillsborough, in North Carolina. General Daniel Morgan was an ancestor of the great financier, John Pierpont Morgan.

**Battle of  
Cowpens.**

**Remark-  
able  
American  
Retreat.**

After a short rest in Virginia, Greene marched into North Carolina to oppose Cornwallis. A bloody battle was fought at Guilford Court House, near Hillsborough, on the 15th of March, 1781. Greene was driven from the field; but the army of Cornwallis suffered severely, and retired to Wilmington. Said Charles James Fox in the House of Commons: "Another such victory will ruin the British army." Greene next advanced into South Carolina to oppose the British under Lord Rawdon. On the 25th of April, Greene was defeated by Rawdon in the battle of Hobkirk's Hill, near Camden. About the middle of May (1781) four important military posts in South Carolina fell into the hands of the Americans.

**Battle of  
Guilford  
Court  
House.**

**Battle of  
Hobkirk's  
Hill.**

On the 22d of May (1781) Greene laid siege to Fort Ninety-Six. After vainly attempting for nearly a month to take the fort, Greene

**Siege of  
Fort  
Ninety-  
Six.**

Capture  
of  
Augusta.

relinquished the siege and retired from the place on the 19th of June, and marched to the High Hills of Santec. American troops under Colonels Pickens, Clarke and Henry Lee captured Augusta, in Georgia, on the 5th of June, 1781, after a siege of twelve days.

Colonel  
Isaac  
Hayne's  
Capture,  
Parole  
and  
Execu-  
tion.

In August, 1781, Lord Rawdon sailed for England, leaving his army in command of Colonel Stuart. Before Rawdon's departure a tragic scene occurred in Charleston. Among those who were paroled by the British after the capture of Charleston in 1780 was Colonel Isaac Hayne, of South Carolina. When the British were driven from the vicinity of his residence, Hayne, considering himself released from the obligations of his parole, again took up arms against the British and was taken prisoner. He was brought before Colonel Balfour, the British commandant at Charleston, who condemned him to death as a traitor, although many Tories petitioned in his favor. Lord Rawdon, who was a man of generous feelings, vainly exerted himself to save the prisoner, but finally consented to his execution. This action caused great excitement throughout the Southern States, and was condemned by the Americans as an act of unwarrantable cruelty; but it was strongly urged by the British as a measure of justice.

Battle of  
Eutaw  
Springs.

During the summer of 1781 Greene encamped on the High Hills of Santec. On the 8th of September he fought with the British under Colonel Stuart the battle of Eutaw Springs. Greene was driven from his position, but during the night the British fled to Charleston and the American army reoccupied the battlefield. The American guerrilla parties under Colonels Marion, Sumter and Henry Lee confined the enemy to the sea-board; so that at the close of 1781 Charleston and Savannah were the only posts held by the British south of New York.


British  
Driven  
to the  
Sea-  
coast.

Lord  
Corn-  
wallis in  
Virginia.

Lord Cornwallis left Wilmington, North Carolina, on the 25th of April, 1781, and arrived at Petersburg, Virginia, on the 20th of May, where he took command of the troops of the deceased General Phillips. Cornwallis moved beyond Richmond, destroying a vast amount of property; but he was compelled to retire before the Americans under General Wayne, Lafayette and Baron Steuben. Soon afterward Cornwallis retired to the sea-coast, and fortified Yorktown, on the York river, near its mouth.

Crisis in  
American  
Affairs.

Before the concentration of the British in Virginia, Washington wrote: "Our affairs are brought to an awful crisis." Again he wrote: "Why need I run into details when it may be declared in a word that we are at the end of our tether and that now or never our deliverance must come?" As dangers accumulated he wrote: "But we must not despair; the game is yet in our own hands; to play it well is all we have to do, and I trust the experience of error will enable us to act better in future. A cloud may yet pass over us, individuals



WASHINGTON AT YORKTOWN





may be ruined, and the country at large, or particular States, undergo temporary distress; but certain I am that it is in our power to bring the war to a happy conclusion."

The American people were not up to the emergency at this time, as a spirit of weariness and selfishness prevailed among them, which was echoed in the restless spirit of the army, which was so ill disciplined and ill fed. The general government was still ineffective; the Confederation was feeble; Congress was inert, if not broken down, as shown by its disposition to abandon the Mississippi to Spain and even to waive the express acknowledgment of American independence as an indispensable preliminary to negotiations for a treaty of peace with Great Britain.

Early in July, 1781, Washington's army was reinforced by French troops under the Count de Rochambeau, and an attempt was about to be made to expel the British army under Sir Henry Clinton from New York city; but when Clinton was reinforced by three thousand fresh troops from England, Washington resolved to march into Virginia for the purpose of driving the British under Cornwallis from that State. After Washington had marched through New Jersey, Clinton sent the traitor Arnold on a plundering expedition into Connecticut for the purpose of inducing Washington to turn back. Although Arnold burned New London and massacred the American garrison under Colonel Ledyard at Fort Griswold, Washington continued his march for Virginia.

On the 28th of September, 1781, the allied American and French armies, under General Washington and the Count de Rochambeau, appeared before Yorktown. The Count de Grasse, with a powerful French fleet, arrived in the mouth of the York river, from the West Indies. A vigorous siege of the British works was soon commenced. The besiegers opened a heavy cannonade upon the British works on the 9th of October, and two of the British redoubts were captured by American and French storming parties under General Lafayette. Reduced to great extremities, Cornwallis attempted to escape on the 16th with his army and join Clinton at New York, but was prevented from so doing by a terrific storm.

This storm destroyed the last hope of Cornwallis, and three days afterward (October 19, 1781) he surrendered Yorktown and his entire army of seven thousand men to General Washington and his shipping to the Count de Grasse. As Lord Cornwallis did not appear in person to offer his sword to Washington, but sent General O'Hara to offer his sword instead, Washington ordered General Lincoln to receive Lord Cornwallis's sword from General O'Hara. A few days after the surrender of Lord Cornwallis, Sir Henry Clinton appeared at the mouth of

**American  
Weak-  
ness and  
Weari-  
ness.**

**Washing-  
ton's  
March for  
Virginia.**

**Arnold's  
Raid in  
Con-  
necticut.**

**Siege of  
York-  
town.**

**Surrender  
of Corn-  
wallis.**

**Clinton's  
Move-  
ments.**

the Chesapeake bay with seven thousand British troops to assist Cornwallis: but, being too late, he soon returned to New York, astonished and chagrined.

**American  
Rejoic-  
ings.**

The surrender of Lord Cornwallis was hailed by the Americans as a harbinger of peace and caused unbounded rejoicings throughout the United States. From every American hearthstone, from pulpits, from the American army, from legislative halls and from Congress went up shouts to the Lord God Omnipotent for the great victory. A messenger with the despatch from Washington reached Philadelphia at midnight October 23, 1781; and the watchmen cried out: "Twelve o'clock and Cornwallis is taken." Very soon lights were seen in all the houses, and the excited people soon poured into the streets and made the air resound with their huzzas. At an early hour in the morning, October 24, 1781, Secretary Thomson read the letter to the assembled Congress. That body addressed thanks to the officers and soldiers, and then went in procession to church to offer thanks to God for the great triumph. Congress also appointed the 13th of December following as a day of national thanksgiving. General Lafayette wrote: "The play is over, and the fifth act is just finished."

**Action of  
Congress.**

**Lord  
North's  
Dismay.**

The surrender of Cornwallis struck terror and amazement into the hearts of Lord North and his supporters in the British Parliament. In his dismay Lord North paced the room, and, throwing his arms about wildly, he kept exclaiming: "O God! it is all over, it is all over!" The English people, who had long desired peace, were now fully convinced of the utter impossibility of restoring Great Britain's colonial empire in North America; and their demands found expression in Parliament, as we shall see presently.

**British  
Senti-  
ment.**

**Great  
Britain  
and Her  
European  
Enemies.**

Although military operations were thus ended in North America, hostilities were now prosecuted with the greatest animosity between Great Britain and her European enemies. Since 1778 the war had extended to other parts of the world, and had been conducted with various success by the British against the French, the Spaniards and the Dutch on the ocean, in Africa and in the East and West Indies. The British fleets under Admirals Rodney, Keppel, Graves, Parker and others maintained the honor of Great Britain on the seas against the attacks of her combined enemies.

**Military  
Move-  
ments.**

After the surrender of Cornwallis, General Washington earnestly desired the coöperation of the French fleet in an attack upon the British at Charleston, but the Count de Grasse refused. Washington next urged upon the French naval commander the transportation of his troops to Wilmington, North Carolina, but the Count de Grasse again refused Washington's request, on the ground that his presence was demanded in the West Indies, whither he then sailed with his fleet. The French

army under the Count de Rochambeau passed the winter at Williamsburg, Virginia; while Washington led a part of his army north to the Hudson and sent a part to reinforce the American forces in the Carolinas. It was apparent that hostilities were practically over, but Washington advised his countrymen to be on the alert, repeatedly rebuking them for the inaction into which they allowed themselves to fall, as if their work was completed. The British still occupied the Penobscot, New York, Charleston and Savannah, but they had evacuated Wilmington, North Carolina. In the meantime Sir Henry Clinton had been superseded in his command by Sir Guy Carleton, the former governor of Canada. Lafayette wrote from France that "the evacuation of New York and Charleston are as far from British intentions as the evacuation of London."

**Peace Prospect.**

The Americans were now practically without army supplies, at least without such as are indispensable for any active military operations. When the French troops under the command of the Count de Rochambeau arrived at the American camp on the Hudson, in the fall of 1782, they passed between two lines of American troops clothed and armed by subsidies from France. This incident was a touching tribute of gratitude and affection for a generous ally, but it was likewise a touching confession of weakness. All the French, with the exception of a single corps, embarked for their homes at the end of the year 1782, and the remainder followed in the spring of 1783, carrying with them the grateful benedictions of the people whose independence they had come to assist in establishing.

**American Weakness and Poverty.**

The first collision between Great Britain and France in the War of the American Revolution occurred at sea. A British fleet under Admiral Keppel had been sent to cruise in the English Channel. Keppel encountered the French fleet under D'Orvilliers off Ushant, on the western coast of France, July 27, 1778; but being badly supported by his second in command, Sir Hugh Palliser, Keppel obtained no decisive success. Lord North's Ministry took advantage of this circumstance to crush Keppel, who had been their political opponent; and at their instigation Palliser preferred a charge of misconduct against his superior. But the court-martial's verdict disappointed the expectations of the Ministry, as Keppel was honorably acquitted; while Palliser was afterward tried for disobedience of orders, and was partially condemned, being saved from a more ignominious verdict only by the interposition of the whole power of the Ministry.

**Indecisive Naval Fight off Ushant.**

**Admiral Keppel's Court-martial and Acquittal**

Soon after the recognition of American independence by France, the English East India Company sent orders to its officers at Madras to attack the neighboring post of Pondicherry, the capital of the French possessions in India. An army of ten thousand men—English-

**British Capture of the French Possessions in India.**

men and Sepoys—accordingly besieged that post, and compelled it to surrender in October of the same year, 1778. Chandernagore and Mahé—the other French possessions in India—were also captured by the English during 1778; so that the French power in India was almost annihilated in one campaign.

British  
and  
French  
Opera-  
tions in  
the West  
Indies.

During the fall of 1778 and the ensuing winter the West Indies were the chief seat of the naval operations of Great Britain and France. In September, 1778, the governor of the French island of Martinique conquered the English island of Dominica, and obtained possession of a large quantity of military stores; but in December of the same year a British fleet under Admiral Barrington conquered the French island of St. Lucia, after the French fleet under the Count d'Estaing had failed to relieve the island.

Spain's  
War with  
Great  
Britain.

As we have seen, Spain declared war against Great Britain in June, 1779. Spain had offered her mediation between Great Britain and France merely as the forerunner of a rupture with Great Britain; and, on the pretext that her mediation had been slighted, she issued a declaration of war against Great Britain, as the ally of France. A combined French and Spanish land and naval force laid siege to Gibraltar.

French  
Successes  
in 1779.

Early in 1779 a French fleet attacked and captured the British forts and factories on the rivers Senegal and Gambia, on the western coast of Africa. Later in the same year the French conquered the English islands of St. Vincent and Granada in the West Indies; but, as we have seen, the French fleet under the Count d'Estaing, in conjunction with an American land force, was repulsed in the siege of Savannah.

Threat-  
ened  
French  
and  
Spanish  
Invasion  
of  
England.

In August, 1779, a combined French and Spanish armament swept the English Channel and attempted an invasion of England. Lord Sandwich, the First Lord of the Admiralty, was notoriously incompetent for his position; but his colleagues in the Ministry, with the blind obstinacy which characterized all their measures, resolved to retain him in office, in spite of the fact that by his neglect Plymouth had been left in such a defenseless condition that its dockyards and arsenal were saved from destruction only by the ignorance of the French and Spanish admirals. Fortunately for the English, the allied admirals thus raised the blockade of Plymouth, and the army of sixty thousand men which had been assembled on the opposite coast of France was withdrawn.

Peaceful  
Revolu-  
tion in  
Ireland.

Even Ireland turned against England in this emergency, and a revolution began in that kingdom which at one time threatened a separation from Great Britain, but this revolution terminated bloodlessly. Most of the army necessary for the defense of Ireland had been withdrawn from that country and sent to America to aid in suppressing the rebellion against British authority there, and when the allied French and

Spanish fleets menaced Ireland with invasion there were no preparations for the defense of that island. Left to themselves, the Irish people displayed a spirit worthy of the crisis. Companies of volunteers were enrolled in every town and district of Ireland. The British government cheerfully supplied arms. The volunteers chose officers, and the patriotic Earl of Charlemont was appointed commander-in-chief of these independent companies, numbering one hundred thousand men.

**Irish  
Volun-  
teers.**

When Great Britain recovered her wonted naval superiority the fear of invasion was removed; but the hundred thousand Irish volunteers retained their arms and refused to disband, thus preserving their organization. They had learned the secret of their strength, and were resolved to effect the regeneration of their country by establishing the independence of the Irish Parliament and the freedom of Irish commerce. They accordingly demanded the repeal of Poyning's Law, an old statute passed by the English Parliament during the reign of Henry VII. requiring all acts passed by the Parliament of Ireland to be approved by that of England before they could become valid. They also demanded that the Irish House of Lords should be recognized as a final Court of Appeal for Ireland. This was a new and unexpected difficulty for Lord North's Ministry; but the Ministry pursued consistently their steady course of narrow and illiberal policy and refused to make any concession, thus bringing Ireland to the very brink of revolution.

**Irish De-  
mands.**

Early in January, 1780, the British fleet under Admiral Sir George Rodney, the greatest English admiral except Nelson and Blake, while on the way to relieve the beleaguered fortresses of Gibraltar, captured a Spanish squadron of seven ships-of-war and many transports; and several days afterward this same British fleet defeated a much larger Spanish squadron off Cape St. Vincent, on the coast of Portugal, capturing six of the heaviest Spanish vessels and dispersing the remainder. By these victories Admiral Rodney was enabled to relieve the beleaguered British garrisons of Gibraltar and Minorca; after which he sailed to the West Indies, and thrice encountered the French fleet, but with only partial success.

**Admiral  
Rodney's  
Victories.**

In August, 1780, the English suffered a heavy loss in the capture of the outward-bound East and West India fleets of merchant vessels by a Spanish fleet off the western coast of France. The Spaniards took most of the English forts on the Mississippi during the year 1780.

**Spanish  
Successes  
in 1780.**

Lord North's Ministry had hitherto found Parliament ready to sustain all their measures, but the many petitions presented from the counties and the principal towns of Great Britain against the Ministry soon gave rise to a formidable opposition to the administration. At

Dun-  
ning's  
Resolu-  
tion  
in the  
House of  
Com-  
mons.

"No  
Popery"  
Riots in  
London.

length, April 6, 1780, Mr. Dunning presented his famous resolution in the House of Commons "that the influence of the crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished." This resolution was carried by a majority of twenty-eight votes; but a second resolution, intended to give effect to the first, was rejected by a majority of fifty-one; and the Ministry soon recovered its wonted superiority.

In the midst of the war, the British Parliament did a wise act in repealing some of the penal laws against the Roman Catholics; but this action of Parliament produced the most disgraceful riots in some of the leading cities of Great Britain, particularly Edinburgh and London. In June, 1780, an immense mob, aroused by the exertions of some misguided bigots and fanatics, assembled in St. George's Fields, London, to petition for a repeal of the laws that had been passed in favor of the Roman Catholics. After adopting several resolutions the mob proceeded in large parties to the avenues leading to the House of Commons, and there insulted several of the members. Lord George Gordon, a visionary enthusiast, came out of the House of Commons and informed the mob that their petition had been rejected. Thereupon the enraged mob proceeded to the greatest outrages and held control of the city for several days, burning the Roman Catholic chapels in and about town, and also several private dwellings, the prisons of Newgate, the King's Bench and the Fleet. Even the Bank of England was threatened, and was only preserved with the greatest difficulty. The greatest loss sustained by the public was the destruction of the manuscripts of Lord Mansfield, the most distinguished lawyer of his time, who had made himself obnoxious by the part which he had taken as a judge in sustaining prosecutions for libels against the government. The riot was suppressed only when the military were called out, and after two hundred and twenty of the mob had been killed or wounded.

The  
Armed  
Neutral-  
ity.

The position taken by Great Britain in claiming the right to search neutral vessels for contraband goods, along with her seizure of vessels not laden with exceptionable cargoes, produced a formidable opposition to her in 1780 by most of the European powers, which united in the *Armed Neutrality* for the protection of the commerce of neutral nations. The instigator and head of this powerful league was the Empress Catharine the Great of Russia, who asserted in her manifesto to the courts of Great Britain, France and Spain that she had adopted the following principles, which she would uphold and defend with all her naval power: 1. That neutral ships should enjoy free navigation from one port to another, even upon the coasts of belligerent powers, except to ports actually blockaded. 2. That all effects conveyed by such ships, excepting only warlike stores, should be free. 3. That whenever any vessel should have shown by its papers that it was not the

carrier of any contraband article it should not be liable to seizure or detention. 4. That such ports only should be considered blockaded before which was stationed a force sufficient to render the entrance perilous. Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Portugal, Prussia and the German Empire readily joined the Empress of Russia in the Armed Neutrality. France and Spain expressed their approval of the terms of this maritime league; while Great Britain, thus opposed by the whole civilized world, was obliged to submit to this exposition of the rights of neutral powers.

Since the conclusion of the alliance between France and the United States mutual recriminations had been almost constantly passing between Great Britain and Holland, the former accusing the latter of supplying the enemies of Great Britain with military and naval stores contrary to the treaty stipulations, and the Dutch Republic complaining that many of her vessels not laden with contraband goods had been seized and carried into British ports. A partial collision between a British fleet and a Dutch squadron early in 1780 increased the hostile feelings of the two nations. The papers found in the possession of Mr. Laurens, a former president of the American Congress, upon his capture by a British cruiser, revealed the existence of a commercial treaty between Holland and the United States; whereupon Great Britain declared war against Holland, December 20, 1780. The Dutch shipping in British ports was detained, and the British Ministry sent orders to the British commanders in the West Indies to attack the Dutch possessions in that quarter immediately.

Accordingly the British fleet under Admiral Sir George Rodney appeared before the Dutch island of St. Eustatia, a free port abounding with wealth as a great emporium of the West India trade. The inhabitants were taken wholly by surprise when Admiral Rodney sent a peremptory order to the Dutch governor of the island to surrender the island and its dependencies within an hour, February 3, 1781. Unable to make any resistance, the governor surrendered the island unconditionally; and property estimated at the value of four million pounds sterling became the prize of the captors. The Dutch merchant fleet of thirty vessels taken by the British was recaptured by a French squadron and conveyed to Brest, in France. A British fleet reduced the settlements of Demerara and Essequibo, in Dutch Guiana, in South America; but a British squadron on its way to attack the Dutch colony at the Cape of Good Hope was defeated off the Cape de Verde Islands by the French fleet under Bailli de Suffrein.

In May, 1781, the Spanish governor of Louisiana completed the conquest of Florida from the British by the capture of Pensacola. The British and French fleets had several partial engagements in the West

**Holland's  
War with  
Great  
Britain.**

**Dutch  
Reverses  
in 1781.**

**British  
Reverses  
in 1781.**

Indies in April, May and June, 1781, but without any decisive results. Late in May (1781) a large French land force effected a landing on the island of Tobago, which surrendered to them June 3d. In August (1781) a severe but indecisive engagement occurred on the Dogger Bank, in the North Sea, between the British fleet under Admiral Sir Peter Parker and the Dutch fleet under Admiral Zoutman. Both fleets were rendered almost unmanageable, and regained their respective ports with extreme difficulty.

Battle  
of the  
Dogger  
Bank.

Siege of  
Gibraltar.

As we have seen, the war in North America ended with the surrender of Lord Cornwallis to General Washington at Yorktown, Virginia, October 19, 1781. In the meantime the attention of all Europe was attracted to the siege of Gibraltar by the combined armies and navies of France and Spain. The fortress had been besieged since 1779, but the besiegers had made no progress in the way of its reduction. The garrison in the fortress consisted of seven thousand British troops under General Elliot, and suffered greatly for want of fuel and provisions, while being exposed to an almost incessant cannonade from the Spanish batteries situated on the peninsula connecting the fortress with the mainland. During three weeks in May, 1781, one hundred thousand shot and shell were thrown into the fortress. All Europe considered a longer defense of the fortress impossible; but suddenly, on the night of November 27, 1781, a select band of two thousand men from the brave little British garrison made a sally from the fortress, and stormed and utterly demolished the enemy's works in less than an hour, inflicting a damage estimated at two million pounds sterling.

French  
Successes  
in 1781.

During the same month (November, 1781) the French fleet under the Count de Grasse had recaptured the Dutch island of St. Eustatia, in the West Indies, from the British. The French afterward conquered the island of St. Christophers, Nevis and Montserrat from the British. In February, 1782, the French also recaptured the Dutch settlements of Demerara and Essequibo, in Guiana, in South America, from the British.

Spanish  
Capture  
of  
Minorca.

In February, 1782, the Spaniards compelled the island of Minorca to surrender, after a long siege almost as memorable as that of Gibraltar, during which the British garrison made a most heroic defense. It appeared that Great Britain would be driven into a dishonorable peace, but the heroic determination of the English people to uphold their national honor was never more strikingly manifested. With the whole civilized world united against her, Great Britain was rescued from her dangerous and humiliating position by the victories of her navy.

British  
Resolu-  
tion.

Admiral  
Rodney's  
Great  
Victory.

The British fleet under Admiral Rodney gained a great and decisive victory over the French fleet under the Count de Grasse in the



West Indies, between the islands of Martinique and Guadaloupe, April 12, 1782; most of the French ships being captured, that of the Count de Grasse among the number, and the French loss in killed, wounded and prisoners being eleven thousand men, while the loss of the British in killed and wounded was only about eleven hundred.

During the year 1782 the fortress of Gibraltar, which had bidden defiance to the armies and navies of France and Spain for three years, sustained one of the most memorable sieges recorded in the annals of warfare. The Spaniards had constructed many enormous floating batteries in the bay of Gibraltar, and twelve hundred pieces of heavy ordnance had been brought to the place to be used in the different methods of assault. In addition to their floating batteries, the besiegers had eighty large boats, mounted with heavy guns and mortars, along with an immense number of frigates, sloops and schooners; while the united fleets of France and Spain, consisting of fifty ships-of-the-line, were to cover and support the assault on the fortress. Eighty thousand barrels of gunpowder were provided for the occasion, and more than a hundred thousand French and Spanish soldiers and seamen were employed in the siege of the strong fortress.

A grand attack was opened on the fortress on September 13, 1782. Early in the morning of that day the Spanish floating batteries came forward, and at ten o'clock they took their stations about a thousand yards from the rock of Gibraltar and opened a terrific cannonade, which was joined in by all the artillery and mortars in the Spanish lines and approaches. At the same time the heroic British garrison under General Elliot replied with all their batteries, discharging both hot and cold shot; and for several hours both sides maintained a terrific cannonade and bombardment without the least intermission. About two o'clock in the afternoon the largest Spanish floating battery was observed to emit smoke, and toward midnight it was plainly perceived to be on fire. The fight was still raging fiercely, and other floating batteries began to kindle. Signals of distress were made, and boats were sent to take the men from the burning ships; but these boats were interrupted by the British gunboats, which now advanced to the assault, raking the whole line of Spanish floating batteries with their fire, and thus completing the confusion. The floating batteries were soon abandoned to the flames or to the British.

The groans and shrieks of the Spaniards on board the burning ships were pitiful beyond description, and the Spaniards ceased firing; whereupon the English, with characteristic humanity, forgetting that the Spaniards were their enemies, and thinking of them only as suffering fellowmen, hastened to their rescue, and saved four hundred of them from the perils by which they were surrounded. But all the floating

The  
Siege of  
Gibraltar  
in 1782.

Grand  
Attack on  
Gibraltar.

Burning  
of the  
Spanish  
Ships.

English  
Rescue  
of the  
Spaniards.

Relief of  
Gibraltar.

batteries were consumed by the flames, and the French and Spanish armies and fleets were unable to renew the assault. During the night the brave garrison of Gibraltar was relieved by Lord Howe's fleet from England, and the French and Spaniards relinquished the siege of the impregnable fortress.

British  
War with  
Hyder Ali  
in India.

The siege of Gibraltar was the last important event of the War of the American Revolution in Europe; but in the meantime the struggle had extended to India, where Hyder Ali, Sultan of Mysore, a soldier or fortune, had been engaged in hostilities with the English East India Company since 1767, but with little success until the War of American Independence, when he was aided by the French and the Dutch. After the English East India Company, during the administration of Warren Hastings, who had become Governor-General of British India in 1773, had reduced all the French settlements in India and humbled the Mahrattas, Hyder Ali and his valiant son, Tippoo Saib, entered the Carnatic in 1780 with an army of a hundred thousand native Hindoos, aided by a French force, and attacked and annihilated the British forces in the presidency of Madras under Baillie and Fletcher, killing or capturing the whole force. Madras was in extreme danger of capture. In 1781 the British were reinforced; and the progress of Hyder Ali in the Carnatic was checked by Sir Eyre Coote, who recovered the Carnatic and totally routed Hyder Ali at the head of two hundred thousand men at Porto Novo, Cuddalore and Pallalore.

Hyder  
Ali's  
Defeat  
by Sir  
Eyre  
Coote.

British  
Reverses  
in India  
in 1782.

In 1782 the British captured Negapatam and all the Dutch settlements in India; but this success was interrupted by the defeat of Colonel Braithwaite, whose forces were surprised, surrounded and cut to pieces by a native force under Tippoo Saib and an auxiliary French force under M. Lally. In 1783 several indecisive actions occurred between the British fleet under Admiral Hughes and the French fleet under Bailli de Suffrein in the Indian seas, but the operations on land were impeded by the jealousies of the civil and military authorities. Hyder Ali died in 1782, and was succeeded as Sultan of Mysore by his son, Tippoo Saib, who, after the conclusion of peace between Great Britain and France in 1783, concluded a treaty with the English East India Company, in which the Company made humiliating concessions which detracted from the respect hitherto paid to the British name in India, A. D. 1784.

Humiliat-  
ing  
British  
Peace  
Terms.

Anti-war  
Resolu-  
tion in the  
House of  
Commons.

As we have seen, the surrender of Lord Cornwallis had fully convinced the English people of the folly and hopelessness of recovering the British dominion in North America; but Lord North's Ministry declared their determination to carry on "a war of posts." The nation at large opposed this foolish project; and Parliament, yielding to the voice of the English people, gradually withdrew its support from the

administration. Finally, on March 4, 1782, on the motion of General Conway, the House of Commons voted that "whoever shall advise His Majesty to the continuation of the American war shall be considered a public enemy." This vote of want of confidence in the Ministry led to the immediate resignation of Lord North and his colleagues; whereupon a Whig Ministry under the Marquis of Rockingham came into power, pledged to the restoration of peace. A member of this Ministry was the great statesman, Charles James Fox, an earnest friend of the Americans during the whole period of the war, and an opponent of the system of Parliamentary taxation of the colonies, which had led to the war.

**Lord North's Resignation.**

**Rockingham Ministry.**

The new Ministry immediately commenced negotiations for peace with all the belligerent powers at war with Great Britain, and sent orders to the British commanders in America to cease from hostilities against the Americans, and the British evacuated Savannah, July 11, 1782, and Charleston, December 14, 1782; but the negotiations were protracted for some months by the changes in the British Ministry, while hostilities were prosecuted with vigor between Great Britain and her European enemies until after the repulse of the French and Spaniards in the siege of Gibraltar, in September, 1782. The Marquis of Rockingham, whose administration was signalized by the concession of Ireland's legislative independence, died in July, 1782; whereupon the Earl of Shelburne became Prime Minister, which so displeased Mr. Fox and the larger Whig faction which he headed that he and his friends in the Ministry resigned.

**Peace Negotiations**

**Ireland's Legislative Independence.**

**Shelburne Ministry.**

Conferences for peace were opened at Paris, through the mediation of the Emperor Joseph II. of Germany and the Empress Catharine the Great of Russia; and, under the Ministry of the Earl of Shelburne, Great Britain concluded peace with the belligerent powers with which she had been at war. The United States appointed John Adams of Massachusetts, John Jay of New York, Dr. Benjamin Franklin of Pennsylvania, Thomas Jefferson of Virginia and Henry Laurens of South Carolina to proceed to France as commissioners to conclude a treaty of peace with Great Britain; but Mr. Jefferson did not serve.

**Peace Conferences.**

**American Peace Commissioners.**

By the Preliminary Peace of Versailles, November 30, 1782, between Great Britain and the United States, the former acknowledged the independence of the latter. Great Britain concluded the Preliminary Peace of Paris with France and Spain, January 20, 1783; Great Britain and France restoring their respective conquests, except the island of Tobago, in the West Indies, and the forts on the river Senegal, in Africa, which were retained by France; while Spain kept Florida and the island of Minorca, but could not purchase Gibraltar, though she offered Oran, in Africa, and the island of Porto Rico, in the West

**Preliminary Peace of Versailles.**

Indies, in exchange. Though Great Britain unreservedly acknowledged the independence of the United States, she retained Canada, the Hudson's Bay Territory, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Labrador and Newfoundland. Finally, September 3, 1783, a definitive treaty of peace was signed at Paris between the United States, Great Britain, France and Spain; and the United States became an acknowledged power among the nations of the earth, with its boundaries extending northward to the Great Lakes and Canada, westward to the Mississippi and southward to the Spanish possessions on the Gulf of Mexico, and obtained an unlimited right of fishing on the banks of Newfoundland.

**Definitive  
Peace of  
Paris.**

**Peace  
between  
Great  
Britain  
and  
Holland.**

The preliminary treaty of peace between Great Britain and Holland was signed at Paris, September 3, 1783; but the definitive treaty between these two powers was not signed until May 20, 1784, when the Dutch ceded Negapatam to Great Britain and granted to British subjects a free trade in the Indian seas in which the Dutch had hitherto maintained an exclusive commerce and navigation.

**Value of  
American  
Independence to  
Great  
Britain.**

Although the establishment of American independence may have been galling to English pride, the United States as an independent republic were of far greater commercial value to the Mother Country than they had been as English colonies; while the overtaxed English people were relieved of the burden of supporting an extensive military establishment three thousand miles from home, and their material prosperity was thereby unhampered.

**Green's  
State-  
ment.**

Says John Richard Green, the English historian: "What startled men most at the time was the discovery that England was not ruined by the loss of her colonies or by the completeness of her defeat. She rose from it indeed stronger and greater than ever. The next ten years saw a display of industrial activity such as the world had never witnessed before. During the twenty years which followed she wrestled almost single-handed against the energy of the French Revolution, as well as against the colossal force of Napoleonic tyranny, and came out of the one struggle unconquered and out of the other a conqueror. Never had England stood higher among the nations of the Old World than after Waterloo; but she was already conscious that her real greatness lay not in the Old World but in the New. From the moment of the Declaration of Independence it mattered little whether England counted for less or more with the nations around her. She was no longer a mere rival of Germany or Russia or France. She was from that hour a mother of nations. In America she had begotten a great people, and her emigrant ships were still to carry on the movement of the Teutonic race from which she herself had sprung. Her work was to be colonization. Her settlers were to dispute Africa with the Kaffir and the Hottentot, to wrest New Zealand from the Maori, to sow on

the shores of Australia the seeds of great nations. And to these nations she was to give not only her blood and her speech, but the freedom which she had won. It is the thought of this which flings its grandeur around the pettiest details of our story in the past. The history of France has little result beyond France itself. German or Italian history has no direct issue outside the bounds of Germany or Italy. But England is only a small part of the outcome of English history. Its greatest issue lies not within the narrow limits of the mother island, but in the destinies of nations yet to be. The struggles of her patriots, the wisdom of her statesmen, the steady love of liberty and law in her people at large, were shaping in the past of our little island the future of mankind."

In the meantime the joy of the Americans at the return of peace was mingled with gloomy apprehensions of coming evil, foreshadowed in the murmurings of the unpaid soldiers, the condition of the public finances and the jealousies of the States. The soldiers had been unpaid for a long time, because the national treasury was empty. Crafty men encouraged the discontent of the army by charging Congress with neglect; and in the spring of 1783 an anonymous address was circulated in Washington's camp at Newburg, on the Hudson, advising the army to take matters into its own hands and to obtain justice by making a demonstration that should arouse the fears of the American people and Congress. The worst consequence seemed inevitable, especially as the excitement was the greatest amongst the better class of soldiers, those described by their illustrious commander-in-chief as "worthy and faithful men, who, from their early engaging in the war at moderate bounties, and from their patient continuance under innumerable distresses, have not only deserved well of their country, but have obtained an honorable distinction over those who, with shorter times, have gained larger pecuniary rewards."

Washington was equal to the perilous crisis which now threatened the country. A year before—May, 1782—he had repelled with indescribable disdain the offer of a crown from certain of his army officers. Now his great influence and sagacity induced the aroused officers to desist from their purpose, and thus a threatening cloud was dispelled in a few days. He rebuked the spirit of the anonymous address, and, by his matchless integrity, calmed the rising passions of his officers. But he espoused the claims of his army. He reiterated his resolve, made at the outset of the war, not to accept any compensation for his military services. Congress listened to his voice and promised pay to the army, including the commutation to a fixed sum of the half pay for life formerly promised to the officers at the end of the war, March, 1783. But all trouble was not yet ended. Three months later a body

**Threat-  
ened  
Outbreak  
of the  
American  
Army.**

**Settle-  
ment  
of the  
Trouble.**

of Pennsylvania troops marched on Congress at Philadelphia. Washington reproved them thus: "These Pennsylvania levies who have mutinied are recruits and soldiers of a day, who have not borne the heat and burden of the war." He at once sent a force to reduce them to submission, June, 1783.

Release  
of Pris-  
oners.

Measures already proposed by Sir Guy Carleton were at once adopted on both sides for the release of prisoners. The treatment and the exchange of captives had led to embarrassing difficulties during the progress of the war. Even where actual cruelty had not occurred, military etiquette and policy asserted themselves over the claims of humanity. The horrors of the British prisons and prison-ships had become bywords, and when the unfortunate captives were offered in exchange for the better-treated prisoners of the other side the Americans hesitated to receive them. The British troops that had surrendered at Saratoga on condition of a free passage home were detained on account of various objections, to be released only by escapes and slow exchanges in the course of years. In short, the prisoners on both sides appear to have been considered troublesome burdens, both by their captors and by their own fellow-soldiers. Individual benevolence alone lighted up the dreary scene. At the end of the war Congress, on Washington's recommendation, voted thanks to Reuben Harvey, a merchant of Cork, Ireland, and, on Franklin's recommendation, to the Rev. Thomas Wren, of Portsmouth, England, for their humane assistance to American prisoners.

Cessation  
of Hos-  
tilities  
Pro-  
claimed.

Sir Guy Carleton, the former governor of Canada, who had superseded Sir Henry Clinton as British commander at New York, proclaimed a cessation of hostilities on the part of the British, April 8, 1783. Soon afterward—April 19, 1783, the eighth anniversary of the opening of the war at Lexington—Washington proclaimed a cessation of hostilities in his army at Newburg.

Society  
of the  
Cincin-  
nati.

Two months later—June 19, 1783—many of the officers at Newburg met and formed a permanent association known as the *Society of the Cincinnati*, electing Washington the first president of the society, and selecting as their emblem a gold eagle suspended on a ribbon, on the breast of which was a medallion with a device representing Cincinnatus receiving the Roman Senators.

American  
Army  
Dis-  
banded.

Washington had written some months previously: "It is high time for a peace." His army was slowly disbanded, so that a small number only were left when the formal proclamation of disbandment was made, November 3, 1783. A few troops were still kept under arms. Thus the American soldiers returned to their homes to enjoy the freedom which their valor had won and to receive the grateful benedictions of their countrymen.

We have already noticed that the British had evacuated Savannah, July 11, 1782, and Charleston, December 14, 1782. After long delays they evacuated their post on the Penobscot. On November 25, 1783, they evacuated New York city; and ten days later—December 4-6, 1783—they embarked from Staten Island and Long Island, thus freeing the United States from British troops, except the small British garrisons in a few Western military posts. The 25th of November has ever since been recognized and remembered in New York city as "Evacuation Day."

**British Evacuation of United States Territory.**

At last, after an affectionate parting with his officers in New York city, on December 4, 1783, Washington proceeded to Annapolis, in Maryland, where Congress was in session; and on the 23d of December, 1783, he resigned into the hands of that body his commission of commander-in-chief of the armies of the United States, in a simple and touching address, to which an equally-affecting response was made by the president of the Congress, General Thomas Mifflin, of Pennsylvania. Washington then returned to his farm at Mount Vernon, on the banks of the Potomac, carrying with him the esteem and gratitude of his countrymen and the admiration of the world. Thus Washington, like Cincinnatus, after delivering his country from its enemies, returned to private life.

**Washington's Resignation.**

Washington's resignation seemed to leave the United States without a head. The towns and the States each had their respective local authorities; but the nation, or, more properly, the confederation, lacked a general, or central government, having practically only the name of a government. Yet there was now the greatest necessity for an adequate general government. Though the War of American Independence was ended, its consequences, its burdens, its debts, its wasting influences, had just commenced.

**The American General Government.**

No one perceived the new nation's need more clearly, no one realized it more keenly, than the retiring commander-in-chief. He had never been absorbed in his military duties. In his relations to Congress, to the States, to his fellow-citizens, to foreign allies and to foreign foes, he had practically been the civil head as well as the military leader of the American people. The arm that had led the new nation through the field of war was now raised to show the paths that opened beyond.

**Washington's Leadership.**

On disbanding his army he wrote thus to the Governors of the States:

"According to the system of policy the States shall adopt at this moment they shall stand or fall; and by their confirmation or lapse it is yet to be decided whether the Revolution must ultimately be considered as a blessing or a curse; a blessing or a curse, not to the present age alone, for with our fate will the destiny of unborn millions be involved. There are four things which I humbly conceive are essential

**His Counsels.**

to the well-being, I may even venture to say, to the existence, of the United States as an independent power.

“First. An indissoluble Union of the States under one federal head.

“Second. A sacred regard to public justice.

“Third. The adoption of a proper peace establishment.

“Fourth. The prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the people of the United States which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies; to make those mutual concessions which are requisite to the general prosperity, and in some instances to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interest of the community.

“I now make it my earnest prayer that God would have you and the State over which you preside in His holy protection; that He would incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government, to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another, for their fellow-citizens of the United States at large, and particularly for their brethren who have served them in the field; and, finally, that He would most graciously be pleased to dispose us all to do justice, to love mercy and to demean ourselves with that charity, humility and pacific temper of mind which are characteristics of the Divine Author of our blessed religion, and without a humble imitation of Whose example in these we can never hope to be a happy nation.”

Says John Richard Green, the English historian, concerning Washington: “No nobler figure ever stood in the forefront of a nation’s life. Washington was grave and courteous in address; his manners were simple and unpretending; his silence and the serene calmness of his temper spoke of a perfect self-mastery; but there was little in his outer bearing to reveal the grandeur of soul which lifts his figure, with all the simple majesty of an ancient statue, out of the smaller passions, the meaner impulses of the world around him. What recommended him for command as yet was simply his weight among his fellow-landowners of Virginia, and the experience of war which he had gained by service in Braddock’s luckless expedition against Fort Duquesne. It was only as the weary fight went on that the colonists learned little by little the greatness of their leader—his clear judgment, his heroic endurance, his silence under difficulties, his calmness in the hour of danger or defeat, the patience with which he waited, the quickness and hardness with which he struck, the lofty and serene sense of duty that never swerved from its task through resentment or jealousy, that never through war or peace felt the touch of a meaner ambition, that knew no aim save that of guarding the freedom of his fellow-countrymen, and no personal longing save that of returning to his own fireside when their freedom was secured. It was almost unconsciously that men learned to cling to

Green’s  
Estimate  
of Wash-  
ington.



Washington with a trust and faith such as few other men have won, and to regard him with a reverence which still hushes us in presence of his memory. Even America hardly recognized his real grandeur till death set its seal on 'the man first in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen.' Washington, more than any of his fellow-colonists, represented the clinging of the Virginia landowners to the Mother Country, and his acceptance of the command proved that even the most moderate among them had no hope now save in arms."

The Washington family derives its name from the village of Wassington, near Ravensworth, now called Wharleton, in the parish of Kirkby-Ravensworth, in the North Riding of Yorkshire. As the family multiplied in succeeding generations it spread from Yorkshire into Lancashire, Leicestershire, Northamptonshire, Buckinghamshire, Warwickshire and Kent. The old home of the Washingtons at the village of Sulgrave, in Northamptonshire, England, is still standing; and the house was built by Hon. Laurence Washington, Mayor of Northampton, about the year A. D. 1564. Colonel Sir Henry Washington fought on the king's side during the civil war between Charles I. and Parliament, leading a storming party at Bristol and defending Worcester against the Parliamentary forces in 1646.

General George Washington was the great-grandson of Colonel John Washington, who, with his brother Laurence Washington, emigrated from Wharton, Lancashire, England, to America in 1659, and settled in Westmoreland county, Virginia, where the illustrious American Revolutionary commander-in-chief was born February 22, 1732.

As his ancestors had belonged to the landed gentry of England, so General Washington belonged to the aristocratic landholding class of Virginia, which in its political and social conditions was more like the Mother Country than any other of the Anglo-American colonies. The landholders were the first of the four classes of Virginia society.

General Washington was educated chiefly by his mother; his father, Augustine Washington, having died when his son was only ten years old. George became a surveyor and was early inured to hardships and filled with a knowledge of the forest and of the Indian character, which became of much service to him. While still a youth he was about to enlist as a midshipman in the British navy, but his mother's opposition caused him to remain at home; and the family estate of Mt. Vernon was named after the British Admiral Vernon, under whom his elder brother, Captain Laurence Washington, had served in the unfortunate expedition against the Spanish town of Carthagena, in South America, in 1740. George Washington married a widow, Mrs. Martha Custis, and died without leaving any offspring. After his service in the French and Indian War he was for some time a member of the Virginia House

**General Washington's Ancestry in England.**

**The Washington Family in Virginia.**

**Members of the Landed Gentry.**

**General Washington's Personal History.**

of Burgesses; and he was a delegate from Virginia to the First and Second Continental Congresses, being a member of the Second Continental Congress when that body appointed him commander-in-chief of the American armies. At his death he was worth eight hundred thousand dollars, and was in his time next to the richest man in the United States.

Geographical  
Limits  
of the  
Thirteen  
States.

At the close of the War of the American Revolution most of the thirteen original States had assumed their present limits. New Hampshire, for a long time claiming jurisdiction over Vermont, had yielded her claim to New York and had taken the Connecticut river as her western boundary. Massachusetts still exercised jurisdiction over Maine, but had arranged her western boundary with New York as at present, accepting the proprietorship of large tracts of land in Western New York in satisfaction of the claim of her charter to territory farther west. Rhode Island and Connecticut had boundaries essentially the same as at present; Connecticut retaining, of all her claims under her charter, only a part of her territory south of Lake Erie, known as the Connecticut Reserve, which now forms the north-eastern portion of the State of Ohio. New York claimed Vermont with the rest of her present territory. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware and Maryland had their present limits. Virginia included Kentucky, and North Carolina included Tennessee. Between themselves, South Carolina and Georgia claimed all of the present Alabama and Mississippi that then belonged to the United States.

The  
American  
Popula-  
tion.

There had been little increase in the population of the United States during the War of the American Revolution; as immigration almost ceased, and as many men had fallen in battle, while many Tories left the country, some of them founding the province of Canada West, now Ontario.

Ameri-  
cans  
in Peace  
and War.

When the Revolution had commenced, the Americans were chiefly farmers, merchants, mechanics and fishermen, who were engaged in the ordinary duties of their respective occupations, and were sober, honest and industrious. But when the struggle for independence had begun, new fields for exertion were opened, and a great change suddenly came about in the American people. Many who had previously been known only in the humble sphere of peaceful callings soon exhibited talents for war or statesmanship.

Moral  
Laxity in  
America.

The war also did much to extinguish local peculiarities and prejudices, but also introduced a greater laxity of manners and morals. An army always carries deep vices in its train and communicates its corruption to society. The failure of the public credit through the depreciation of the Continental money so far disabled individuals to fulfill their private engagements that the breach of such engagements became very

general, and was at length not considered dishonorable. Thus that high sense of integrity which had previously existed was exchanged for more loose and slippery notions of honor and honesty, but after the return of peace things returned somewhat to their former condition. Those sober habits for which the Americans had been formerly distinguished began to return. Business assumed a more regular and equitable character, and the tumultuous passions excited by the war subsided.

The frequent intercourse between different portions of the country promoted by the war had softened sectarian prejudices and had almost extinguished the spirit of intolerance, but the war had also introduced irreligion and infidelity. The atheistical philosophy which had spread over France was communicated to the American army by the French allies, thus tending to produce a serious decline in the tone of religious feeling among the American people. Thus the atheistical writings of Voltaire, Rousseau and others spread in the United States with alarming rapidity; and there were American writers of infidel works, such as Colonel Ethan Allen, of Vermont, whose *Oracles of Reason* had already appeared, and Thomas Paine, who had come to America from England at the beginning of the war and had supported the American cause by such writings as *Common Sense* and the *Crisis*, and who had afterward written his celebrated skeptical work, the *Age of Reason*, whose effects were long felt in the country. Religious institutions suffered much neglect during the war, as churches were often demolished or converted into barracks, while public worship was frequently suspended. After the war there was a revival of religion, and infidelity began to lose some ground. During this period Methodism was introduced into the United States from England, and increased rapidly, especially in the Middle States, producing beneficial effects upon society.

Education also suffered during the war, along with other kindred interests. The course of instruction was suspended in several colleges. Professor and student turned soldiers. Common schools, which had before been fostered by the state, the church or the family, were neglected during the war, and in many instances were entirely overlooked and allowed to perish. But after the war there was a revival of interest in education, and in a few years several colleges and other institutions of learning were established in various portions of the United States. During this period there was much added to the political and other literature of the English language in the United States.

The writings of American soldiers and statesmen were almost as important as their actions in the field or in the cabinet. There were other writers who were conspicuous solely by their literary efforts.

**Spread of  
Infidelity  
in  
America.**

**Decline of  
Education  
in  
America.**

**Literature  
of the  
American  
Revolution.**

Such was the Englishman Thomas Paine, whose pamphlet called *Common Sense*, which appeared in 1776, as already noticed, had contributed largely to preparing the American people for independence. His other pamphlets, issued during the next few years of the war under the name of the *Crisis*, were of equal influence on the American cause. John Trumbull, of Connecticut, wrote a poem called *McFingal*, which was a satire upon his countrymen and their foes. Francis Hopkinson, of Philadelphia, was the author of various productions in prose and poetry relating to the war; and Philip Freneau, of New York, wrote popular poems upon the battles of the Revolution. The influence of this literature was felt in spreading the spirit of the camp and of the council around the fireside and within the closet, arousing sympathy, exciting action, and thus contributing vastly to the national redemption. William Billings, of Boston, was the first of American musical composers, and such was his enthusiasm for his art and for his country that he moved many a spirit by his ardent strains. His melodies were heard on the march and on the battlefield as well as in the choir, and such as his *Independence* and his *Columbia* may be called psalms of the Revolution and the Constitution.

Decay and  
Revival of  
American  
Com-  
merce.

During the war American commerce ceased, but it revived when peace returned. Most of the American shipping was destroyed by the British during the war, or perished by a natural process of decay. The coasts of the United States were so lined with British cruisers that navigation became too hazardous to be pursued to any considerable extent. During the first two years after the return of peace the imports from England alone amounted to thirty million dollars, while the exports of the United States to England were only from eight million to nine million dollars.

American  
Arts and  
Manu-  
factures.

At this period arts and manufactures made considerable progress in the United States. As the American people had been cut off by the war from foreign sources they had been obliged to depend upon their own industry and ingenuity to furnish articles required by the struggle and by the usual occupations of life. When peace returned, many branches of manufacture had become so firmly established that they held their ground, even against the large importations immediately following.

American  
Agricul-  
ture.

During the war agriculture was greatly interrupted by the withdrawal of laborers to the camp and by the distractions which disturbed all the occupations of society. But within a few years after the return of peace the exports of agricultural products from the United States were again considerable. About the year 1783 attention began to be directed to the culture of cotton in the Southern States, and that agricultural product became a staple in that portion of the country.

Southern  
Cotton  
Culture.

Agricultural societies began to be formed in the United States about the same time.

Slavery, so directly in opposition to the rights of man for which the War of Independence had been waged, and in violation of the principles enunciated in the Declaration of Independence, by which the revolt had been justified to mankind, remained undisturbed in all the States until near the end of the war; but in the meantime all the States except South Carolina and Georgia had prohibited the further importation of slaves, while the New England States and Pennsylvania had taken measures for the final abolition of slavery within their respective borders, and their example was followed not many years afterward by New York and New Jersey. The wisest and best men of the time, both in the North and in the South, looked forward with confidence and hope to the speedy extinction of an institution so repugnant to the principles of Christian civilization and so fraught with danger to society, religion and the state; but, unfortunately, slavery became firmly established in the States south of Mason and Dixon's Line and the Ohio river. Many of the leaders of the Revolution were slaveholders, and among these were the two eminent Virginians, the American Revolutionary commander-in-chief and the author of the Declaration of Independence.

**American  
Slavery  
and the  
Slave  
Trade.**

The European nations were very profuse in their sympathy for the first independent Republic of the New World. The sympathy that they had repressed while the thirteen United States were still claimed as colonies of Great Britain burst forth full-fledged after Great Britain had renounced her claim by acknowledging the independence of her former colonies. Congratulations were received by the new-born Nation from all parts of Europe, even from Great Britain itself. Even foreign sovereigns showed friendly feelings for the new Republic, especially those of the Bourbon dynasty who occupied the thrones of France and Spain. King Louis XVI. of France retained his friendship for the infant Nation whose independence his fleets and armies had helped to establish; and King Charles III. of Spain recognized its National existence and sent presents and compliments to the great leader who had conducted its military hosts triumphantly through the struggle for National independence.

**Foreign  
Sym-  
pathy  
for the  
United  
States.**

No evidence of esteem was more highly appreciated by the great American commander-in-chief than that which was shown by the generous friend and champion who had left his beloved France in his young manhood to help the Americans in their struggle for independence. Lafayette had spent two and a half years in generous exertions among his own countrymen, when, in the summer of 1784, he crossed the ocean to participate with the Americans in their rejoicings at the

**Lafay-  
ette's  
Visit.**

establishment of their National independence. The entire American people gave him a most enthusiastic welcome. Though divided on many other matters, they were united in the grateful affection which his visit and the remembrance of his generous services had inspired in their hearts. All Americans—soldiers and citizens, wild frontiersmen and busy townspeople, the inhabitants of every section of the new Republic—thronged together with a common desire to do honor to their distinguished visitor and former champion. He was feasted in all the principal American cities and towns. Congress honored him with a public reception. General Washington extended to him the hospitality of Mt. Vernon. After a six month's tour of the United States (August, 1784–January, 1785), the honored French guest left America, soon to share in the great revolution which deluged his own country.

#### SECTION IV.—BIRTH OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION (A. D. 1783–1789).

Two  
Great  
Crises  
in the  
History  
of the  
United  
States.

THERE have been two momentous crises in the history of the United States since the acknowledgment of its independence in 1783—crises in which the Nation was threatened with dismemberment and dissolution. The first crisis was the period from the close of the War of Independence, in 1783, to the adoption of the National Constitution, in 1789. The second crisis was the Great Civil War of 1861–'65, when eleven Southern States threatened a forcible dissolution of the Union.

The First  
Crisis.

The first crisis was no less perilous to the existence of the Nation, although bloodless. It was with extreme difficulty, and through the most acrimonious domestic dissensions, the jealousies of the States toward each other and toward their weak confederated government, and the bitterest sectional animosities, that the Nation had to pass before it became a consolidated Nation by the establishment of "a more perfect Union."

Monarchy  
and  
Democ-  
racy.

In the establishment of the new National Constitution two principles struggled for the mastery, and the result was a sort of compromise. These two principles were monarchy and a strong general government, as championed by Alexander Hamilton, and democratic republicanism and a radical popular government with State sovereignty and popular rights, as advocated by Thomas Jefferson. The Constitution adopted was a mean between these two extremes, and was adopted partly to withhold much liberty from the people.

When the War of American Independence was ended, and external dangers had passed away, the Americans perceived that the Articles



JAMES MADISON



JAMES MONROE



BENJAMIN FRANKLIN



JOHN ADAMS



THOMAS JEFFERSON



ALEXANDER HAMILTON



AMERICAN REVOLUTIONARY STATESMEN





of Confederation allowed the exercise of too much sovereign and independent power by the States, and too little by Congress, thus preventing a Union of States sufficiently strong to entitle the American people to the character or rank of a nation. Congress had no power to dispose of the immense foreign and domestic debt with which the country was burdened; and the States, all financially exhausted by the war, found it extremely difficult to provide means for the payment of the soldiers of the Revolution.

**Weakness of the Articles of Confederation.**

The new Nation was struggling against manifold wants, some of which were common to any youthful nation, while others were peculiar to itself, to a Nation so unique in its history, especially in the history of the twenty years embracing the period of the direct provocations leading to the War of Independence and the war itself. These wants and the manner in which they were to be supplied must now engage our attention.

**Wants of the New Nation.**

The chief want, the one which really comprehended all the others, was that of National organization. There was scarcely a political principle upon which the whole American people were agreed. There was not one political power by which they were governed. Interests clashed with interests, classes with classes, men with men. When the army officers formed the Society of the Cincinnati, for the purpose of keeping up their relations with one another and assisting such of their number as might fall into distress, a great uproar was excited because membership in the society was to be hereditary, to be transmitted from father to son, from kinsman to kinsman; so that it was found necessary to strike out this provision at the first general meeting of the society, in 1784. Even then the Society of the Cincinnati was inveighed against as a caste, as an aristocracy, as anything but what it really was—a charitable organization. While all this was a sign of republicanism, of a patriotic desire and a devoted anxiety to preserve the political institutions for which so much suffering and sacrifice had been endured, it was also an evidence of National weakness; of the suspicions and collisions which were threatening the dissolution of the young Nation. The only remedy was unification of the American people.

**Organization.**

So weak was the general government, and so disordered were the National finances, that Robert Morris, of Philadelphia, the Superintendent of Finance, by whose personal efforts and financial aid the United States had been able to carry on the struggle with Great Britain during the last years of the war, resigned in despair after a year of peace. His creation of the *Bank of North America* at Philadelphia in 1781 was recommended by Congress to the States, with the request that branches should be established; but all in vain. Robert Morris,

**Robert Morris and the National Finances.**

who was a wealthy Philadelphia merchant, afterward lost his immense fortune by land speculations in Western New York, and died a poor man in 1806.

Vain  
Appeals  
of  
Congress  
to the  
States.

In 1783 Congress renewed its petition to the States for power to impose a duty on imports for a limited period. After long delay Congress made a fresh appeal to the States with really-piteous representations of the National insolvency. New York refused to comply upon the terms proposed, and Congress was again humiliated, A. D. 1786. Congress also asked the States for authority over the foreign commerce of the country. Such was the urgency that Congress appointed a commission to negotiate treaties with the European powers, A. D. 1784; but the States denied the supplications of Congress on this point, although a treaty was made with Prussia in 1785, which contained sufficient substance for a score of old treaties in prohibiting privateering and sustaining the liberty of neutral commerce in case of war.

Public  
Debts and  
Poverty.

The States were absorbed in their own troubles. The debts of the Confederation were a heavy burden upon them, as well as their own State debts. Their citizens were impoverished, and maddened by their public and private burdens and calamities. At Exeter, New Hampshire, in 1786, the Assembly of that State was assailed by an armed mob of two hundred men demanding an issue of paper money. The rioters held possession of the Assembly chamber, but early in the evening they were dispersed by a rumor that Exeter was arming against them.

New  
Hamp-  
shire  
Assembly  
Mobbed.

Shays's  
Insurrec-  
tion in  
Massa-  
chusetts.

Some of the States followed the advice of Congress to bear their proportions of the public debt and to uphold their credit. This led to an outbreak in Massachusetts in the winter of 1786-'87, known as *Shays's Insurrection*, so called from its leader, Daniel Shays, formerly a captain in the American army. In the western counties of that State the courts of law were closed by armed mobs for the purpose of preventing the collection of debts and taxes. So general was the sympathy with the insurgents in Massachusetts and adjoining States that twelve or fifteen thousand men were supposed to be ready to join them. Almost two thousand men were in arms at the beginning of 1787. There was intense horror in the rest of the country. Congress ordered troops to be raised; but, as it had no power to interfere with the States, it set up the pretext of Indian hostilities. Governor James Bowdoin, of Massachusetts, sent about four thousand militia under General Benjamin Lincoln against the insurgents under Daniel Shays. The insurgents had attacked the arsenal at Springfield, but were driven back; whereupon they retreated to Petersham, where they were totally routed and dispersed. Fourteen of the ringleaders were convicted of treason

and condemned to death, but all were finally pardoned. The insurrection lasted from August, 1786, to February, 1787.

In New England, besides the four States already in that section—New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut—two new aspirants appeared for independent Statehood. Maine again strove to become independent of Massachusetts in 1786. Vermont, which had been claimed by New Hampshire and New York, and which had declared itself an independent State in 1777, was still denied admission to the Union by Congress.

**Proposed  
New  
States of  
Maine  
and  
Vermont.**

The case of Vermont was one apart and deserves special consideration in this connection, as it came up at the beginning of the War of Independence, when the inhabitants of that region, then known as the *New Hampshire Grants*, declared that territory an independent State under the French name of *Vermont*, meaning "Green Mountain," January, 1777, and six months later applied to Congress for admission into the Union, July, 1777. Congress refused the request, because of New York's claims to the territory. A number of towns in the upper part of the valley of the Connecticut river, partly within the limits of New Hampshire, formed themselves into a State which they called *New Connecticut*, in 1779. This movement came to naught, leaving Vermont to be enlarged by the New Hampshire towns on the east bank of the Connecticut river, along with the New York settlements as far west as the Hudson river, in 1781. Being still excluded from the American Union by the Continental Congress, the Vermonters then made application to the British authorities in Canada. As Vermont expected, Congress became alarmed and proposed to admit Vermont into the Union if she would relinquish her recent annexations from New Hampshire and New York. Vermont surrendered these annexations in 1782, but Congress delayed her admission. All the Northern States, except New Hampshire and New York, favored Vermont's admission; while New York and the Southern States opposed it, because of, as James Madison said, "first, an habitual jealousy of a predominance of Eastern interests; secondly, the opposition expected from Vermont to Western claims; thirdly, the inexpediency of so unimportant a State to an equal vote in deciding a peace, and all the other grand interests of the Union now depending; fourthly, the influence of the example on a premature dismemberment of the other States." Thus Vermont was still denied admission into the Union as a new State.

**Case of  
Vermont.**

There were many internal troubles in the States. A body of settlers in the Wyoming Valley in Pennsylvania, chiefly emigrants from New England, held their land grants from the State of Connecticut, which had long claimed the territory. When Connecticut relinquished her claims to Pennsylvania, and the latter State insisted upon new titles to

**Connect-  
icut  
Settlers  
in the  
Wyoming  
Valley.**

the Wyoming settlements, the settlers armed themselves and threatened to set up a State of their own, A. D. 1782-1787. This *Pennamite and Yankee War*, as related in a previous section, was ended by the Connecticut settlers retaining possession of their lands on condition of recognizing the jurisdiction of Pennsylvania.

Proposed  
New  
States of  
Franklin  
and  
Kentucky.

In the vast wilderness south of the Ohio river were two applicants for Statehood. The western counties of North Carolina—now included in the State of Tennessee—when ceded to the United States in 1784, organized an independent State under the title of *Franklin*, or *Frankland*; but the people were divided in opinion; and Colonel Sevier, the governor, of King's Mountain fame, was driven from the territory in 1788 by the opponents of an independent State government. In the meantime the western counties of Virginia—now comprised in the State of Kentucky—petitioned the Virginia Legislature for independence; and Virginia consented to the independence of Kentucky on certain conditions, A. D. 1785-'86. Kentucky vainly petitioned Congress for admission into the Union, A. D. 1787-'88.

Disputes  
between  
States.

The strife manifested in the case of Vermont was nothing new or temporary. As we have observed, disputes between different States arose during the War of the American Revolution, and these did not cease upon the return of peace. In speaking of sectional interests, James Madison alluded to the varieties of occupation and of investment which distinguished State from State. These things were certain to produce different systems in different parts of the country, especially so, as there were in the North and in the South differences of character and of principle to affect seriously the differences of pursuits or of possessions. As the Western territory was but sparsely settled when the Confederation was completed, the question of the unoccupied lands was still undecided. As a rule, this question united the smaller States against the larger ones, as the latter were the ones which claimed the Western domain. Besides these great disputes between the North and the South, and those between the larger and the smaller States, there were other disputes of less importance. Boundary controversies arose, some being settled, others left unsettled, but none subsiding at once. Differences as to the share of the National debt, especially as to the method of dealing with it, continued from year to year. In fact, instead of being closely united in fraternal ties, the thirteen States were arrayed against one another on almost every important matter that arose amongst them.

State  
Claims to  
Western  
Terri-  
tories.

The territory north of the Ohio, east of the Mississippi and south of the Great Lakes—embracing the present States of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan and Wisconsin—had been claimed by the States of New York, Virginia, Connecticut and Massachusetts; while the territory

south of the Ohio, east of the Mississippi and north of the Spanish possessions on the Gulf of Mexico belonged to Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia.

Congress induced most of the States to relinquish their claims to the regions so remote from themselves. New York was the first to abandon her pretensions, and Virginia followed her example; whereupon Thomas Jefferson, then a delegate from Virginia in the Continental Congress, proposed a plan for the division and organization of the entire Western territory. His proposed prohibition of slavery in the new territory was instantly rejected by Congress, but otherwise his plan was adopted, April, 1784. As the cessions of the States claiming the whole of that vast region were not yet completed, the organization of the territory was postponed until the National title to the lands could be made complete. Massachusetts ceded her claims to the United States in 1785, and Connecticut ceded her pretensions in 1786, the latter with a reservation. The Indian titles to the Western territories were partially disposed of by treaties with the various tribes, A. D. 1784-1786.

After these cessions had established the claim of the Nation upon the region north of the Ohio, east of the Mississippi and south of the Great Lakes, that vast domain was erected by an ordinance of Congress into the *North-west Territory*, July 13, 1787. This ordinance intrusted the government of the Territory partly to officers appointed by Congress and partly to an assembly chosen by the settlers as soon as they should number five thousand. The inhabitants and the authorities were alike bound to the observance of certain articles of compact between the old States and the new ones that might arise within the Territory. The articles provided for religious liberty, habeas corpus, trial by jury and kindred privileges, and for the encouragement of religion and education, for justice toward the Indians, for the equal rights and responsibilities of the new States and the old ones, and for the prohibition of slavery by the following ordinance of Congress, borrowed from Jefferson's plan submitted to Congress three years previously: "There shall be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in the said Territory, otherwise than in punishment of crimes."

Under so liberal an organization, surveys, sales and settlements quickly followed in the North-west Territory. A colony from New England, under General Rufus Putnam, made the first settlement within that part of the North-west Territory now forming the State of Ohio, at Marietta, on the Ohio river, in 1788. Cincinnati was founded a few years later, and in 1796 General Moses Cleveland, of Connecticut, founded the beautiful city on Lake Erie bearing his name.

In 1786 the Northern and Central States, sustained by General Washington, were willing to surrender the navigation of the Mississippi

Relinquishment of these Territories to the Nation.

North-west Territory Organized

First Settlements in the Present Ohio.

Troubles with Spain.

to Spain, which then owned all the region west of that great river, in return for a treaty of commerce with that power. Washington attached more importance to internal communication between the East and the West alone than to that wider intercourse which the West would possess by means of its great river. In this matter he was not so farsighted as Thomas Jefferson. In 1787 Jefferson, then United States Minister to France, wrote: "The act which abandons the navigation of the Mississippi is an act of separation between the Eastern and Western country." If the right to the Mississippi had been relinquished, even for a limited period, the Western settlers, regarding themselves as sacrificed, would, in all likelihood, have made themselves wholly independent of their Eastern countrymen and acquired a passage through that great stream either in war or in alliance with Spain.

Troubles  
with  
Great  
Britain.

The peaceful relations of the United States and Great Britain were disturbed. The peace of 1783 required the surrender of the Western military posts by Great Britain, but the United States was also required by that treaty to provide for the immense debts due to British merchants. This obligation Congress was unable to fulfill, and the States were unwilling. Five States undertook to prevent the collection of British debts. Therefore, when John Adams, the first United States Minister to Great Britain, entered into a negotiation with that power for the recovery of the Western military posts still in British hands, the British government, under the younger William Pitt, at once demanded that the American part of the treaty should also be fulfilled, A. D. 1786. There were other points besides debts on which the States were violating the treaty of 1783. Congress vainly addressed a remonstrance to the States concerning their infraction of the treaty of 1783, but all to no purpose, A. D. 1787. The States turned a deaf ear to all the appeals and remonstrances of Congress, regardless of the effect of such action.

Lafayette's  
Remark.

Lafayette wrote: "The consideration felt for America by Europe is diminishing to a degree truly painful; and what has been gained by the Revolution is in danger of being lost little by little, at least during an interval of trial to all the friends of the Nation." Washington wrote: "I am mortified beyond expression when I view the clouds that have spread over the brightest morn that ever dawned upon any country."

Old Founda-  
tions  
Secure.

But the old foundations stood secure amid this tottering of the National system. The laws that had been laid deep in the past, the social and political institutions that had been reared above them, remained to support the uncertainties of the time. Every strong principle of the Mother Country, every broad reform of the colonies, contributed to the strength and development of the struggling Nation.

But the States, in forming and reforming their constitutions, established many a new principle previously undeveloped. Pennsylvania voted an indemnity to the proprietary family whose dominion she had renounced—a recognition of rights belonging to rulers never before made by subjects in a successful revolution. The colonies, led by Georgia, gradually prohibited the claim of the eldest son to a double share of his father's property and to the prerogatives of primogeniture. New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Delaware and South Carolina extended the suffrage from holders of real or personal property to all tax-paying freemen; and North Carolina partially did the same. Personal liberty was extended and protected.

Civil and  
Political  
Privileges.

The class of indentured servants diminished; and, as we have seen, slavery was altogether abolished in the States north of Mason and Dixon's Line, while the slave trade was forbidden by all the States except South Carolina and Georgia. Societies were formed in many localities to quicken the action of the authorities. In making such exertions and upholding such principles, the young Nation was proving its title to independence.

Abolition  
of  
Slavery  
in the  
North.

The most enlightened innovations were in the enlargement of religious privileges. The majority of the State constitutions allowed full religious liberty, even conservative Rhode Island repealing the prohibitory statute against Roman Catholics, A. D. 1784. A few restrictions remained in the Puritan States, where payment of church taxes and the attendance upon services in some church or other were enforced, and where particular forms of religious faith were required from the magistrates, if not from the citizens; some of the States excluding Roman Catholics from office.

Religious  
Privileges.

As there were many varieties of Christian denominations in the United States, and as there was no union of Church and State, and no State Church, the various Church denominations effected organizations for the government and efficient management of ecclesiastical affairs upon definite principles. Thus was prevented collisions among the more zealous or desertions on the part of the more lukewarm. The American branch of the Church of England, the Protestant Episcopal Church, deserted by the Tories, or Loyalists, and suspected, if not assailed, by the Revolutionary patriots, had not more than barely survived the Revolutionary struggle. It had among its membership the great American commander-in-chief. It obtained its first bishop, Samuel Seabury, by ordination in Scotland in 1784; and his first associates, White and Provoost, were consecrated in England in 1787. A convention of several States at New York in 1784 declared their Church to be the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. The Methodist Episcopal Church, which had its chief strength in the Middle and

Church  
Organizations.

Southern States, obtained its first bishop, Thomas Coke, in 1784. The first Roman Catholic bishop in America, John Carroll, was appointed to the See of Baltimore in 1786. The Presbyterians formed their synods for the Middle and Southern States in 1788. In the North the Presbyterians and the Congregationalists united to some extent and maintained their old institutions. All over the United States ecclesiastical systems were arranging themselves under form and law.

**Sug-  
gestions of a  
National  
Constitu-  
tion.**

The dangers to which the young Nation was exposed by its loose system of government—this mere league of States, as formed by the Articles of Confederation—induced thoughtful men to devise a more consolidated system. As early as 1780 the youthful Alexander Hamilton of New York conceived the idea of a convention of all the States to frame a National Constitution. Other men advocated the same measure publicly or privately. The New York Legislature supported it in 1782, and the Massachusetts Legislature supported it in 1785.

**Alexan-  
dria  
Conven-  
tion.**

In the spring of 1785 commissioners from Maryland and Virginia met at Alexandria, Virginia, for the purpose of regulating the navigation of the Chesapeake and the Potomac. They also met at Mount Vernon. One of the commissioners from Virginia was James Madison, who suggested that commissioners with additional powers be appointed, with the assent of Congress, to act in instituting a tariff for Maryland and Virginia. The commission recommended Madison's plan, and the Virginia Legislature appointed commissioners to meet others from all the States and "to take into consideration the trade of the United States."

**Annapolis  
Conven-  
tion.**

In accordance with Virginia's recommendation, a convention of delegates from five States assembled at Annapolis, in Maryland, in September, 1786, to establish a better system of commercial regulations; but they did more. At the proposal of Alexander Hamilton, one of the delegates from New York, the Annapolis Convention recommended a National Convention to meet at Philadelphia the next May, "to take into consideration the situation of the United States, to devise such further provisions as shall appear necessary to render the constitution of the federal government adequate to the exigencies of the Union, and to report such an act for that purpose to the United States in Congress assembled, as, when agreed to by them, and afterwards confirmed by the Legislature of every State, will effectually provide for the same."

**Action of  
Virginia.**

Virginia was the first State to act upon the proposal of the Annapolis Convention. The Legislature of that great State spoke thus: "The General Assembly of this commonwealth, taking into view the actual situation of the Confederacy, \* \* \* can no longer doubt that the crisis is arrived at which the good people of America are to decide the



solemn question whether they will, by wise and magnanimous efforts, reap the just fruits of that independence which they have so gloriously acquired, and of that Union which they have cemented with so much of their common blood, or whether, by giving way to unmanly jealousies and prejudices, or to partial and transitory interests, they will renounce the auspicious blessings prepared for them by the Revolution. \* \* \* The same noble and extended policy, and the same fraternal and affectionate sentiments which originally determined the citizens of this commonwealth to unite with their brethren of the other States in establishing a federal government, cannot but be felt with equal force now, as motives to lay aside every inferior consideration, and to concur in such further concessions and provisions as may be necessary to secure the great objects for which that government was instituted, and to render the United States as happy in peace as they have been glorious in war." Thereupon the Legislature appointed delegates to join with those of the other States "in devising and discussing all such alterations and provisions as may be necessary to render the federal constitution adequate to the exigencies of the Union."

Virginia's example was promptly followed by New Jersey, Pennsylvania, North Carolina and Delaware. In February, 1787, Congress, acting independently of this movement of the States, summoned a convention of all the States "for the sole and express purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation." All the States except Rhode Island appointed delegates. Some of these delegates were instructed to support the liberal views of Virginia to form a new Constitution. Others were instructed to act on the narrower suggestion of Congress. Delaware positively required her delegates to maintain the right of that small State to an equal vote with each of the other States in any government that might be framed.

The Convention assembled in the State House, in Philadelphia, in May, 1787. Thus the same historic hall in which the Declaration of Independence had been adopted was chosen for the sessions of the Constitutional Convention. At the appointed day only Virginia and Pennsylvania were represented in the Convention, May 14, 1787. By the 25th (May, 1787) only seven States were represented, and these opened the Convention and elected Washington president of the assemblage. The Convention gradually filled up with delegates from all the States but Rhode Island, but those from New Hampshire did not arrive until July 23d.

In that Constitutional Convention the interests of classes and of sections, and the prejudices of narrow politicians and of selfish men, obtruded themselves; and many of the members were unequal to the National duties of the Convention. But some of the greatest patriots

**Action of  
Other  
States.**

**Opening  
of the  
Constitutional  
Convention  
at Philadel-  
phia.**

**Clashing  
Interests  
in the  
Conven-  
tion.**

and ablest men of the country were also there. Among the prominent names of the Convention were Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts; Roger Sherman and Oliver Ellsworth, of Connecticut; Alexander Hamilton, of New York; Jonathan Dayton and William Paterson, of New Jersey; Dr. Benjamin Franklin, General Thomas Mifflin, Robert Morris and Gouverneur Morris, of Pennsylvania; John Dickinson, then of Delaware; Luther Martin, of Maryland; General George Washington, Governor Edmund Randolph and James Madison, of Virginia; and John Rutledge, Charles Pinckney and Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, of South Carolina. There were various members of the Stamp Act Congress; of the Continental Congress that declared the independence of the United States, and of the various Congresses under the Articles of Confederation. Among the signers of the Declaration of Independence were Elbridge Gerry, Roger Sherman, Benjamin Franklin and Robert Morris.

Plans of  
a Consti-  
tution.

The rules of the Convention ordered secrecy of debate and the right of each State to an equal vote. Edmund Randolph, of Virginia, opened the deliberations on May 29th, by offering a series of resolutions proposing a National legislature of two branches, a National executive, and a National judiciary of supreme and inferior tribunals. Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, of South Carolina, offered a plan of government based on the same principle as Governor Randolph's, but developed with greater detail. Both plans were referred to a committee of the whole, but Randolph's plan occupied the debate. A fortnight later the committee reported in favor of Randolph's plan. William Paterson, of New Jersey, then proposed a plan for a government of more limited powers; his plan embodying the views of New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Delaware and Maryland. Randolph's and Paterson's plans were both referred to a committee of the whole.

Alex-  
ander  
Hamilton's  
Anti-re-  
publican  
Views.

Alexander Hamilton, of New York, who had no faith in the people and who was an avowed monarchist, proposed a plan of his own. His belief in monarchy and his lack of faith in popular government were afterwards expressed thus: "There is no stability in any government but monarchy." His partiality for a privileged aristocracy was well shown in such expressions as these in a speech in the Convention: "The British Constitution is the best model that the world has ever produced. \* \* \* Give the rich and well-born a permanent share in the government. You can not have a good executive on the democratic plan." Hamilton's plan proposed a National government, of which the executive and the higher branch of the legislature, as well as the judiciary, should all be elected to serve during good behavior or life. Hamilton confessed that his plan was "very-remote from the idea of the people." He looked upon popular government as the rule of the mob. His

proposal was not considered by the Convention, which was divided on the question as to whether Randolph's or Paterson's plan should be adopted.

In the Constitutional Convention, as in the Annapolis Convention, a difference of opinion was clearly evident between the advocates of a republic and those of a monarchy; but, as the friends of republican government were largely in the majority, the monarchical party confined their efforts to obstruction merely, and to delay, in everything proposed. The monarchists under their great leader, Alexander Hamilton, the ablest man in the Convention, hoped that, if nothing was done and all things should go from bad to worse, a kingly government might be usurped, and submitted to by the people, as better than anarchy and civil and foreign wars, which would be the certain consequences of the existing want of a general government. It was the effect of their maneuvers before the Constitutional Convention which resulted in the measure of calling that assemblage. By preventing a government of concord, which they foresaw would be republican, the monarchists endeavored to force their way through anarchy to monarchy. But the great majority of the Convention were too thoroughly republican to be baffled and misled by the maneuvers of the monarchists.

Hamilton proposed a form of government which would have been practically a compromise between royalty and republicanism. His plan was to have the executive and one branch of the legislative body to remain in power during life or good behavior, and to have the Governors of the States to be appointed by these two permanent National departments. When this plan was rejected by the Convention, Hamilton left in anger, and did not return until near its close. These secret and avowed opinions and efforts of the advocates of monarchy had caused the great jealousy through the States which developed into the strong suspicion of the designs of the Constitutional Convention—a jealousy which finally manifested itself in a general determination to establish certain Amendments of the Constitution as safeguards against a monarchical or consolidated government.

There was a difference of opinion in the Convention as to its powers. Some of the members contended that the Convention could do no more than revise the Articles of Confederation; and these favored Mr. Paterson's plan, and were called the Federal party. The members opposed to this plan maintained that the necessity of a National government was sufficient to authorize the Convention to frame one, even if the power had not been expressly delegated to it. These members, called the National party, urged their view the more, as the Convention would not create the new government, but would simply recommend it to the Nation. The National party favored Governor Randolph's plan. As the

Parties  
in the  
Conven-  
tion.

Hamil-  
ton's  
Compro-  
mise  
Plan.

Question  
of the  
Conven-  
tion's  
Powers.

Federal or the National party prevailed, so followed the fate of Paterson's and Randolph's plans, and even of the Constitution and the Nation. The turning point of the Convention was therefore when the committee of the whole again reported in favor of Randolph's plan. The labors of construction and of detail were all to be gone through. But the one guiding and assuring principle of a National system was gained.

Attitude  
of Large  
and  
Small  
States.

Parties in the Convention were very distinctly defined by this time. The delegates of the small States generally took the Federal side, while those of the large States usually advocated the National plan. Whatever was upheld by the large States, especially by Virginia, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, was opposed by the small States, which appeared to be in constant dread of the dominion which they supposed that the large States would exercise to the disadvantage of the inferior States. The breach between the two parties widened when the Convention declared in favor of the National plan, as proposed by Randolph. Within ten days afterward Dr. Franklin, shocked by the alterations in the Convention, arose and said: "Mr. President, How has it happened, sir, that while groping so long in the dark, divided in our opinions, and now ready to separate without accomplishing the great objects of our meeting, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of Lights to illuminate our understanding? In the beginning of the contest with Britain, when we were sensible of danger, we had daily prayers in this room for divine protection. Our prayers, sir, were heard, and they were graciously answered." After a few more remarks, Franklin moved that "henceforth, prayers, imploring the assistance of Heaven and its blessings on our deliberations, be held in this assembly every morning before we proceed to business." The resolution was not adopted; as the Convention, excepting a very few delegates, thought prayers unnecessary; and as there were no funds to pay the expenses of such clerical services.

Frank-  
lin's  
Sugges-  
tion of  
Prayer.

Views of  
State  
Govern-  
ment.

The Federal party argued that the only principle of sovereignty was the government by States, and that recourse must be had to this principle for the existence of a government for the Nation. They therefore assumed the name of Federal, implying the support of a league of the States, as the proper form of a general government. The National party maintained that the Convention derived its power from the people of the United States to frame a Constitution; that the Convention was assembled to frame a Constitution for the people, and not for the States; and that the people, not the States, are to be governed and united. With a few exceptions, the National party did not deny the excellence of State governments. They maintained that these State governments are precisely what are needed to manage the

local affairs of the various parts of the country, in which capacity the States will be truly pillars of the Union.

These different opinions had entered largely into the debates already decided by the adoption of Edmund Randolph's National plan for the Constitution. These same views were again brought forward with increased earnestness in relation to a question now presented for decision. In the Continental Congress, both before and during the period of the Articles of Confederation, the votes of the States had been equal; each State having but one vote, and no more. As already noticed, this was the rule of the Convention; but when the point was reached in the debates on the details of the Constitution the National party insisted upon an entirely-different plan, asserting that the votes to be taken in the legislative branches of the new National government are not the votes of the States, but the votes of the people of the United States, and that these votes should therefore be given according to the numbers of the people, not of the States. The Federal party, which had opposed the National plan on this very account, insisted on the equal votes of the States, fearing that their small States with their few votes would be utterly absorbed by the large States. Delaware sent her delegates with express instructions to reserve her equal vote in the National legislature.

The Federal party, already defeated, was destined to another defeat. Expressing its willingness to abandon the claim of an equal vote in both branches of the National legislature, it stood resolutely for equality in the proposed upper branch of that legislature—the United States Senate. But even this moderate demand was disregarded by the majority of the Convention, bent upon unequal votes in both branches of the National legislature. Great agitation followed. A delegate from a small State exclaimed with indignation: "We will sooner submit to a foreign power!" The question was referred to a committee, which, at Franklin's suggestion, adopted a compromise, giving the States equal votes in the Senate. But for this compromise the Convention would have broken up in confusion, and its work would have come to a sudden close.

Even as it was, the report of the committee scarcely allayed the tumultuous passions that had been aroused. It but partially satisfied the small States; while it aroused the anger of the large ones, as these latter had supposed themselves secure upon the point which they were thus obliged to yield. Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, said: "If no compromise should take place, what will be the consequence? A secession will take place, for some gentlemen seem decided on it." The Federal party was the one that threatened secession. The National party as unwisely threatened to dismember and absorb the small States, by the sword if necessary. Two of the New York delegates, incensed or dejected by the triumphant course of the National party, retired

**Votes of States.**

**Great Agitation.**

**Threatened Dissolution of the Convention.**

from the Convention. Said Luther Martin, of Maryland, afterward: "We were on the verge of dissolution, scarce held together by the strength of a hair." Fortunately, peace was preserved by the acceptance of the compromise by both parties; so that the States were to have equal representation in the Senate, and to be unequally represented according to population in the House of Representatives.

Slaves  
in the  
Apportionment  
of Representa-  
tion.

There was a great division in the Convention on the slavery question between the delegates from the North and those from the South. This system was abolished or about to be abolished in all the States north of Mason and Dixon's Line, but was still maintained in the States south of that line. The first struggle upon the slavery question arose in regard to the apportionment of representation. It was to be decided how the people of the United States were to be represented in the House of Representatives, the popular branch of the proposed National legislature—in what proportions and in what classes. The great question was whether slaves should be included with freemen in making up the number of Southern people entitled to representation, while at the same time these slaves should not be entitled to vote. The extreme party of the South said that the slaves must be included in such apportionment of representation, as they were as valuable as the free laborers of the North. The extreme party of the North declared that the slaves should never be taken into account so long as they were not emancipated, as they ought to be. This question also threatened to break up the Convention, and was also settled by compromise. The moderate delegates from the North and the South came together, and agreed that three-fifths of the slave population should be enumerated with the whites in the apportionment of Representatives among the States.

Executive  
Powers.

Another question which caused much discussion in the Convention was the powers of the executive. The more democratic delegates opposed the veto power of the executive. Among these was James Madison, of Virginia. Alexander Hamilton and the monarchical party wanted the President elected for life or during good behavior. The Electoral College, as well as the election of two United States Senators by each State Legislature, was a concession to the States Rights party.

Electoral  
College.

In its practical operation no part of the Constitution has so widely departed from the ideas of the framers of the Constitution as the Electoral College. They never dreamed that the choice of the Electors would enter into party politics and be decided in each State by popular vote. They did not have sufficient confidence in the people for that. Their idea in creating the Electoral College was to remove the election of President and Vice President entirely away from the people—to have the Electors of each State appointed by the Governor or Legislature of the State, and not chosen by the people directly.

A more serious point was now raised. In the draft of the Constitution now under debate there was a clause forbidding the general government to impose any tax or prohibition upon the migrations or importations authorized by the States, thus implying that there was to be no interference with the slave trade. Luther Martin, of Maryland, exclaimed: "It is inconsistent with the principles of the Revolution and dishonorable to the American character to have such a feature in the Constitution!" John Rutledge, of South Carolina, replied: "Religion and humanity have nothing to do with this question. Interest alone is the governing principle of nations. The true question at present is whether the Southern States shall or shall not be parties to the Union." Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, also of South Carolina, was calmer and took broader ground, saying: "If the States be left at liberty on this subject, South Carolina may perhaps by degrees do of herself what is wished, as Virginia and Maryland have already done."

Slave  
Trade.

The opposition to the claims of the extreme South did not come from the North, but from the more central States, particularly from Virginia. The North, desirous of the passage of laws for the protection of her large shipping interests, was willing to come to an understanding with the South. The result was that the Convention protracted the slave trade for twenty years, or until 1808; while the restriction upon laws concerning commerce was stricken from the Constitution. This dark transaction was a compromise. It was better to extend the slave trade for twenty years than to leave it without any restriction at all. At the end of these discussions the draft of the clause respecting fugitive slaves was introduced and was accepted without debate. The word *slaves* was also avoided here, as in all other parts of the Constitution concerning slavery.

Compro-  
mise  
Thereon.

There were discussions on the details of the Constitution, but the interest in these debates was usually entirely subordinate to that excited by the questions already alluded to. As these questions involved compromise, it was felt that the Constitution depended upon them. The draft of a letter proposed to be addressed to Congress ran thus: "The Constitution which we now present is the result of a spirit of amity and of that mutual deference and concession which the peculiarity of our political situation rendered indispensable." Said James Wilson to his constituents of Pennsylvania: "I can well recollect the impression which on many occasions was made by the difficulties which surrounded and pressed the Convention. The great undertaking sometimes seemed to be at a stand, and other times its motions seemed to retrograde."

Details  
and Dis-  
cussions.

Finally, after almost four months' deliberation through all the heat of summer, the Convention agreed to the Constitution, September 15, 1787. As soon as it was properly engrossed, it was signed by all the

Adoption  
of the  
Constitu-  
tion by  
the Con-  
vention.

delegates present, except Elbridge Gerry, of Massachusetts, and Edmund Randolph and George Mason, of Virginia, September 17, 1787. As the last members were signing the instrument Dr. Franklin pointed to a sun painted on the back of the president's chair, saying: "I have often and often, in the course of the session and the vicissitude of my hopes and fears as to its issue, looked at that sun behind the president, without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting; but now, at length, I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."

**Three  
Depart-  
ments of  
Govern-  
ment.**

The National Constitution invests the Government of the United States with threefold powers—legislative, executive and judicial—each of which is independent in its own sphere, and each is a coördinate branch of the General Government. The legislative power is to enact laws, the executive power to execute them and the judicial power to interpret them.

**Legisla-  
tive  
Depart-  
ment.**

The Constitution vests the legislative power in a Congress of the United States, which consists of two branches, a Senate and a House of Representatives. The House of Representatives, or Lower House, consists of members chosen for two years by the people of the several States; the Representatives to be apportioned according to the population, which is ascertained every ten years. The Senate, or Upper House, consists of two members from each State, chosen for six years by the Legislatures of the States. The States retain the power of domestic legislation; but the Congress is invested with the power to declare war; to raise and support armies; to levy and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises; to coin money; to establish post-offices and post-roads; to provide and maintain a navy; to call out the militia for the purpose of suppressing insurrection and repelling invasion; to admit new States into the Union; and to dispose of, and make all needful rules and regulations respecting, the territory and other public property of the United States. All bills for raising the revenue originate in the House of Representatives, and that branch of the Congress has the sole power of impeachment; but the Senate has the sole power to try all impeachments, and to confirm all treaties and all executive appointments.

**Executi-  
ve  
Depart-  
ment.**

The Constitution vests the executive power in a President of the United States, who, with the Vice President, is chosen for a term of four years by Electors, equal in number for each State to all its Senators and Representatives in the National Congress. No bill passed by the Congress can become a law without the President's signature, unless repassed by a vote of two-thirds of each branch of that body. The President is also commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States. He must be a native-born citizen; and



before he can enter upon the duties of his office he must solemnly swear, or affirm, that he will faithfully execute the office of President of the United States, and will, to the best of his ability, preserve, protect and defend the Constitution of the United States. The President has the power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, and to appoint ambassadors and other public ministers and consuls, Judges of the Supreme Court, and other officers of the United States. The duty of the Vice President is to preside over the Senate of the United States, but he is allowed no vote unless the Senate is equally divided, in which case he must give the casting vote; and in case of the death, resignation or removal of the President, the Vice President must perform the duties of President of the United States.

The Constitution vests the judicial power in a Supreme Court of the United States, consisting of a Chief Justice and several Associate Justices, and in such inferior courts as the Congress may establish. The judges of both the Supreme and inferior courts hold their offices during good behavior. The judicial power of the United States extends to all cases arising under the Constitution and laws of the United States, and treaties made with foreign powers; to all cases of maritime jurisdiction; to all controversies to which the United States is a party; to all controversies between States; between citizens of different States; between a State and citizens of another State; between a State, or its citizens, and foreign States, citizens or subjects.

The Constitution defines treason against the United States to consist in levying war against them or in adhering to their enemies; and it provides for the removal of the President and all other civil officers of the United States, on impeachment for, and conviction of, treason, bribery and other high crimes and misdemeanors. Provision is also made for the amendment of the Constitution; also for guaranteeing to every State of the Union a republican form of government, and for the protection of each against invasion or domestic violence. The Constitution is the Supreme Law of the Land; and all civil officers of the United States, and of the several States, are bound thereby.

The National Constitution was to go into effect as the Organic Law of the Republic upon its ratification by conventions of the people in nine States. The new instrument met with violent opposition from a large portion of the American people, and two parties were quickly formed upon the question of its adoption or rejection. Those in favor of its adoption were called Federalists, and those opposed to such action were designated Anti-Federalists. Some of the States very reluctantly yielded their assent to the new instrument; and some of the greatest men in America, such as Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry, of Virginia, were strenuously opposed to its adoption, because it de-

Judicial  
Department.

Various  
Provisions  
of the  
Constitution.

Opposition  
to the  
Ratification  
of the  
Constitution.

prived the States and the people of too many of their former rights and centralized too much power in the National Government. Even some of the delegates of the Constitutional Convention opposed it when they returned to their homes. Luther Martin, of Maryland, declared: "I would reduce myself to indigence and poverty, if on those terms only I could procure my country to reject those chains which are forged for it." Luther Martin, like Oliver Ellsworth and others, had been absent during the last days of the Convention.

Cham-  
pions  
of Its  
Ratifica-  
tion.

But the articles in *The Federalist* in favor of its adoption, written by Alexander Hamilton and John Jay, of New York, and James Madison, of Virginia, had a powerful effect upon the public mind. Jeremy Belknap, a Boston clergyman, was a strong champion of the Constitution. Under the signature of "Fabius," John Dickinson, of Delaware, formerly of Pennsylvania—whose *Farmer's Letters* had pleaded for liberty twenty years before, but who had in 1776 opposed the Declaration of Independence as premature—now pleaded for constitutional government. Francis Hopkinson, of Philadelphia, wrote an allegory, called the *New Roof*, in support of the Constitution; and William Billings, of Boston, was the author of a patriotic song, called *Columbia*, in support of the same instrument.

Final  
Ratifica-  
tion by  
States.

The National Constitution was ratified by conventions of the people in eleven States in the following order: Delaware, December 7, 1787; Pennsylvania, December 12, 1787; New Jersey, December 18, 1787; Georgia, January 2, 1788; Connecticut, January 9, 1788; Massachusetts, February 6, 1788; Maryland, April 28, 1788; South Carolina, May 23, 1788; New Hampshire, June 21, 1788; Virginia, June 26, 1788; New York, July 26, 1788.

Continued  
Opposi-  
tion in  
Some  
States.

The various State conventions ratified the Constitution by very small majorities. In most of these conventions a series of amendments was framed and passed. North Carolina refused to consent unless her amendments were adopted. The New York convention urged upon the Nation another general convention. New York was the scene of more decided demonstrations. The many riots throughout the country began with a collision between two bands of the rival parties at Albany, July 4, 1788, and ended with the destruction of the type of an Anti-Federalist newspaper establishment in New York city, July 27, 1788. The project of another general convention found favor in Pennsylvania; and the Assembly of Virginia took up the matter, but only after the convention of that State had accepted the Constitution. Thus the large States, to which the Constitution was supposed to be particularly acceptable, developed the greatest opposition to the new instrument of government. Massachusetts had but a bare majority in favor of the Constitution. The small states, which had so bitterly opposed the Con-

stitution in the Convention, were now its most earnest supporters. The parties in the large States opposing the Constitution were unable to combine with any effect, and the generous impulses and united exertions of its advocates carried it through in triumph. North Carolina and Rhode Island were the only two of the thirteen States that held aloof until after the organization of the new government; North Carolina ratifying the Constitution, November 21, 1789, and Rhode Island, May 29, 1790.

Thus, after much opposition, the Constitution was finally ratified in 1788 by the conventions in eleven States; whereupon it became the Supreme Law of the American Republic. On September 13, 1788, Congress appointed days for the requisite elections and for the organization of the new government; and on the 4th of March, 1789, the old Continental Congress expired and the new National Government went into full operation. Then the Republic of the United States of America commenced its glorious career.

Thus was completed one of the most extraordinary transactions in history. An infant Nation, enfeebled, dismembered, dispirited, broken by the losses of a war for existence, by the dissensions of peace, incapacitated for its duties to its own citizens or to foreign powers, suddenly bestirred itself and prepared a National Government. It chose its representatives without conflicts or even without emotions. These representatives assembled, at first only to disagree, to threaten and to fail; but the inspiration of a National cause proved potent against the spells of individual selfishness and sectional passion. The representatives of the Nation consented to the measures on which depended the common honor and the common safety. The Nation itself then broke out in clamors, but there was very little violence. No contentions arose between the States. Each had its own differences, but when each had decided for itself it united with the others in proclaiming the National Constitution.

Said Washington: "I conceive under an energetic general government such regulations might be made and such measures taken as would render this country the asylum of pacific and industrious characters from all parts of Europe"—as he said in another place, "a kind of asylum for mankind." Thus he and other generous spirits looked beyond the limits of their country, and the work achieved was not only for the Nation that achieved it. It was not only for the United States of America that her sons labored, but for all mankind.

Thus, with the organization of the new National Government, the United States ceased to be a mere league, or loose confederation of States, and became a Nation in the true sense of the word, the word *Nation* to be spelled with a big *N*.

Organiza-  
tion of  
the Gov-  
ernment.

Character  
of the  
Transac-  
tion.

Sympa-  
thy for  
Mankind.

SECTION V.—GREAT BRITAIN AND HER EMPIRE  
(A. D. 1782–1789).

Ireland  
Since  
William  
III.

SAYS John Richard Green, the English historian: “The history of Ireland, from its conquest by William the Third up to this time, is one which no Englishman can recall without shame. Since the surrender of Limerick every Catholic Irishman, and there were five Catholics to every Protestant, had been treated as a stranger and a foreigner in his own country.”

Irish Dis-  
franchise-  
ment.

The Catholic, or native Irish were excluded from the Irish House of Lords and House of Commons, from the right to vote for members of this Parliament, from the magistracy, from all corporate offices in towns, from all ranks in the army, from the bench, from the bar, from the whole administration of government or justice in Ireland.

Green's  
State-  
ment.


Says Green: “Few Catholic landowners had been left by the sweeping confiscations which had followed the successive revolts of the island; and oppressive laws forced even these few, with scant exceptions, to profess Protestantism. Necessity, indeed, had brought about a practical toleration of their religion and their worship; but in all social and political matters the native Catholics, in other words the immense majority of the people of Ireland, were simply hewers of wood and drawers of water to their Protestant masters, who still looked on themselves as mere settlers, who boasted of their Scotch or English extraction and who regarded the name of ‘Irishman’ as an insult.”

Small  
English  
and  
Scotch  
Ruling  
Class.

Thus the Catholic population of Ireland was disfranchised and oppressed by the few English and Scotch colonists who had settled in the island during the reigns of the Stuarts. But one-half of this small Protestant population possessed but little more political power than the Catholics; as the Presbyterians, who constituted the great majority of the English and Scotch settlers of Ulster, were excluded by law from all civil, military and municipal offices. Thus the administration and justice in Ireland were kept rigidly in the hands of members of the State Church, which embraced about a twelfth of the population of the island; while the government of the Emerald Isle was virtually monopolized by a few great Protestant landowners.

Ireland's  
Rotten  
Boroughs.

By this time the rotten boroughs of Ireland, which had originally been created to render the Irish Parliament dependent on the English crown, had come under the influence of the neighboring landlords, who thus became masters of the Irish House of Commons, while they personally constituted the Irish House of Lords. This system had attained such proportions that at the time of the Parliamentary Union of Ireland with Great Britain in 1801 more than sixty seats in the



ENGLISH PUBLIC MEN OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY



Irish House of Commons were in the hands of three powerful families—those of Lord Downshire, the Ponsonbys and the Beresfords. One-half of the Irish House of Commons was actually chosen by a small body of nobles, who were styled “Parliamentary undertakers” and undertook to “manage” the Irish Parliament on their own terms. These men looked upon Irish politics as a means of public plunder. They were enriched with pensions, preferments, and bribes in hard cash, as a reward for their services. They were the counselors of every Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland and practically governed the country. Says Green: “The result was what might have been expected; and for more than a century Ireland was the worst governed country in Europe.”

The government of Ireland would have been even worse than it was had it not been for the subordination of the Irish Parliament to the British Privy Council. The Irish Parliament was without the power to originate legislative or financial measures, and was empowered only to approve or reject the acts submitted to it by the Privy Council of Great Britain. The British Parliament also claimed the right to bind Ireland, as well as England and Scotland, by its enactments; and one of its statutes transferred the appellate jurisdiction of the Irish peerage to the British House of Lords. Though these restrictions were galling to the plundering aristocracy of Ireland, they were a wholesome check on its tyranny.

In the language of Green: “But as if to compensate for the benefits of this protection, England did her best to annihilate Irish commerce and to ruin Irish agriculture.” The jealousy of English landowners caused the enactment of statute after statute forbidding the export of cattle or sheep from Ireland to England. The export of wool from Ireland was also forbidden lest it might curtail the profits of English wool-growers. Says Green: “Poverty was thus added to the curse of misgovernment, and poverty deepened with the rapid growth of the native population, till famine turned the country into a hell.”

But the bitter lesson of the last English conquest of Ireland—that by William III.—long tended to check all designs of revolt among the native Catholic Irish, and the murders and riots which occurred at various times in consequence of the misery and discontent of the Irish population were sternly repressed by the English Protestant ruling class.

When Ireland threatened revolt against England at last, the threat proceeded from the tyrannical ruling class of Ireland itself. At the accession of George III. the British government made some efforts to control the tyranny of the selfish oligarchy of Ireland, whereupon the

**Subjection of the Irish Parliament.**

**Green's Statement.**

**Ireland's Thralldom.**

**Threatened Revolt of the Protestant Ruling Class.**

Irish Parliament refused to vote money bills and demanded the removal of the checks imposed upon its independence. In 1768 the situation of Ireland gave considerable uneasiness to the Ministry of the Duke of Grafton; as the Irish Parliament demanded the repeal of Poyning's Law, passed by the English Parliament during the reign of Henry VII. and extended by several subsequent statutes, and which had made the Parliament of Ireland so dependent on the British government that it had become a mere nullity.

**Octennial Act.**

The strong party which had been formed in Ireland to achieve the legislative independence of that country gained a part of its object by the passage of the *Octennial Act*, which limited the duration of Irish Parliaments to eight years. Prior to that the Irish Parliament had been dissolved only on the death of the sovereign. In 1769 the Irish Parliament manifested such a determination to cast off the English yoke that the British Ministry was obliged to elude its demands by a prorogation.

**Ireland's Rise during the American Revolution.**

During the War of the American Revolution—when the whole civilized world was united directly or indirectly against Great Britain—Ireland arose and demanded the independence of her Parliament; thus adding a new political danger to Great Britain's other perils in this momentous crisis of her history. The threat of a French invasion of Great Britain and Ireland in 1779, and the want of any regular military force to oppose such invasion, left Lord North's Ministry under the necessity of calling upon Ireland to provide for her own defense; and in that year forty thousand Protestant volunteers, commanded by Protestant officers, appeared in arms and were turned to account by the Protestant aristocracy which had so long oppressed and misruled Ireland.

**The Irish Volunteers.**

The fervid eloquence of two Irish Parliamentary leaders—Henry Grattan and Henry Flood—threatened Great Britain with another armed revolt in the midst of her struggle with her rebellious North American colonies and their European allies; and the Irish volunteers, who soon numbered a hundred thousand, bid for the sympathy of the native Catholic Irish by claiming for them a relaxation of the penal laws against the exercise of their religion and of some of their most oppressive disabilities.

**Independence of the Irish Parliament Granted.**

Lord North's Ministry, with the blindness and obstinacy which characterized all its measures, stubbornly refused to concede the demand for the legislative independence of Ireland; but the brief Whig Ministry of the Marquis of Rockingham in 1782—which took steps to end the War of American Independence—conceded the independence of the Irish Parliament by inducing the British Parliament to abandon the judicial and legislative supremacy which it had hitherto asserted



over Ireland. For the next eighteen years, A. D. 1782-1800, Ireland was entirely independent of the British Parliament, and was simply united with Great Britain under one sovereign. Thus the two island kingdoms were held together only by the fact that the sovereign of one was also the sovereign of the other, being independent of each other in everything else. This concession satisfied Ireland for the time.

The affairs of British India, as well as those of America and Ireland, occupied the attention of Great Britain during the first part of the reign of George III., in the last half of the eighteenth century. As we have seen, the British Empire in India was founded by Colonel Robert Clive, on the ruins of the Great Mogul Empire founded by Baber several centuries before, and on the total subversion of the French power in India. Colonel Clive was rewarded for his distinguished services by being raised to the peerage of England with the title of Lord Clive, Baron of Plassey. Under his government the English East India Company obtained the sovereignty of Bengal, Bahar and Orissa, on condition of paying twelve lacs of rupees annually to the nominal Mogul Emperor at Delhi.

The work of organization was soon to follow that of conquest, as the tyranny and corruption of the merchant-clerks who had suddenly become rulers were fast ruining the province of Bengal; and though Clive had reaped more profit than any other by the spoils of his victory he soon perceived that avarice must yield to the responsibilities of power. As soon as the East India Company had acquired the sovereignty of the rich and opulent provinces of Bengal, Bahar and Orissa, a conflict of interest arose between the Company's directors in England and its officers in India. The directors desired to increase their commercial dividends by the revenues of their territories in India, while the officers in India were as determined to apply the surplus income to their own purposes. The want of control over the Company's subordinate authorities in India produced the most lamentable consequences. The Company's officers in India established monopolies in all the chief branches of the domestic trade of that country, rendered property insecure by arbitrarily changing the tenure of land and perverted the administration of justice to protect their avarice.

Clive's administration, after his return to India in 1765, lasted two years and constituted the most glorious years of his life. In spite of opposition from every clerk of the Company, and in spite of mutiny among the Company's troops, Clive suppressed the private trading of the Company's servants in India and forbade them to accept any presents from the natives. Clive set an example of disinterestedness by relinquishing to public uses a large legacy which had been bequeathed to him by a prince whom he had raised to the throne of

**British  
India  
under  
Lord  
Clive**

**Oppres-  
sion of  
the East  
India  
Company  
in India.**

**Clive's  
Reforms**

Bengal; and he returned to England poorer than he went, only to face the storm that his proceedings had aroused among those in England who were interested in abuses in India.

**First  
War with  
Hyder  
Ali.**

The injustice of the East India Company's servants toward the native princes aroused a formidable foe to the English. In 1767 Hyder Ali, a military adventurer, who by the force of his own abilities had become Sultan of Mysore, began a war against the Company, imperiling the existence of its territories and keeping its settlements in a state of constant alarm for several years.

**Regula-  
tion Act.**

Clive's unsparing denunciations of the misgovernment of Bengal finally aroused even Lord North to interfere; and, when the East India Company's financial distress obliged it to seek aid from the government, the government's grant of assistance was coupled with measures of administrative reform. The *Regulation Act*, passed by the British Parliament in 1773, placed all the possessions of the East India Company under a *Governor-General* and a *Supreme Court of Judicature* at Calcutta; thus concentrating the power of the three presidencies of Bengal, Madras and Bombay under one government. The Regulation Act prohibited judges and members of the Council of Bengal under the Governor-General at Calcutta from trading, forbade the acceptance of any gifts from native Hindoos and ordered that every act of the directors of the Company should be submitted to the British government to be approved or disallowed.

**Clive  
Unjustly  
Accused**

The new interest aroused in England concerning India was seen in an investigation of the East India Company's administration of affairs by a committee of the House of Commons. Clive's own early acts were examined by this committee with unsparing rigor. His bitter complaint that he had been arraigned like a sheep-stealer did not prevent the passage of resolutions by the House of Commons censuring the corruption and treachery of the early days of the Company's dominion in India. But the justice of the House of Commons ended there. When Clive's accusers proceeded from the censure of the Company's misrule to the censure of Clive himself the House of Commons, in memory of his great exploits, unanimously voted "that Robert Lord Clive did at the same time render great and meritorious services to his country." But, although Clive was acquitted of the charge of misrule and oppression, this searching Parliamentary investigation of his acts drove him to despair and suicide, A. D. 1774.

**His  
Suicide.**

**Warren  
Hastings,  
First  
British  
Governor-  
General  
of India.**

Upon the passage of the Regulation Act of 1773 Warren Hastings became the first Governor-General of British India. He belonged to a noble family that had long fallen into decay, and in his boyhood his poverty had obliged him to accept a clerkship in the service of the East India Company. Clive's quick eye discerned the merits of Hast-

ings, whom he brought into political life after the battle of Plassey; and the administrative ability which Hastings displayed during the disturbed period which followed led to his elevation from one post to another until he became Governor of Bengal. No one could have been more competent to discharge the duties of the new office of Governor-General which the British government had created without an idea of its real greatness. He was endowed with rare powers of organization and control.

The first measure of Warren Hastings as Governor-General of British India was to establish the direct rule of the East India Company over Bengal by abolishing the government of its native princes, which, though having become merely nominal, frustrated all projects for effective administration. The Nabob of Bengal became a pensionary of the East India Company, whose new province of Bengal was roughly but efficiently organized. Hastings formed an able body of public servants out of the clerks and traders of the Company. He devised a system of law and finance far superior to any that India had ever before known or seen, hasty and imperfect as it necessarily was. He stamped out corruption with as firm a hand as Clive had done, but he acquired the love of the new "civilians," while he also won the affection of the Hindoos. Although he raised the revenue of Bengal and was able to send annually a surplus of half a million pounds to the Company in England, he did so without imposing a fresh burden on the natives or losing their good-will.

The administration of Warren Hastings was guided by an intimate knowledge of and sympathy with the people of India. At a time when the Hindoo language was regarded simply as a medium of trade and business he was familiar with that language in its various dialects and was conversant with the native customs and with the native feeling. It is therefore not surprising that he was more popular with the Bengalees than any other British ruler in India and that Hindoo mothers still hush to silence their crying infants with the name of Warren Hastings.

The conscious and deliberate design of subjecting India to the British crown commenced with Warren Hastings. Though English influence was great in the South of India, Bengal was then alone directly in the possession of the English. The policy of Warren Hastings was directed toward making Great Britain mistress of all Hindoostan, from the island of Ceylon on the south to the Himalayas on the north, and from the frontier of Afghanistan on the west to the borders of Burmah on the east. For this purpose Warren Hastings bound the native princes of Oude and Berar by treaties and subsidies, crushed without scruple every state which appeared to afford a nucleus

**His  
Vigorous  
Admini-  
stration.**

**His Popu-  
larity  
with the  
Natives.**

**His Sub-  
jection of  
India.**

for resistance, like that of the Rohillas, and watched with ceaseless jealousy the growth of powers as remote as that of the Sikhs.

War  
with the  
Mah-  
rattas.

Warren Hastings was surprised in the midst of his vast schemes by the War of American Independence, which hurried him into immediate action most unexpectedly. The jealousy of France sought a counterpoise to British power in the Mahrattas, those Hindoo freebooters whose tribes had for a century raided India from the Western Ghauts and founded sovereignties in Guzerat, Malwa and Tanjore. All the Mahratta tribes were bound by a slight tie of subjection to the Mahratta chief who reigned at Poonah, and through this chieftain the French envoys were able to unite the whole Mahratta confederacy against the English power in India.

Embar-  
rassments  
of Warren  
Hastings.

Warren Hastings met the danger which threatened him with characteristic promptness of resolution. He was surrounded with great difficulties. The opposition of his Council had rendered him powerless for two years; and when he was released from that obstacle the East India Company pressed him constantly for money, and the crown repeatedly threatened to recall him. His own general, Sir Eyre Coote, was miserly and capricious and had to be humored like a child. Every mail which he received brought censures and complaints; but he never lost his calm self-command, and his action showed no trace of embarrassment. He prosecuted the war with the Mahrattas with the most unrelenting tenacity of purpose, in spite of the blunders of his subordinates and the inefficiency of the soldiers at his command.

Second  
War with  
Hyder  
Ali.

The English arms encountered repeated failures; and no sooner had the struggle with the Mahrattas promised a favorable issue than a more powerful foe to English dominion in India appeared in Hyder Ali, who, in alliance with the French and the Dutch, began a second war with the East India Company in 1780, as already noticed in the section on the War of the American Revolution. Warren Hastings heard of Hyder Ali's formidable invasion of the Carnatic when he was about to triumph over the Mahrattas; but he instantly made peace with the Mahrattas and hurried all his forces to Madras, which was in imminent danger of capture. Sir Eyre Coote's victory over Hyder Ali at Porto Novo in 1781 hurled that native prince back into the fastnesses of Mysore, and India was the only quarter in which the English lost nothing during the War of the American Revolution.

Extension  
of British  
Dominion  
in India.

Though the schemes of conquest planned by Warren Hastings were frustrated for the time, the annexation of Benares, the extension of the East India Company's dominions along the Ganges, the reduction of Oude to virtual dependence, the appearance of British armies in Central Hindoostan, and Hyder Ali's defeat, laid the foundation for the extension of the British dominion over the whole of Hindoostan—a re-

sult which the genius of Hastings was bold and sagacious enough to foresee.

With the brief Ministry of the Marquis of Rockingham in 1782 a new power arose in the House of Commons—the younger William Pitt, the second son of the elder William Pitt, the Great Commoner, afterward the illustrious Earl of Chatham. The younger Pitt, though but twenty-two years of age, soon took rank as one of the Whigs—a distinction which he shared with Charles James Fox. Pitt had just left college with the learning of a ripe scholar. After his first speech in the House of Commons a member of Parliament said to Charles James Fox: “He will be one of the first men in Parliament.” Fox replied: “He is so already.” Edmund Burke then said of the younger Pitt, comparing him with his renowned father: “He is not a chip of the old block. He is the old block itself.” This “boy,” as his political rivals sneeringly called him, was soon to crush every political opponent and to make himself master of the destinies of Great Britain. His figure was tall and spare, his demeanor was grave, his countenance was never lighted by a smile, his address was cold and repulsive.

**The  
Younger  
William  
Pitt.**

The return of the Whig party to power soon developed a new breach between the bulk of the party headed by Charles James Fox and the small faction under the leadership of the Earl of Shelburne and the younger William Pitt. Pitt introduced a bill for the reform of the House of Commons on the plan proposed by his illustrious father in 1770. But the bulk of the Whigs would not consent to sacrifice their property and influence which such a reform would involve, and Pitt's bill was therefore rejected. In its stead the Ministry sought to weaken the means of corrupt influence which the king had used so unscrupulously by disqualifying persons holding government contracts from occupying seats in Parliament, by depriving revenue officers of the elective franchise and by a bill introduced by Edmund Burke to reduce the civil establishment, the pension list and the secret-service fund. These measures somewhat diminished the influence of the crown over Parliament and put an end to the direct bribery of members of Parliament, but they did not render the House of Commons really representative of or responsible to the people of Great Britain.

**His  
Reform  
Measure  
Rejected.**

The jealousy which the bulk of the Whigs entertained for the more progressive faction under the Earl of Shelburne was shown when, upon the death of the Marquis of Rockingham, in July, 1782, and the accession of the Earl of Shelburne to the head of the Ministry, Mr. Fox and his immediate supporters in the Ministry resigned, while the youthful Pitt became Chancellor of the Exchequer.

**Ministry  
of the  
Earl of  
Shel-  
bourne.**

The Ministry of the Earl of Shelburne lasted long enough only to conclude the Treaties of Paris and Versailles, which ended the War of

**Coalition  
Ministry  
of Fox  
and Lord  
North.**

American Independence. Early in 1783, to the utter astonishment of all England, Mr. Fox and the Whig faction which he headed formed a coalition with the Tory faction under Lord North, whom he had so long and so bitterly opposed. This coalition was the most unscrupulous in British history. The united Parliamentary influence of Mr. Fox and Lord North was irresistible. They overthrew the Ministry of the Earl of Shelburne and forced themselves into the royal councils in spite of the king's secret dislike and the nation's open disgust.

**Gloomy  
Aspect of  
Affairs  
in India.**

Secure in their Parliamentary majority and regardless of the power of public opinion, the Coalition Ministry undertook a task greater than any that had yet taxed the genius of English statesmen. In spite of the fortunate termination of the wars with the Mahrattas and with Hyder Ali, and the extension of the East India Company's dominion in Bengal by the capture of Negapatam from the Dutch during the War of the American Revolution, the aspect of affairs in India was gloomy and threatening. All the exactions of the Company were not sufficient to enable it to fulfill its engagements with the British government, and its affairs were regarded as fast approaching bankruptcy. It had likewise been found very inconvenient to have a powerful merchant company existing as a state within the state, and all parties in England were agreed that the East India Company ought to be placed more directly under the control of the British government.

**Fox's  
India  
Bill.**

Mr. Fox introduced a bill in the House of Commons providing for the transfer of the civil government of British India from the directors of the East India Company to a board of seven commissioners, to be nominated by Parliament and confirmed by the crown, to remain in office five years, but subject to removal on address from either House of Parliament. This bill, on which Mr. Fox had staked the existence of the Coalition Ministry, immediately encountered a storm of opposition. The scheme was an injudicious one; as the new commissioners would have been destitute of the political knowledge of India possessed by the East India Company, while such a board would manifestly be an independent authority within the state, and the want of an immediate link between the board and the Ministry of the crown would have prevented Parliament from exercising any real control over its acts.

**Outcry  
against  
it.**

Great was the popular outcry against Mr. Fox's India bill. The mercantile class were galled by the blow aimed at the greatest merchant company in the kingdom. Corporations trembled at the cancellation of a charter. King George III. looked upon the measure as a design to transfer the patronage of India to the Whig party and thus make the power of a party rival the power of the king. The opposition of the English people at large to the bill was on account

of the character of the Ministry which proposed it. The Whigs had rejected the younger Pitt's proposal of Parliamentary reform a second time, while Mr. Fox's coalition with Lord North showed that in an unreformed Parliament the force of public opinion was powerless to check the most disgraceful efforts of political faction. The power of the crown had been diminished by reforms introduced by the Marquis of Rockingham to the profit of the borough-mongers who usurped the people's representation, but not to the advantage of the English people themselves.

To give the government and patronage of India to the existing House of Commons was to give a new and immense power to a body which misused in the grossest manner the power which it already possessed. This popular feeling encouraged the king to exert his personal influence to defeat the measure; and, when the bill had passed the House of Commons, His Majesty, through Earl Temple, intimated his opposition to the measure; whereupon the House of Lords rejected it by a considerable majority. As the Coalition Ministry appeared unwilling to resign it was summarily dismissed by the king, in December, 1783; and a new Ministry was formed under the younger William Pitt, who was then but twenty-five years of age.

Pitt's position of First Lord of the Treasury would have been insecure had the English people sustained their nominal representatives. The House of Commons repeatedly rejected his measures by large majorities; but these majorities dwindled as the addresses which poured in from every part of the kingdom, from the Tory University of Oxford as well as from the Whig Corporation of London, showed that public opinion sustained the young Prime Minister and not the House of Commons. This popular approval justified Pitt in the firmness with which he delayed the dissolution of Parliament for five months, in the face of addresses for his dismissal from office, and gained time for that maturity of public opinion on which he counted for success. The Parliamentary elections of 1784 ended the struggle. Public sentiment had become strong enough for the time to break through the corrupt influences which generally rendered Parliamentary representation a farce. Every great constituency elected supporters of Pitt, and a hundred and sixty members of the majority which had defeated him in the House of Commons were defeated, while but a remnant of the Whig party was saved by its control of nomination boroughs.

British India is indebted to Pitt's triumph for a form of government which remains unchanged to the present time. The India bill which he introduced in 1784 preserved apparently the political and commercial powers of the directors of the East India Company, while it established a Board of Control formed from members of the Privy

**Its  
Rejection  
by the  
Lords.**

**The  
Younger  
Pitt's  
Ministry.**

**His  
Popular  
Support.**

**His India  
Bill.**

Council for the approval or rejection of the acts of the directors. But the powers of the directors were virtually absorbed by a secret committee of three elected members of the board of directors, to whom all the more important administrative functions had been reserved by the bill, while the powers of the Board of Control were practically exercised by its president. As this president was virtually a new Secretary of State for the Indian Department and became an important member of each Ministry, responsible to Parliament for his actions like his fellow-members, the administration of India was thus made a part of the general system of the British government; while the secret committee supplied the practical experience of Indian affairs in which the Prime Minister might be lacking.

British  
Desire for  
Justice  
to India.

But a far more important change than any which could be effected by Parliamentary legislation occurred at that time in Great Britain's attitude toward its great Asiatic dependency. The discussions of the rival India bills of Mr. Fox and Mr. Pitt created a sense of responsibility for the good government of India. There was a general determination that the security against misrule which the poorest Englishman enjoyed should also be enjoyed by the poorest Hindoo, and this determination manifested itself in the memorable impeachment and trial of Warren Hastings.

Return of  
Warren  
Hastings.

At the close of the war with Hyder Ali and his son Tippoo Saib, Warren Hastings returned to England from India, hoping to receive rewards as great as those which had been conferred on Robert Clive. Hastings had saved all that Clive had won. He had laid the foundation of a vast British dominion in the East. He had displayed rare powers of administration and the foresight, courage and moderation of an able ruler.

His Op-  
pression  
and  
Extortion  
in India.

But the wisdom and glory of the administration of Warren Hastings could not conceal its oppression and extortion. To satisfy the incessant demands of the East India Company, to support his wars, to maintain his diplomacy, he had needed money; and he took it wherever he could find it. For an immense sum he had sold the services of British troops to crush the free tribes of the Rohillas. By oppression he had extorted half a million pounds from the Rajah of Benares. By torture and starvation he had wrung over a million pounds from the Princesses of Oude.

His  
Arbitrary  
Acts.

Warren Hastings had also maintained his power by the most unscrupulous measures. At the beginning of his career, when he was considered helpless before his enemies in the Council, he had displayed his power by using the forms of English law in putting Nuncomar, a native who supported the party opposed to him, to death as a forger. When Sir Elijah Impey, the first Chief Justice of Bengal, opposed his



plans he bribed him into acquiescence by creating a fictitious and lucrative office for him.

Although Warren Hastings was not guilty of corruption, and although he had not sought power from selfish motives, but from a firm conviction that his hold of power was essential to the preservation of India to the British crown, even Pitt shrank from justifying his acts when Edmund Burke moved the impeachment of Hastings in the House of Commons in 1786.

**Burke's  
Impeach-  
ment of  
Hastings.**

In this speech of passionate eloquence Burke said: "I impeach Warren Hastings, Esquire, of high crimes and misdemeanors. I impeach him in the name of the Commons of Great Britain, in Parliament assembled, whose Parliamentary trust he has betrayed. I impeach him in the name of all the Commons of Great Britain, whose national character he has dishonored. I impeach him in the name of the people of India, whose laws, rights and liberties he has subverted; whose properties he has destroyed; whose country he has laid waste and desolate. I impeach him in the name and by the virtue of those eternal laws of justice which he has violated. I impeach him in the name of human nature itself, which he has cruelly outraged, injured and oppressed, in both sexes, in every age, rank, situation and condition of life."

**Extract  
from  
Burke's  
Impeach-  
ment  
Speech.**

The great trial of Warren Hastings at the bar of the House of Lords lingered eight years, during which the brilliant galaxy of great British statesmen—Burke, Fox and Sheridan—distinguished themselves by their oratory in their speeches against the accused; and the proceedings ended in the acquittal of Mr. Hastings by the House of Lords in 1794, at least of intentional wrong, as the East India Company by its ceaseless demands for large remittances were more responsible than the Governor-General; but the protracted prosecution ruined the accused in health and fortune.

**Trial and  
Acquittal  
of  
Hastings.**

Though Warren Hastings was acquitted, the object of his impeachment had really been gained, as the crimes which sullied his glory have never been practiced by the worst of his successors. Ever since that day the peasant of Bengal or Mysore has enjoyed the same rights of justice and good government as are claimed by Englishmen. In 1785 Warren Hastings had been succeeded as Governor-General of British India by Sir John MacPherson, who was succeeded by Lord Cornwallis in 1786.

**Beneficial  
Results  
of the  
Impeach-  
ment and  
Trial.**

Pitt had refused to shelter Warren Hastings, in spite of pressure from King George III. himself. When the new Parliament assembled in 1784, Pitt, though but twenty-five years of age, seemed master of Great Britain as no Prime Minister had been before him. Even the king yielded to his sway, partly through gratitude for the triumph

**Pitt's  
Great  
Political  
Power.**

which the youthful Minister had won for His Majesty over the Whigs, and partly from a consciousness of the coming madness which was soon to afflict him.

His  
Honesty  
and  
Greatness.

The Whig party was broken, unpopular and without a policy. The Tories adhered to the Prime Minister who had "saved the king." Pitt was incorruptible, too proud to accept a bribe, and honestly sought his country's welfare. He was a man of gigantic ability and by far the greatest statesman of England in his time. He was his father's inferior as an orator, but his superior in many other qualities, particularly in his power of self-command, his immense capacity for business and his untiring industry.

His Esti-  
mable  
Qualities.

The trading classes saw in the younger William Pitt all that they had loved in his renowned father—his nobleness of temper, his consciousness of power, his patriotism, his sympathy with the public. His simplicity and good taste freed him from his father's ostentation and extravagance. The younger Pitt resembled Sir Robert Walpole in his love of peace, his great industry, his dispatch of public business, his skill in debate, his knowledge of finance; but, as he cared not for personal gain, he was free from the corruption which sullied Walpole's long administration.

Canning  
and  
Welles-  
ley.

Pitt's lofty self-esteem freed him from any jealousy of his subordinates. He was generous in his appreciation of youthful merits; and the "boys" whom he called about him, such as George Canning and Arthur Wellesley, both of whom afterward played so prominent a part in the destinies of Great Britain, rewarded his generosity by a devotion which did not cease with death.

His  
Patriot-  
ism and  
Love of  
Peace.

The younger Pitt had no sympathy whatever with Walpole's cynical inaction. His policy from the very beginning was one of active reform; and he faced all the financial, constitutional and religious problems from which Walpole had shrunk. More than all, Pitt was free from Walpole's scorn of his fellow-men. The noblest feature in Pitt's mind was its wide humanity. His love for England was no less deep and personal than his father's love, but he was free from the sympathy with English passion and English prejudice which had been both his father's weakness and strength. When Charles James Fox taunted him with forgetting his father's jealousy of France, and his faith that France was the natural enemy of England, Pitt replied nobly that "to suppose any nation can be unalterably the enemy of another is weak and childish."

The New  
Reform  
States-  
men of  
Europe.

The temper of the age and the wider sympathy of man with his fellow, which particularly characterized the last half of the eighteenth century as a turning-point in the history of mankind, was everywhere bringing to the front a new class of European statesmen, such as

the French Prime Minister Turgot and the Emperor Joseph II. of Germany, who were distinguished by their love of the human race and by a belief that as the happiness of each individual can be secured only by the general happiness of the community of which he forms a part, so the welfare of each nation can be secured only by the general welfare of the world. Pitt belonged to this class of contemporary European statesmen, but he was superior to the rest of them in the consummate knowledge and the practical force which he brought to the realization of his aims.

Pitt exerted his great genius to advance the material wealth and industry of England. His measures were eminently successful, and under his wise administration England commenced that wonderful advance of prosperity which has made her the leading manufacturing and commercial nation of the world—"the workshop of the world."

**England's  
Industrial  
Prosper-  
ity.**

England made wonderful progress during this period. Her population more than doubled during the eighteenth century, and her advance in wealth was even greater than her growth in population. The War of American Independence had added a hundred million pounds to the national debt, but this burden was scarcely felt. England's commerce with America was greater since the war than it had been when the United States were English colonies.

**Her  
Advance  
in Popu-  
lation and  
Wealth.**

During the first half of the eighteenth century the cotton trade, the chief seat of which was Manchester, had risen only from the value of twenty thousand pounds to that of forty thousand pounds; and the hand-loom was of the same primitive shape as the hand-loom of India at the present day. But three successive inventions in ten years—that of the spinning-jenny by the weaver James Hargreaves in 1764, that of the spinning-frame by the barber Richard Arkwright in 1768 and that of the mule by the weaver Crompton in 1776—made Lancashire a hive of industry.

**Cotton  
Trade  
and In-  
ventions.**

At the time of the accession of George III. to the British throne, in 1760, the entire linen trade of Scotland was less in value than the cloth trade of Yorkshire; but before the end of his reign Glasgow was rapidly becoming one of the commercial emporiums of the world. The potteries which Josiah Wedgwood established in 1763, and in which he profited by the genius of Flaxman, soon surpassed those of Holland or France. Before the lapse of twenty years more than twenty thousand potters were employed in Staffordshire alone.

**Linen  
Industry  
of  
Scotland.**

**Stafford-  
shire  
Potteries.**

The means of communication hitherto had been of the rudest kind. The roads were generally so wretched that all cheap or rapid transit was impossible, and the cotton bales of Manchester were conveyed to Liverpool or Bristol on pack-horses. But the rapid development of manufactures led to a corresponding improvement in the means of

**Means of  
Communi-  
cation  
in  
England.**

communication throughout England. Canals were constructed between the prominent points of the kingdom, and England was covered with a network of splendid highways.

Canals in  
England.

In 1761 the engineering skill of James Brindley connected Manchester with Liverpool by a canal which crossed the Irwell on a lofty aqueduct, and it was the success of this experiment which soon led to the universal introduction of transportation by water. Canals joined the Trent with the Mersey, the Thames with the Trent, the Forth with the Clyde.

England's  
Coal  
Trade.

The cheapness of the new method of transit, no less than the great progress in engineering science, caused a great development of English collieries; and coal became one of the chief articles exported from England. The value of coal as a means of producing mechanical force was disclosed in 1765 in the discovery by which the Scotchman James Watt transformed the steam-engine into the most wonderful instrument which human industry has ever had at its command.

Watt  
and the  
Steam  
Engine.

England's  
Agricul-  
tural  
Progress.

The same energy and enterprise was displayed in the agricultural progress of the country. During the eighteenth century a fourth part of England was reclaimed from waste and brought under cultivation. At the time of the Revolution of 1688 more than half of the kingdom consisted of moorland and forest and fen, while the greater part of England north of the Humber was covered with vast commons and wastes; but the many inclosure bills which commenced with the reign of George II., and which particularly marked that of George III., changed the entire face of the country. Under the operation of these bills, ten thousand square miles of untilled land have been added to the area of land under tillage; while in the cultivated land itself the production had been more than doubled by the growth of agriculture which commenced with the travels and treatises of Arthur Young, the introduction of the system of large farms by Mr. Coke of Norfolk and the development of scientific tillage in the valleys of Lothian.

Adam  
Smith's  
"Wealth  
of  
Nations."

Among the books which exerted the greatest effects upon mankind was Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. Adam Smith was an Oxford scholar and a Glasgow professor. In his famous book he contended that labor is the one source of wealth, and that it is by freedom of labor, by suffering the worker to pursue his own interest in his own way, that the national wealth can be promoted to the best advantage. He maintained that any effort to force labor into artificial channels, to shape the course of commerce by means of laws, to promote special branches of industry in particular countries, or to fix the character of the intercourse between one country and another, is not only wrong to the worker or the merchant, but also really injurious to the wealth of the nation.



WATT DISCOVERING THE POWER OF STEAM



The *Wealth of Nations* was published in 1776, and was studied by the younger Pitt during his career as an undergraduate at Cambridge. Thenceforth he followed Adam Smith's teachings. No sooner had Pitt become Prime Minister than he made the principles of the *Wealth of Nations* the groundwork of his economical policy. The first ten years of his long administration were characterized by a new departure in English statesmanship. The second William Pitt was the first English statesman who really comprehended the part that industry was to exercise in promoting the welfare of the world. He was not only a peace Minister and a financier like Sir Robert Walpole; but he was also a statesman who perceived that the freedom and development of commercial intercourse between nations was the best security for peace; that public economy not only diminished the public burdens, but also left additional capital in the hands of industry; and that finance might be turned from a mere means of raising revenue into a powerful engine of political and social improvement.

**Pitt's  
New  
States-  
manship.**

Pitt's failure to carry these principles into effect was partly attributable to the mass of ignorance and prejudice with which he had to contend, and still more to the sudden interruption of his plans through the French Revolution. His power depended mainly on the trading classes of England, and these classes still regarded gold and silver as wealth and considered commerce as best promoted by jealous monopolies. Only by patience and dexterity were the mob of merchants and country squires who supported Pitt in the House of Commons induced to consent to the reforms and innovations which he proposed. The failure of the first great measure which he introduced showed how small his power was when it struggled with the prejudices around him.

**Obstacles  
to His  
Plans.**

We have seen that the question of Parliamentary reform had been proposed before the War of American Independence, and that the elder Pitt, as Earl of Chatham, had advocated an increase of county members, who were then the most independent part of the House of Commons. The Duke of Richmond at that time talked of universal suffrage, equal electoral districts and annual Parliaments. Wilkes proposed to disfranchise the rotten boroughs and to give members in their stead to the counties and to the more populous and wealthy towns.

**Previous  
Efforts  
at Parli-  
amentary  
Reform.**

The second William Pitt had made the subject his own by proposing reform when he first entered the House of Commons; and one of his first measures was the introduction of a bill in 1785 which disfranchised thirty-six rotten boroughs at once and transferred their members to the counties, while providing for the gradual extinction of the remaining decayed boroughs. He induced King George III. to abstain from op-

**Pitt's  
Reform  
Bill.**

position, and endeavored to buy off the borough-mongers, or holders of rotten boroughs, by offering to compensate them for the seats which they lost at their market value.

Opposi-  
tion  
There to  
from Both  
Parties.

But the bulk of Pitt's own party joined the bulk of the Whigs in steadily resisting his reform bill. The more glaring abuses within Parliament itself had mainly ceased to exist—the abuses which had aroused the elder Pitt and John Wilkes. Edmund Burke's Bill of Economical Reform had inflicted a fatal blow at the influence which the king exercised by abolishing a multitude of unnecessary offices, household appointments and judicial and diplomatic charges, which were maintained for the sole purpose of corruption. The late triumph of public opinion had likewise contributed vastly to dispel any actual peril from the opposition hitherto manifested by Parliament to the voice of the English people. Wilberforce tells us that Pitt was "terribly disappointed and beat" by the rejection of his reform bill; but the sentiment of the House of Commons and of the nation was too plain to be mistaken, and he never again proposed his measure, though his opinion remained unaltered.

Success  
of Pitt's  
Financial  
Measures.

The second Pitt's financial measures were eminently successful. The public credit was almost ruined when he entered office. The national debt had been doubled by the War of American Independence, but large sums still remained unfunded; while the public revenue was reduced by a gigantic system of smuggling which made every coast town a nest of robbers. Pitt met the deficiency by new taxes, but the time thus gained served to change the entire aspect of public affairs. Though Pitt's first financial measure—his revival of the plan for gradually paying off the public debt by a sinking fund, which Sir Robert Walpole had discarded—was a mistake, it restored public confidence. Pitt put a stop to smuggling by a reduction of customs-duties, thus making the smuggling trade unprofitable. He revived Walpole's plan of an excise.

Public  
Credit  
and  
Surplus  
Revenue.

In the meantime Pitt's measures reduced the public expenses, and commissions were repeatedly appointed to introduce economy into every department of the public service. The rapid development of the national industry contributed to the success of Pitt's financial measures. Credit was restored, and the smuggling trade was vastly diminished. In two years there was a surplus of a million pounds in the national treasury; and, though the duties were gradually abolished, the public revenue increased steadily with every reduction of taxation.

Ireland's  
Unhappy  
Condi-  
tion.

In the meantime Pitt was showing the political value of the new finance. France was considered England's natural enemy. Ireland, then as now, was the sore spot on the British body-politic. Says Green: "The tyrannous misgovernment under which she had groaned



ever since the battle of the Boyne was producing its natural fruit." The unhappy country was distracted with political faction, religious feuds and peasant conspiracies. As we have seen, the attitude of the Protestant party in Ireland had become so threatening during the War of American Independence that the British Parliament was obliged to relinquish its control over the Irish Parliament at Dublin.

Pitt perceived that much of the misery and disloyalty of Ireland resulted from its poverty. The population of Ireland had grown rapidly, but culture remained stationary and commerce was ruined. And much of this Irish poverty resulted directly from unjust law. Ireland was a grazing country, but the import of Irish cattle into England was forbidden in order to protect the interests of English graziers. Irish manufacturers were burdened with duties in order to protect the interests of English clothiers and weavers.

**Ireland's Poverty and Disloyalty Caused by Unjust Laws.**

Pitt's first financial effort was intended to redress the wrongs of Ireland resulting from the English tariff laws, and the bill which he introduced in 1785 removed every obstacle to free trade between England and Ireland. He asserted that the passage of the measure by the British Parliament would "draw what remained of the shattered empire together," and partially repair England's loss in the independence of her colonies in North America by creating a loyal and prosperous Ireland.

**Pitt's Desire to Redress Ireland's Wrongs.**

Although Pitt struggled almost alone in face of a fierce opposition from the Whigs and the Manchester merchants, he succeeded in securing its passage by the British Parliament only to have it rejected by the Irish Parliament, which was then ruled by the selfish Protestant faction under Grattan.

**His Failure Therein.**

But Pitt's failure in his efforts for free trade between England and Ireland only encouraged him to a greater effort in another direction; and his commercial treaty with France in 1787 enabled the subjects of either kingdom to reside and travel in the other without license or passport, dispensed with the prohibitory restrictions of trade on both sides and reduced all import duties.

**Commercial Treaty with France.**

But the spirit of humanity which was exemplified by Pitt's measures of commercial freedom assumed a wider scope. The trial of Warren Hastings by the House of Lords was arousing England to a more vivid sympathy with her Hindoo subjects, and in 1788 the new philanthropy directed by William Wilberforce united with the religious spirit created by the brothers John and Charles Wesley in an attack on the iniquitous slave trade.

**English Philanthropy and the Slave Trade.**

At the time of the Peace of Utrecht, in 1713, the privilege of carrying negroes from the coast of Africa to sell them as laborers in the European colonies in America and the West Indies had been regarded

**The African Slave Trade in America.**

as some of the gains reaped by England in the War of the Spanish Succession; but the horrors and iniquity of the traffic, the ruin and degradation of the native tribes of America which resulted therefrom, along with the oppression of the negro himself, were now widely and deeply felt.

Wilberforce and the Slave Trade.

In 1788, "after a conversation in the open air at the root of an old tree at Holwood, just above the steep descent into the vale of Keston," Pitt encouraged his friend William Wilberforce, whose position as the Parliamentary representative of the Evangelical party gave prestige to his championship of so noble a cause, to introduce a bill for the abolition of the infamous slave trade; but, notwithstanding Pitt's ardent support, Wilberforce's bill of 1788 was rejected by Parliament through the opposition of the Liverpool slave-merchants and through the general indifference of the House of Commons.

British Maritime Discoveries.

In the meantime the great extension of the British colonies gave a fresh stimulus to the spirit of maritime discovery, and English navigators penetrated into the remotest seas. Captain Phipps had made an ineffectual effort to discover a north-west passage to India in the early part of the reign of George III.; while Byron, Wallis, Carteret and Cook successively circumnavigated the globe and discovered several new islands in the Pacific Ocean. Captain Cook discovered the Hawaiian Islands, in the North Pacific Ocean, in 1778, and was killed there in a contest with the natives in 1779. These islands were named the *Sandwich Islands*, in honor of Lord Sandwich, the First Lord of the Admiralty in Lord North's Ministry.

Captain Cook and the Sandwich Islands.

Great Britain's Occupation of Australia.

Captain Cook's three voyages aroused a spirit of enterprise almost equal to that awakened by the great discoveries of Columbus. The South Sea Islands soon became as well known in England as the islands of the Mediterranean, and their natural productions speedily constituted articles of commerce. Captain Cook himself suggested the expediency of forming a settlement on the coast of the vast island of New Holland, or Australia, the largest island of the world; and in 1786 Mr. Pitt's government resolved to transport convicts thither and give them an opportunity to retrieve their characters and reform their habits in that distant part of the world. The settlers there reformed and became good colonists; and Australia, which has long ceased to be a penal colony, has outgrown the fostering care of the Mother Country and become one of Great Britain's most flourishing possessions, thus planting Anglo-Saxon liberty and civilization in that distant part of the globe.

Attempt to Murder George III.

In 1786 an insane woman named Margaret Nicholson made an attempt to assassinate King George III., as he was alighting from his carriage; but she was immediately seized, and the king remarked:

“Don't hurt the poor woman; she must be mad.” Her insanity being fully proven, she was sent to Bethlehem hospital, where she was kept securely guarded but unmolested.

In 1788 King George III. had a temporary attack of insanity, and of course the crisis demanded a regency. Mr. Fox insisted that the regency rightfully belonged to the Prince of Wales, while Mr. Pitt as vehemently asserted that Parliament alone could provide for such an emergency. After some spirited debates early in 1789, it was finally agreed that the Prince of Wales should be declared regent, but subject to some restrictions, and that the custody of the king's person should be intrusted to the queen, assisted by a council.

The Parliament of Ireland declared the Prince of Wales regent without any restriction whatever. This difference between the two Parliaments showed the weakness of the federal union between Great Britain and Ireland; and serious consequences might have followed but for the king's unexpected recovery, which thus dispensed with the necessity of a regency. From that time Pitt seemed to have resolved on uniting the two Parliaments. The king's recovery was hailed with joy throughout the kingdom and was celebrated with splendid illuminations.

First  
Insanity  
of George  
III. and  
Proposed  
Regency

Disagree-  
ment  
of the  
British  
and Irish  
Parliaments.

## SECTION VI.—GREAT BRITAIN AND REVOLUTIONARY FRANCE (A. D. 1789–1803).

IN 1789 the great French Revolution broke out—a revolution which was destined to change the face of the world and to involve Great Britain in a long but not inglorious war. The Puritan movement of the seventeenth century had finally checked the general tendency of the time to religious and political despotism in England. The Revolution of 1688 had practically established freedom of conscience and the English people's right to govern themselves through their representatives in Parliament. Social equality had begun in England long before. All Englishmen, from the highest to the lowest, were governed and protected by the same laws.

The English aristocracy, though exercising a powerful influence on the government, had few social privileges, and were prevented from constituting a separate class in the nation by the Law of Primogeniture and the social tradition which assigned all but the eldest son of a noble family to the rank of commoners. The gentry and the commercial classes were not separated from each other by any impassable barrier, and neither of these two classes possessed any privileges which could separate them from the lower classes of English

The  
French  
Revolution  
and  
English  
Freedom

General  
Equality  
of Classes  
in  
England

society. After a short struggle, public opinion, the general sense of educated Englishmen, had become the dominant element in the English government.

**Despotism in Continental Europe.**

It was, however, different in all the countries of Continental Europe. In those lands the wars of religion resulting from the Reformation had left nothing but the name of freedom, and government there tended to a pure despotism. Privilege was supreme in religion, in politics, in society. Society itself in those countries rested on a rigid division of classes from one another, denying to the masses of the people any equal rights of justice or of industry. We have observed in a preceding section how incompatible such ideas of national life were with the notions which the wide diffusion of intelligence was spreading throughout Europe during the last half of the eighteenth century. We have also observed that in most of the countries of Continental Europe efforts were made by enlightened statesmen and sovereigns to redress existing wrongs by administrative reforms.

**Revolutionary Changes in France.**

We shall afterward note in the history of the French Revolution how the political condition of France brought about the great crisis which was to overturn social and political institutions which had stood the test of a thousand years—how the aristocracy and the monarchy were overthrown, how the First French Republic was established and how the French king's execution involved the new Republic in a general struggle with the crowned heads of Europe.

**Views of Parties in England on the French Revolution.**

The French Revolution was viewed in England with quite different feelings by the two great parties in that country. While one party considered it the triumph of constitutional liberty, the Ministry and a large part of the English aristocracy regarded it as the triumph of anarchy over all legitimate and constituted authority. These feelings were not confined to the higher classes of English society, as the English masses shared largely in the hatred to the movement in France. In London a dinner to celebrate the capture of the Bastille by the Paris mob was adjourned through fear of popular resentment; and in Birmingham a festive meeting to commemorate the same event was dispersed by a furious mob, which afterward proceeded to destroy the chapels of Dissenters and the houses of all sympathizers with the French Revolution. A furious mob burned the house, library and valuable apparatus of the great scientist and Unitarian divine Joseph Priestley because of his sympathy with this great popular rising in a neighboring kingdom. Priestley emigrated to the United States in 1794 and settled at Northumberland, Pennsylvania, where he died in 1804 and where his remains were interred.

**Priestley Mobbed.**

The destruction of the Bastille by the Paris mob, July 14, 1789, created great joy everywhere. Charles James Fox exclaimed with a

burst of enthusiasm: "How much is this the greatest event that ever happened in the world and how much the best!" The Whigs sided with their leader in his sympathy with the French Revolution; while the Tories adhered to Pitt, who looked with characteristic coolness and indifference upon the approach of the French to sentiments of liberty which had long been familiar to England.

**Whig  
Sym-  
pathy  
and Tory  
Coolness.**

For the time Pitt's attention was occupied with schemes to defend Poland and Turkey against the ruthless ambition of the Empress Catharine the Great of Russia, and for this purpose he entered into an alliance with Prussia and Holland; but, as a war with Russia was unpopular in Great Britain, Pitt was not sustained in his anti-Russian policy by Parliament, and was therefore obliged to discontinue his armaments; while Prussia joined Russia in a new attack on the independence of Poland in 1792, after the Peace of Jassy between Russia and Turkey.

**Pitt's  
Anti-  
Russian  
Policy.**

In 1790 Great Britain became involved in a dispute with Spain about the possession of Nootka Sound, on the Pacific coast of North America, where an English settlement had been planted, which was seized by the Spaniards, who made the settlers prisoners. Great Britain quickly prepared an armament at the cost of three million pounds sterling; but, as Spain was unprepared for war, the dispute was soon adjusted by negotiation.

**Dispute  
with  
Spain  
about  
Nootka  
Sound.**

In 1790 the East India Company became involved in a new war with Tippoo Saib, Sultan of Mysore. In 1791 and 1792 he was completely defeated before his capital, Seringapatam, by Lord Cornwallis, then Governor-General of British India; and in 1792 he was obliged to purchase peace by the cession of a considerable part of his territories to the East India Company and by the payment of a large war-indemnity, giving his sons as hostages for the fulfillment of the conditions of the treaty.

**Second  
War with  
Tippoo  
Saib.**

As we have seen, Charles James Fox, as the leader of the Whigs, openly sympathized with the French Revolution; while Prime Minister Pitt, who was a peace man and was sustained by the Tories, regarded the Revolution with unconcern. Though the desertion of Pitt by the Whigs had driven him out of the Whig party and obliged him to accept the support of the Tories, thus virtually making him the leader of the Tory party, he did not share the distrust of the French Revolution which was felt by the Tories in general. Pitt, being a peaceful statesman, was unfitted for the direction of a great war; and he struggled hard to prevent Great Britain from becoming involved in a war with Revolutionary France. In January, 1790, he expressed the opinion that "the present convulsions in France must sooner or later culminate in general harmony and regular order," and that when

**Pitt's  
Struggle  
for the  
Preserva-  
tion of  
Peace  
with  
France**

French freedom is established "France will stand forth as one of the most brilliant powers of Europe."

Burke and the English Sentiment against Revolutionary France.

But Pitt's coolness and good-will toward the French Revolution was not shared by all his Tory followers. The cautious good-sense of the majority of Englishmen, their love of law and order, their aversion to violent changes and abstract theories, their reverence for the past, were fast creating throughout England a dislike for the revolutionary changes in progress in France. This English dislike was slowly developing into fear and hatred through the impassioned eloquence of Edmund Burke, whose conservatism and love for order and for established institutions made him one of the most inveterate foes of the French Revolution.

Burke's Previous Life and His Opposition to Parliamentary Taxation of America.

Edmund Burke had come to London forty years before, a poor and unknown Irish adventurer. His learning gained for him the friendship of the great literary leader, Dr. Samuel Johnson, and of the great painter, Sir Joshua Reynolds; but natural inclination drew Burke to politics, and the poor Irish youth became secretary to the Marquis of Rockingham, under whose patronage he was elected to the British House of Commons in 1765. Like the elder William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, and like John Wilkes, Colonel Barre, Charles James Fox and Lord Camden—prominent as Whig leaders in Parliament—Edmund Burke was a friend and champion of the Anglo-American colonists in their opposition to Parliamentary taxation of the colonies, sustaining their stand of "no taxation without representation." His speeches against the Stamp Act and the policy of Lord North's Ministry toward the Americans before and during the War of American Independence soon gained for him the fame of an orator. Said Charles James Fox, concerning Burke's oratory: "I have learned more from him than from all the books I ever read."

Dullness of Burke's Oratory.

But Burke's eloquence, which had vied with that of the elder Pitt during the Parliamentary debates on the Stamp Act, at length became distasteful to the majority of the members of the House of Commons, because of the length of his speeches, the profound and philosophical character of his arguments, the splendor and frequent extravagance of his illustrations, his passionate earnestness, his lack of temper and discretion; and eventually the wearied and perplexed merchants and squires left their seats in the House of Commons whenever he rose to speak, so that he came to be known as "the dinner-bell of the House." Burke's prominent part in the impeachment and trial of Warren Hastings for a time gave scope to his energies, and the grandeur of his appeals to the justice of England in her treatment of India silenced detraction; but after the close of the impeachment his repute had again fallen, and as he was now past sixty years of age it seemed the part

of wisdom that he should retire from an assembly where he stood unpopular and alone. Richard Brinsley Sheridan, another young Irishman, also became a member of the British House of Commons and distinguished himself during the trial of Warren Hastings by his oratory; and, besides being a great statesman and Parliamentary orator, he also acquired renown as a lawyer and a dramatist.

**Burke and Sheridan in the Hastings Impeachment.**

Burke's sense of justice and hatred of oppression had made him the friend of the Americans in their opposition to Parliamentary taxation, also the champion of the rights of the Hindoos against the extortion and tyranny of Warren Hastings; but his innate conservatism, his reverence for the past and for the sanctity of established institutions, his veneration for law and order, his hatred of anarchy and social chaos, made him the most inveterate foe of the French Revolution. It was this feeling which led him to oppose Pitt's measures of Parliamentary reform. He looked upon the Revolution of 1688 as having closed for all time a great era of national progress which had moved on "from precedent to precedent."

**Burke's Hatred of Tyranny and His Conservatism.**

To sustain his position, Burke quoted a declaration made by the Convention-Parliament of 1689 to William and Mary in these words: "The Lords Temporal and Spiritual, and Commons, do, in the name of the people aforesaid, most humbly and faithfully submit themselves, their heirs and posterity forever." Burke also quoted another act of Parliament of the reign of William and Mary, the terms of which he said "bind us, our heirs and our posterity to them, their heirs and posterity to the end of time." Burke further said that "if the people of England possessed such a right before the Revolution, yet that the English nation did at the time of the Revolution most solemnly renounce and abdicate it for themselves and for all their posterity forever."

**His Theory of the Revolution of 1688.**

Said Burke: "The equilibrium of the Constitution has something so delicate about it that the least displacement may destroy it." He went on to say: "It is a difficult and dangerous matter even to touch so complicated a machine." In a speech on the Canadian Constitution bill Burke said, concerning the United States: "America never dreamed of such absurd doctrine as the rights of man."

**Some of His Assertions.**

Burke's theory made him hostile to all movement whatever, and he passionately sustained the helpless inaction of the Whigs. He ardently admired the Marquis of Rockingham, an honest and upright man, but the weakest of party leaders. Burke sought to check Parliamentary corruption by his bill in 1782 providing for civil retrenchment, but he led in defeating all plans for Parliamentary reform. He was the one man in England who understood with Pitt the value of free industry; but nevertheless he bitterly opposed Pitt's proposals to give

**His Fear of Innovation and Reform.**

free trade to Ireland, and he also ardently disapproved of Pitt's commercial treaty with France in 1787. He sustained the policy of inaction and timid content which the Whigs had inherited from Sir Robert Walpole. His intense belief in the natural development of a nation rendered him incapable of understanding that any good could result from particular laws or special reforms, no matter what the demand or necessity for such laws or reforms.

His  
Alarm  
at the  
Destruc-  
tion of  
the  
Bastile.

The storming of the Bastile by the Paris mob, which kindled such enthusiasm in Fox, filled Burke with apprehension and alarm. Said he: "Whenever a separation is made between liberty and justice neither is safe." While Pitt was predicting a glorious future for the French Constitution, Burke asserted: "The French—the French have shown themselves the ablest architects of ruin who have hitherto existed in the world. In a short space of time they have pulled to the ground their army, their navy, their commerce, their arts and their manufactures."

His  
Political  
Isolation.

But Burke at this time stood alone in Parliament; as the Whigs followed Fox in his applause of the French Revolution, while the Tories distrustfully followed Pitt, who warmly expressed his sympathy with the constitutional government which had just been established in France. While Pitt was striving for friendship between Great Britain and Revolutionary France, Burke was resolved to make such friendship impossible. As he stood alone in the House of Commons and as Parliament paid no attention to his passionate appeals, he appealed to his country through his pen; and his work entitled *Reflections on the French Revolution*, which he published in October, 1790, not only denounced the violent popular uprising which had swept away the Church and nobility of France, destroyed the ordered structure of classes and ranks, established a constitution founded on the doctrine of social equality, rudely demolished and reconstituted a state, threatened the whole social fabric with ruin, and thus inaugurated a revolution founded on scorn for the past; but he denounced the very principles from which this great change had sprung—this embodiment of all that he hated.

His  
"Reflec-  
tions  
on the  
French  
Revolu-  
tion."

His Call  
for a  
Crusade  
against  
the  
French  
Revolu-  
tionists.

Burke's deep sense of the grandeur of social order, of the value of permanence and stability in human institutions, "without which men would become like flies in a summer," made him blind to everything but dread of popular revolt. He obstinately refused to see any abuses in the past, as the past had now been wiped out; and he perceived nothing but ruin and chaos for society in the future. He therefore preached a crusade against the Revolutionists of France, whom he considered the enemies of religion, of civilization, of social order, and called upon the crowned heads of Europe to employ their armies



in crushing a revolution whose principles threatened every state of Europe with utter ruin.

Burke found a great obstacle to such a crusade in Pitt; and one of the grandest outbursts of his *Reflections on the French Revolution* ended with this bitter taunt at the peaceful Prime Minister: "The age of Chivalry is gone; that of sophisters, economists and calculators has succeeded, and the glory of Europe is extinguished forever." But Pitt was not moved from his course by taunts or invective; and at the very time of the appearance of Burke's *Reflections on the French Revolution* he again assured France of his resolve not to take any part in a crusade against the Revolution, expressing his determination thus in writing: "This country means to persevere in the neutrality hitherto scrupulously observed with respect to the internal dissensions of France, and from which it will never depart unless the conduct held there make it indispensable as an act of self-defense."

So little did Pitt share in the apprehensions of some of his Tory followers as to the effect of the French Revolution on the stability of English institutions that in 1791 he supported Mr. Fox in his *Libel Act*, which completed the freedom of the press in Great Britain by transferring the decision on what was libelous in any publication from the judge to the jury. In 1791 Pitt himself put aside the dread which had been aroused in England by the War of American Independence by carrying a bill through the House of Commons conceding the right of self-government to the two Canadas by giving each of them a House of Assembly and a Council. Said Fox, who heartily supported this measure: "I am convinced that the only method of retaining distant colonies with advantage is to enable them to govern themselves." Pitt's policy and Fox's foresight have been justified by the subsequent history of the British dependencies. Mr. Wilberforce's motion for the abolition of the slave trade was again rejected by Parliament by a considerable majority.

Burke was no more successful with his own party, the Whigs; as Fox remained an ardent supporter of the French Revolution, and replied to another attack of Burke upon it with more than his usual warmth. Hitherto these two statesmen had entertained the most ardent affection for each other, but Burke's fanaticism declared it at an end. Fox exclaimed with a sudden burst of tears: "There is no loss of friendship!" Burke responded: "There is. I know the price of my conduct. Our friendship is at an end."

Burke stood wholly alone in Parliament. His *Appeal from the Old to the New Whigs*, in June, 1791, did not detach a follower from Fox. Pitt coldly advised Burke to praise the English Constitution rather than rail at the French. Burke wrote sadly to the French

Pitt's  
Opposition  
to  
Burke's  
Proposed  
Crusade.

Pitt's  
Support  
of  
Fox's  
Libel  
Act.

Pitt's  
Bill  
Granting  
Self-gov-  
ernment  
to  
Canada.

Fox's  
Sym-  
pathy  
for the  
French  
Revolu-  
tion.

Failure of  
Burke's  
Appeal  
to the  
Whigs.

princes, who had fled from their country and were raising an army at Coblenz: "I have made many enemies and few friends by the part I have taken."

English  
Public  
Opinion  
Drifting  
to  
Burke's  
Side.

But English public opinion was slowly drifting to Burke's side, as the sentiment of Englishmen was echoed by the sale of thirty thousand copies of his *Reflections on the French Revolution*. England was in no mood to appreciate the mighty political and social upheaval across the English Channel, as her temper was industrial above everything else. Men who were working hard and growing rich, who had the narrow and practical turn of business men, were angry at the Revolution's disturbance of social order, its restless and vague activity, its rhetorical appeals to human emotion, its abstract and frequently-empty theories. England was at this time blessed with political content and social well-being, with steady economic progress and a powerful religious revival; and Englishmen failed to perceive that every element of this content, of this order, of this peaceful and harmonious progress, of this reconciliation of society with religion, was lacking in other lands.

Change  
Caused  
by  
French  
Violence.

The general sympathy which the French Revolution had at first excited in England slowly changed to disgust in consequence of the violence of the legislative changes in France, the anarchy of that country, the bankruptcy of its treasury and the growing power of the Paris mob. English sympathy with the Revolution was soon confined to a few groups of reformers who gathered in "Constitutional Clubs" and whose reckless language simply hastened the national reaction. But notwithstanding Burke's appeals and the cries of the emigrant nobles of France who had sought refuge outside their country and who longed to invade it, the other nations of Europe hesitated to make war on the Revolution and Pitt persevered in his attitude of neutrality.

Plans  
of Pitt,  
Emperor  
Leopold  
II. and  
Czarina  
Catharine  
the  
Great.

Pitt was anxious for the restoration of tranquillity in France in order to protect Poland and Turkey from the grasping ambition of the Empress Catharine the Great of Russia. He accordingly frustrated a plan of the emigrant nobles of France for a descent on the French coast, and formally announced at Vienna that Great Britain would maintain a strict neutrality in case of war between Revolutionary France and the German Empire. But the Emperor Leopold II. was as anxious to remain at peace with France as was Great Britain's Prime Minister himself. After her Peace of Jassy with Turkey, in January, 1792, Russia's great Empress desired to plunge Austria and Prussia in war with France in order to leave her free to annex the whole of Poland to her dominions; but the Austrian and Prussian monarchs would not allow their hands thus to be tied.

But the progress of events rendered the continuance of peace impossible, as the emigrant nobles had raised an army on the Rhine; and in April, 1792, Revolutionary France declared war against Austria and Prussia. Pitt still determined to hold Great Britain neutral, and in 1792 he announced a reduction of the military forces of Great Britain and brought forward a peace budget in Parliament resting on a large remission of taxation.

Pitt's  
Continued  
Struggle  
against  
War.

But the maintenance of peace between Great Britain and France became more impossible daily; as the French Revolutionists were striving to arouse the Constitutional Clubs in England to excite the same revolutionary spirit in that country that existed in France, in order to procure the alliance of the English people in the war with Austria and Prussia. Chauvelin, the French ambassador in England, boldly protested against a proclamation which denounced this seditious correspondence. Even Fox now declared that the discussion of Parliamentary reform was inexpedient in such an emergency.

War  
with  
Revolutionary  
France  
Becoming  
Inevitable.

In the meantime Burke was exerting himself to his utmost by his pen to spread alarm throughout Europe at the violence of the French Revolution. He had encouraged the French emigrant nobles from the first to take up arms against the Revolutionists and had sent his son to join them at Coblenz. He wrote to them: "Be alarmists; diffuse terror!" But their conduct and the Austro-Prussian invasion of France in July, 1792, produced a revolutionary "Reign of Terror" in France, which ended in the bloodiest insurrections and massacres in Paris, the overthrow of the monarchy, the establishment of the First French Republic and the complete triumph of the Paris mob and the Paris Commune.

Burke's  
Continued  
Incitement  
to  
War.

The defeat and retreat of the Austro-Prussian invaders from France and the invasion of the Austrian Netherlands by the triumphant French encouraged the French National Convention to declare that France offered the aid of her armies to all nations that would strive for freedom, its president saying: "All governments are our enemies; all peoples are our allies." The action of Revolutionary France in violating treaties signed with Great Britain only two years before by invading Holland rendered Great Britain's participation in the war inevitable.

Revolutionary  
France's  
Warlike  
Action.

Public opinion in England was pressing harder upon Pitt daily. The horror of the Reign of Terror in France and the despotism of the Paris mob had done more to estrange English sympathy from the French Revolution than all Burke's eloquence had done. But Pitt obstinately struggled for peace even after the withdrawal of the British ambassador from Paris upon the overthrow and imprisonment of King Louis XVI. Great Britain's Prime Minister had hindered

English  
Public  
Opinion  
Pressing  
Pitt.

Holland from joining Austria and Prussia in the war against Revolutionary France. He hoped to end the war through Great Britain's mediation, and, as he expressed it, to "leave France, which I believe is the best way, to arrange its own internal affairs as it can."

His Last  
Vain  
Efforts to  
Preserve  
Peace.

The greatest hour of Pitt's life was when he stood alone in England for the preservation of peace and refused to yield to the growing popular demand for war with Revolutionary France. The news of the September massacres only induced Pitt to express the hope that the French would refrain from a war of conquest and escape from their social anarchy. In October, 1792, the French ambassador in England reported that Pitt was about to recognize the French Republic. At the opening of November he still urged Holland to remain neutral in the war.

Pitt  
Finally  
Forced  
into War  
with  
Revolutionary  
France.

But the aggressive action of France left Pitt no other alternative than war. The decree of the French National Convention and the French invasion of Holland rendered Great Britain's participation in the war inevitable, as it was impossible for Great Britain to desert her ally. Even in December, 1792, Pitt made a last effort for peace, on the eve of the Second Partition of Poland. He offered to aid Austria to acquire Bavaria if she would make peace with France, and pledged himself to France to remain at peace with her if she would respect the territory of her neighbors. But the French Revolutionists only interpreted his moderation as the result of fear, while the general mourning in England on the receipt of the news of the execution of King Louis XVI. showed the growing ardor of the English people for the inevitable struggle. Diplomacy between Great Britain and France was broken off; and France declared war against Great Britain and Holland in February, 1793, and two weeks later against Spain.

His  
Unfitness  
as a War  
Minister.

Pitt's power was at an end from the moment of the French Republic's declaration of war against Great Britain, though he remained Prime Minister with little intermission for the remaining thirteen years of his life. Though his pride, his immovable firmness and the general confidence of the British nation still kept him at the head of public affairs, he thenceforth drifted along with a tide of popular feeling which he never understood fully. He was unfitted for the conduct of a war by the very excellence of his character. He was actually a peace Minister, forced into war by a panic and enthusiasm which he shared in a very small degree, without his illustrious father's gift of at once entering into the sympathies and passions of the English people or of arousing their sympathies and passions in return.

British  
Public  
Sentiment  
United for  
War.

Pitt's task at home politically was an easy one, as the British nation was united by its desire for war. Even the bulk of the Whigs, headed by the Duke of Portland, Lords Fitzwilliam and Spencer and Mr.

Wyndham, deserted Mr. Fox when he remained firm in his sympathy with Revolutionary France and gave their support to the Ministry.

The violence of the French Revolution and the execution of King Louis XVI. had produced a coalition of almost all the crowned heads of Europe against the French Republic early in 1793, and their armies invaded France on all sides. As we shall describe the events of this war in the section on the French Revolution, we will merely state in this connection that the invasion was defeated on all the French frontiers and that the armies of the French Republic were everywhere successful, compelling the allies to retreat and to act on the defensive. But the British fleet under Lord Howe defeated the French navy off the western coast of France, June 1, 1794.

Pitt was earnest for peace, as he was without the means for prosecuting the war efficiently. The British army was small and without military experience, while its leaders were wholly incompetent. Lord Grenville, the British Minister of Foreign Affairs, wrote: "We have no general but some old woman in a red ribbon." Besides Great Britain's military weakness and defect, Pitt had other reasons for desiring the end of the war. He felt that the war was undoing all that he had done, impassive and inflexible as he appeared. The increase of the public burdens in England was dreadful. Although Great Britain had few soldiers she was the wealthiest nation of the world, and Pitt was obliged to utilize her wealth in the prosecution of the war. He made Great Britain the paymaster of the European coalition against Revolutionary France, and British subsidies brought the allied armies into the field. Pitt raised immense loans for this purpose and for a war expenditure at home which was both extravagant and unnecessary. The public debt of Great Britain was increased by leaps and bounds. Taxation, which under Pitt's peace administration had reached its lowest point, now attained a height before unknown.

The public suffering in England was increased by a general panic. Burke had succeeded only too well in his resolve to "diffuse the terror." The partisans of France and of republicanism in England were really only a few men who assembled conventions and called themselves citizens and patriots in imitation of the French Revolutionists. But the dread of revolution in England soon passed the limits of reason. Even Pitt, though still unaffected by the political reaction in England, was influenced by the alarm of social danger and believed in the existence of "thousands of bandits" who were ready to rise against the British throne, to murder every landlord and to sack London. Said he to his niece who quoted to him Thomas Paine's *Rights of Man*, in which that author had vindicated the principles of the French Revolution: "Paine is no fool; he is perhaps right; but if I did what he

European  
Coalition  
against  
Revolutionary  
France.

Great  
Britain's  
Military  
Weakness.

Her  
Great  
Wealth.

Public  
Alarm in  
England.

Pitt's  
Fear's.

wants, I should have thousands of bandits on my hands to-morrow, and London burned."

His  
Repres-  
sive  
Measures.

Pitt thus shared with Parliament and the British nation at large the belief in a social danger. The Ministry suspended the Habeas Corpus Act, while a new act of Parliament against seditious assemblies restricted the liberty of public meeting, and a wider scope was given to the Statute of Treasons. The Ministry directed frequent prosecutions against the press, while some Nonconformist clergymen were indicted for preaching seditious sermons, and conventions of sympathizers with Revolutionary France were roughly dispersed by the authorities. The worst excesses of this general panic were manifested in Scotland, where some young Whigs who merely advocated Parliamentary reform were sentenced to banishment, and where a brutal judge openly expressed his regret that the practice of torture in cases of sedition should have ceased.

Trial and  
Acquittal  
of Sympa-  
thizers  
with the  
French  
Revolu-  
tion.

But in England the social panic soon disappeared as suddenly as it had risen. In 1794 three leaders of the Corresponding Society, a body sympathizing with the French Revolution—Thelwall, Hardy and Horne Tooke—were brought to trial at the Old Bailey on a charge of high treason, and were acquitted after a patient investigation of several days. The prisoners themselves acknowledged that they desired to effect great changes in the British Constitution, but it was clearly proven that they wished to obtain reform only by legal and constitutional methods and that they were opposed to violence and insurrection. Their acquittal demonstrated very clearly that the terror in England was over.

Distress  
and Dis-  
content in  
England.

In 1795, however, there were symptoms of discontent in different parts of England, in consequence of the ill-success of the war and the distress occasioned by the unprecedented taxation. The poor were goaded to riots by sheer want of bread. The people of London suffered intensely from the interruption of commerce occasioned by the war; and some of the lower classes, irritated by their protracted misery, assailed the king's carriage by pelting it with stones as His Majesty went in state to the House of Lords, October 29, 1795. But this outrage strengthened the Ministry; as Parliament, exasperated at the indignity thus offered to the sovereign, passed several acts for the suppression of sedition. These bills, which greatly restricted English freedom, were perhaps rendered necessary by the peculiar circumstances of the period.

New  
Repres-  
sive  
Measures.

The  
Prince  
of Wales.

In 1795 the Prince of Wales married his cousin, the Princess Caroline of Brunswick, in order to procure the payment of his debts; but soon after the birth of a daughter, early in 1796, the parents finally separated, never living together thereafter.

The defeats of the allies led to the dissolution of the European coalition against the French Republic in the spring of 1795, after the conquest of the Austrian Netherlands and Holland by the French armies. Prussia, Spain and the smaller allied powers made peace, thus leaving Great Britain and Austria alone in the war against Revolutionary France.

**Dissolution of the Anti-French Coalition.**

Though military failure on the Continent of Europe and panic and distress in England had made Pitt anxious to end the war with Revolutionary France, he was almost alone in his desire for peace. The English people were still ardent for the continuance of the war; and their military ardor was intensified by Burke's *Letters on a Regicide Peace*, which denounced Pitt's effort to negotiate with the French Republic in 1796.

**Pitt for Peace and Burke for War.**

France was as ardent for the continuance of the war as Great Britain, in consequence of the brilliant victories of the youthful Napoleon Bonaparte over the Austrians in Italy; and after the Peace of Campo Formio between France and Austria, October 17, 1797, Great Britain alone remained at war with the French Republic. Spain and Holland had become allies of Revolutionary France and enemies of Great Britain.

**Great Britain Alone at War with France.**

At this time British credit was at its lowest ebb, and the enormous expenses of the war exhausted the resources of Great Britain to such an extent that the Bank of England suspended specie payments early in 1797, thus giving rise to an issue of paper money. Two alarming mutinies broke out in the British navy at the same time, that at Spithead being settled by giving the seamen increased pay, but that at the Nore being quelled only by bloodshed and by the execution of the ringleaders.

**Suspension of Specie Payments and Naval Mutinies.**

In this dark hour of the struggle, in 1797, Burke died, protesting to the very last against peace with Revolutionary France; while Pitt opened fresh negotiations at Lille, but his efforts were again thwarted by the undying hatred of the two nations. A threat of French invasion ended the depression and disunion in England. Credit revived; and, in spite of the enormous taxation, a public subscription poured two million pounds into the national treasury toward the expenses of the war.

**Pitt's Vain Efforts for Peace.**

At the same time public confidence in England was restored by the victories of the British navy—that of Admiral Sir John Jervis over the Spanish fleet off Cape St. Vincent, on the coast of Portugal, February 14, 1797; that of Admiral Duncan over the Dutch fleet at Camperdown, on the coast of Holland, October 11, 1797; and that of Admiral Nelson over the French fleet in the battle of the Nile, August 1, 1798, while pursuing Bonaparte in his expedition to Egypt.

**Three British Naval Victories.**

Irish Re-  
bellion  
and Last  
War with  
Tippoo  
Saib.

In rejecting Pitt's peace offers, the French Republic had counted on an outbreak in Ireland against British authority in 1798 and on the new war which Tippoo Saib, Sultan of Mysore, began against the English in India. The Irish rising was crushed by British troops in a defeat of the rebels at Vinegar Hill in 1798; and the war in India was ended by the storming and capture of Seringapatam, the capital of Mysore, and by the death of Tippoo Saib, who fell in the defense of his capital, May 4, 1799; after which Mysore was annexed to the territories of the English East India Company.

Lord  
Cornwal-  
lis and  
Other  
British  
Govern-  
ors-  
General  
of India.

The Governors-General of British India during this period were Sir John Shore, who succeeded Lord Cornwallis in 1793, and who was himself succeeded by Lord Cornwallis in 1796. Sir Alured Clarke became Governor-General in 1798, and the Earl of Mornington in the same year. Lord Cornwallis, who in the meantime had been Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and whose mild and merciful measures had contributed to restore tranquillity in that country after the rebellion of 1798, was made Governor-General of British India a third time in 1805; but he died during the same year near Benares.

Second  
Coalition  
against  
the  
French  
Republic.

Bonaparte's invasion of Egypt and Syria induced Mr. Pitt to unite Austria, Russia, Turkey and Naples with Great Britain in a second coalition against the French Republic in 1799; but after the Austrians and Russians had driven the French from Germany and Italy the coalition fell to pieces, and only Great Britain and Austria remained at war with France. The defeats of the Austrians at Marengo and Hohenlinden in 1800 led to the Peace of Luneville between France and Austria, February 9, 1801, leaving Great Britain again alone in the war against France.

Ireland's  
Con-  
nection  
with  
Great  
Britain.

But when Great Britain thus stood alone once more in the war with France, Pitt achieved his greatest political triumph in the Constitutional Union of Ireland with Great Britain. As we have seen, the Ministry of the Marquis of Rockingham in 1782 had granted the legislative independence of Ireland; and for the next eighteen years, A. D. 1782-1800, Ireland was independent of Great Britain in everything but its subjection to the British crown; but its independence was only a name for the uncontrollable rule of a few noble families, who oppressed the great mass of the Irish people.

Ireland's  
Small  
Protest-  
ant  
Ruling  
Class.

The victory of the Protestant volunteers of Ireland had been won merely to the advantage of the "Parliamentary undertakers," who selected the majority of the members of the Irish House of Commons, while they themselves constituted the Irish House of Lords. Ireland was left at the mercy of these men by the suspension of control or interference from England, and they soon showed that they intended to keep to themselves the power which they thus possessed.



When the native Irish Catholics demanded admission to the franchise and to equal civil rights with the Protestants, as a reward for their assistance in the recent struggle for Irish legislative independence, their just claim was rejected by the selfish Protestant faction. When the Presbyterians, who formed half of the Protestant volunteers, made a similar demand for the removal of civil and political disabilities they also were ignored. Even Grattan utterly failed when he pleaded for a reform which would make the Parliament of Ireland at least a fair representative of the Protestant population of the island.

**Vain  
Efforts  
for  
Reform in  
Ireland.**

The Protestant ruling class found political power too profitable to share it with others. Only by the hardest bribery could the British government secure the coöperation of this ruling class of Ireland in the simplest measures of administration. Said Lord Hutchinson: "If ever there was a country unfit to govern itself, it is Ireland. A corrupt aristocracy, a ferocious commonalty, a distracted government, a divided people."

**Ireland's  
Unfitness  
to Govern  
Herself.**

The real character of Ireland's Parliamentary rule was seen in its rejection of Pitt's offer of free trade between England and Ireland. Pitt considered Ireland's chief danger in the misery of its native population rather than in its factious aristocracy. He perceived that the discontent of the native Catholic Irish was rapidly growing into rebellion, although they were kept down by the mere brute force of their Protestant rulers. He observed also that one cause of this discontent was Irish poverty, which had been increased, if not produced, by the jealous exclusion of Irish products from their natural markets in England.

**Pitt's  
Desire to  
Alleviate  
Ireland's  
Misery.**

One of Pitt's first commercial measures was a bill to put an end to this exclusion by establishing freedom of trade between England and Ireland; but, though he succeeded in silencing the jealousy of the English farmers and the English manufacturers, he was thwarted by the factious ignorance of the Irish landowners, and his bill was rejected by the Irish Parliament after it had passed the British Parliament.

**His  
Proposed  
Anglo-  
Irish Free  
Trade.**

Pitt was so completely discouraged that he was roused to fresh measures of conciliation and good government for Ireland only by the outbreak of the French Revolution and by the efforts which Revolutionary France was making to excite rebellion among the native Catholic Irish. In 1792 he forced on the Irish Parliament measures providing for the admission of native Irish Roman Catholics to the elective franchise and to all civil and military offices in Ireland, which promised to begin a new era of religious liberty in that oppressed land; but the promise came too late. The hope of conciliation was lost in the fast-rising tide of religious and social passion.

**His  
Efforts  
to En-  
franchise  
Irish  
Catholics.**

United  
Irishmen,  
Defenders  
and  
Peep-  
o'-day  
Boys.

The Protestants of Ulster organized an association of *United Irishmen* for the purpose of obtaining Parliamentary reform, and this association engaged in a correspondence with Revolutionary France and in schemes of rebellion. The native Catholic Irish peasantry, brooding over their misery and wrongs, were also roused by the French Revolution; and their disaffection manifested itself in outrages committed by organizations known as *Defenders* and *Peep-o'-day Boys*, who filled Ireland with terror. But for a while the Protestant landowners banded themselves together in *Orange Societies*, which kept down the native Catholic population by sheer terror and bloodshed.

Catholic  
Irish  
Outraged  
by the  
Orange-  
men and  
the Irish  
Parliament.

Finally the smouldering disaffection broke out in a general conflagration, and Catholic Ireland was driven into rebellion by the lawless cruelty of the Orange yeomanry and the English troops. In 1796 and 1797 English soldiers and Orange yeomanry marched through the unhappy country torturing and scourging the "crockies," as the insurgents were called in derision because of their short-cut hair. The outrages of robbery and murder perpetrated by this soldiery and yeomanry were sanctioned by a *Bill of Indemnity*, passed by the Irish Parliament, and were protected for the future by an *Insurrection Act*, also passed by the Irish Parliament, and by a suspension of the Habeas Corpus.

Rebellion  
of the  
United  
Irishmen  
in 1798.

In the meantime the United Irishmen prepared for an insurrection, which was delayed by the failure of the French expeditions on which they had relied for aid, and especially by the British naval victory over the Dutch fleet at Camperdown. Atrocities were perpetrated on both sides, and the revolt of the United Irishmen finally broke out in 1798. The rebels lashed and tortured loyal Protestants in their turn and mercilessly massacred the English soldiers whom they took prisoners. But as soon as the rebels had mustered fifteen thousand men in a strong camp on Vinegar Hill, near Enniscorthy, in County Wexford, that camp was stormed by the English troops under General Lake, who thus thoroughly suppressed the rebellion.

Battle of  
Vinegar  
Hill.

French  
Invasion  
of  
Ireland.

The suppression of the revolt of the United Irishmen came in time only to prevent greater calamities. A few weeks after the end of the rebellion a thousand French troops under General Humbert landed at Killala, in County Mayo, vanquished a force of three thousand English troops in a battle at Castlebar, and surrendered only when Lord Cornwallis, then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, faced them with thirty thousand English troops. Lord Cornwallis, who was a wise and humane ruler, found more difficulty in checking the reprisals of his English troops and of the Orangemen than in extinguishing the last sparks of rebellion; but his mild and merciful measures soon restored tranquillity to the island.

Pacifica-  
tion of  
Ireland  
by Lord  
Cornwallis.

Prime Minister Pitt's disgust at "the bigoted fury of Irish Protestants" made him firmly resolve to end the farce of "Irish Independence," which left the unhappy country helpless at the mercy of the Protestant faction which ruled the Irish Parliament. The course of the Irish Parliament in the disputes over the regency of the Prince of Wales during the king's temporary insanity in 1788 had impressed every English statesman with the political necessity for a union of Ireland with Great Britain under one Parliament. As the only union between Great Britain and Ireland was the union of the two island kingdoms under one sovereign, the controversy of the two Parliaments might have ended in the total separation of the two kingdoms by the severance of the only link which united them. In consequence of this danger, Pitt's proposal to unite the two Parliaments was welcomed in England.

Pitt's  
Desire  
for a  
Parliamentary  
Union of  
Great  
Britain  
and  
Ireland.

The Irish borough-mongers obstinately and resolutely opposed Pitt's measure for the Constitutional Union of the two kingdoms; but the English Prime Minister overcame their opposition by the influence of gold, and bought the assent of the Irish Parliament with a million pounds in money and with a liberal distribution of pensions and peerages to its members. Only by such wholesale bribery was Pitt able to procure the passage of his celebrated *Act of Union* by the Irish Parliament.

Passage  
of the  
Act of  
Union by  
the Irish  
Parliament.

After the Act of Union had been passed by the British and Irish Parliaments and the matter finally arranged in June, 1800, Ireland was represented in the British House of Commons by one hundred members, and in the British House of Lords by twenty-eight temporal and four spiritual peers, chosen for each Parliament by their fellows. All restrictions on the commerce between the two islands were removed, and all the trading privileges of each were thrown open to the other; while a proportionate distribution of taxation was arranged between the two peoples thus united for the first time under one Parliament. The Act of Union went into effect on the first day of the nineteenth century, January 1, 1801, when the Irish Lords and Commons for the first time took their seats in the Parliament at Westminster, which was the beginning of the *United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland*.

One  
Parliament  
for the  
United  
Kingdom  
of Great  
Britain  
and  
Ireland.

Pitt's lavish creation of Irish peers, which constituted a part of the price which he paid for the Constitutional Union of Ireland with Great Britain, was only an instance of his deliberate policy in dealing with the peerage in general; and, although he did not succeed in reforming the British House of Commons, he brought about a practical change in the British Constitution by his thorough and substantial reform of the House of Lords.

Pitt's  
Creation  
of New  
Peers.

Repeated  
Creations  
of New  
Peers  
in the  
Past.

Few legislative bodies have varied more in the number of their members than the English House of Lords. At the end of the Wars of the Roses only thirty Lords remained to take their seats. During Queen Elizabeth's reign they numbered sixty, and the Stuarts so enlarged the peerage that they amounted to one hundred and sixty-eight. This last number was not increased to any extent during the reigns of the first two Georges, and Lord Stanhope would have restricted the peerage to the number which it had then reached had he not been prevented by the dogged opposition of Sir Robert Walpole. Though such a limitation would have been mischievous, it would have prevented the lavish creation of peers on which King George III. relied in the early part of his reign as a means of breaking up the party government which restrained him.

Pitt's  
Whole-  
sale  
Creations  
of New  
Peers.

But what was with King George III. a mere means of corruption became with the second William Pitt a settled purpose of so altering the peerage that instead of remaining a narrow and exclusive caste it would become a large representation of the wealth of England. He expressed his design as intended to use the House of Lords as a means of rewarding merit, also to bring the peerage into closer relations with the landowning and opulent classes, as well as to render the crown independent of factious combinations among the existing peers. While Pitt therefore had a disdain for hereditary honors, he lavished them with more profusion than any Prime Minister before him had done. He created fifty new peers during the first five years of his Ministry, A. D. 1783-1788. In 1796 and 1797 he created thirty-five. By 1801 the peerage had been so enlarged as the price of the Constitutional Union between Great Britain and Ireland that Pitt's created peers numbered one hundred and forty-one. Pitt's successors so busily followed his example that at the end of the reign of George III., in 1820, there were double the number of hereditary peers that there had been at the time of his accession, in 1760.

His  
Complete  
Reform  
of the  
House of  
Lords.

The change in the peerage was not only an increase of numbers, but it was also a change in the whole character of the House of Lords. Hitherto that body had been a small assembly of great nobles, united by family or party ties so as to form a distinct power in the kingdom. Pitt completely revolutionized the Upper House of Parliament by giving it new members from the middle and commercial class, who constituted the basis of his political power—small landowners, bankers, merchants, nabobs, lawyers, army contractors, soldiers and seamen. Instead of remaining the stronghold of blood and hereditary aristocracy as it had hitherto been, the House of Lords thus became the stronghold of property—the representative of the great estates and great fortunes built up by the vast increase of English wealth. For the

first time in English history the House of Lords also became the distinctly-conservative element in the British Constitution.

The full import of Pitt's changes still remains to be revealed, but in some respects their results have been far different from what was intended. The increased number of the peerage, though due to the will of the crown, has virtually freed the Upper House of Parliament from any influence which the crown can exert by the distribution of honors. This change has rendered it still more difficult to reconcile the free action of the House of Lords with the regular working of constitutional government, because the power of the crown has been practically wielded by the House of Commons, the republican part of the British government. But the increased number of the peerage has also rendered the House of Lords more responsive to public opinion when public opinion is strongly pronounced, while the political tact inherent in great aristocratic assemblies has hitherto prevented any collision between the two Houses of Parliament from ending in an irreconcilable quarrel. The most direct result of the change is the popularity of the House of Lords with the masses of the English people. The large number of its members and the constant increase of the number from almost all classes of English society have thus far secured it from the suspicion and ill-will which in most other constitutional governments has hampered the effective working of an upper legislative chamber.

The legislative Union of Great Britain and Ireland was but a part of the plan which Pitt had conceived for the conciliation of Ireland. With the conclusion of the Parliamentary Union his project of free trade between the two islands, which had failed several years before through the folly of the Irish Parliament, was now quietly accomplished; and, in spite of inadequate capital and social disquiet, the increase of the trade, the shipping and the manufactures of Ireland has ever since proceeded unchecked. The change which placed Ireland directly under the British Parliament was followed by a gradual revision of its oppressive laws and an improvement in their administration; while Irish taxation was lightened, and a slight beginning was made in public instruction in Ireland.

But Pitt regarded the concession of religious equality as the great means of Ireland's conciliation. When he had proposed the Parliamentary Union of the two island kingdoms he had pointed out to the British Parliament that when Ireland was united with such Protestant countries as England and Scotland there would be no danger of a Catholic supremacy in Ireland in case of the removal of Catholic disabilities, and he had suggested that in such an event "an effectual and adequate provision for the Catholic clergy" would be a security

**Beneficial  
Result  
of this  
Reform.**

**Free  
Trade  
between  
England  
and  
Ireland.**

**Pitt's  
Desire  
for Irish  
Catholic  
Emanci-  
pation.**

for their loyalty to the British government. Pitt's words gave promise to the hopes of "Catholic Emancipation," or the removal of the civil and political disabilities of the Irish Roman Catholics, which Lord Castlereagh held out in Ireland for the purpose of preventing any Catholic opposition to the plan of Constitutional Union with Great Britain. All parties were aware that the opposition of the Catholic Irish would have defeated the projected Union, but no Catholic opposition to the project was manifested in Ireland, as the Irish Catholics were tired of the oppression of the Irish Protestant ruling class.

After the passage of the Act of Union, Pitt prepared to submit to the British Cabinet a measure which would have raised both Roman Catholics and Dissenters to perfect equality of civil and political rights. In this measure Pitt proposed to remove all religious tests which restricted the franchise or which were required for admission to Parliament, the magistracy, the bar, municipal offices or situations in the civil or military service of the United Kingdom. Pitt's measure provided for political security by the imposition of an oath of allegiance and of fidelity to the British Constitution, in place of the Sacramental Test; while a government grant of some provision secured the loyalty of both the Catholic and Nonconformist clergy. To conciliate the Anglican State Church, measures were added to strengthen its means of discipline and to increase the stipends of its poorer clergy. To insure harmony between the Episcopal clergy and the Irish people, a commutation of tithes was provided for.

Pitt's wise measure was too broad and statesmanlike to obtain the immediate assent of the Cabinet; and, before such assent could be procured, the scheme was communicated to King George III. through the treachery of the Lord Chancellor, Lord Loughborough. The king declared angrily to Dundas: "I count any man my personal enemy who proposes any such measure." Pitt replied to this outburst of royal wrath by submitting his whole project to His Majesty. The Prime Minister wrote to the king thus: "The political circumstances under which the exclusive laws originated, arising either from the conflicting power of hostile and nearly-balanced sects, from the apprehension of a Popish queen as successor, a disputed succession and a foreign pretender, a division in Europe between Catholic and Protestant powers, are no longer applicable to the present state of things." But it was useless to argue with George III. In spite of the lawyers whom the king consulted, he considered himself bound by his Coronation Oath to maintain the religious tests; and his bigotry coincided too well with the religious hatred and political distrust of the Roman Catholics still entertained by the majority of the English people not to make his decision fatal to Pitt's beneficent measure.

His  
Efforts  
in that  
Direction.

Frustrated  
by the  
Bigotry  
of King  
George  
III.  
and the  
English  
People.

But Pitt held firmly to the principle of his liberal measure, and resigned in February, 1801; whereupon Mr. Addington, Speaker of the House of Commons, a man as dull and bigoted as George III. himself, became Prime Minister. The war with the French Republic was ended by the Peace of Amiens, March 27, 1802, but was renewed in 1803, as we shall presently see.

In 1803 Colonel Despard and others were executed in England for plotting against the government; and Robert Emmett was hanged in Dublin for an attempt at rebellion in Ireland, Lord Kilwarden and others having been killed by the insurgents. In India during 1803 the Mahrattas were defeated by Sir Arthur Wellesley, afterward Duke of Wellington, at Assayé and Argaum; while General Lake took Delhi and Agra by storm; whereupon the Mahrattas ceded large territories to the East India Company.

**Addington's  
Ministry.**

**Peace  
and War.**

**Robert  
Emmett.**

**Last War  
with the  
Mahrattas.**

X-16241

HCSB LIBRARY


















A 000 457 047 9

