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PREFACE

The desire of American high schools for an intensive course devoted to modern European history was already pronounced before the World War. Since then it has become an imperious demand, for knowledge of the historical background of that epochal struggle is indispensable to the educated citizen. *Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas.*

The Committee on Social Studies of the Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education in its *Report* (1916) to the National Education Association urged that an entire year be devoted to a course in modern history (including English history) since approximately the end of the seventeenth century. The Regents of the University of the State of New York in their latest *Syllabus* (1919) have outlined such a course for the schools under their supervision. Finally, the Committee on History and Education for Citizenship, which represents the National Education Association, the American Historical Association, and the Committee for Historical Research, has made a preliminary report recommending for the tenth year of the high school a study of European history from the middle of the seventeenth century to the present age.

This text-book covers the period between 1648 and 1920. It forms a continuation, therefore, of my *Early European History*, issued three years ago. All the chapters, except the first, have appeared in abbreviated form in my recent *Medieval and Modern History*. Yet much of the book is new, and there are many new maps, plates, and drawings.

As in the preceding volumes of this series, teachers will find abundant bibliographical material in the "Suggestions for Further Study." The several hundred "Studies," distributed throughout the various chapters, are intended to do something more than merely test the pupil's memory of what he has read; they ought to make possible, as well, Socratic methods of teaching in the classroom. The appendix furnishes a list of the rulers of the principal countries for the last three hundred years. The index, which is unusually full, gives the pronunciation of most proper names, including those in foreign languages.
It seems to be generally agreed that the best collateral reading in connection with a text-book consists of sources. They alone supply the means for exercises in historical method, while for vividness and picturesqueness no secondary narrative, however well constructed, can rival them. To provide these sources the author has prepared Readings in Medieval and Modern History, of which the last eleven chapters cover the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries, and a Historical Source Book of thirty-three documents, all but two of them relating to modern times. References to both collections are inserted in footnotes.

The author cannot allow this volume to go forth without at least a word of acknowledgment to the printers, cartographers, and artists who have coöperated with him in its preparation.

HUTTON WEBSTER

Lincoln, Nebraska
March, 1920
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MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

CHAPTER I

FOUNDATIONS OF MODERN EUROPE

1. The Geography of Europe

History, which begins in western Asia and Egypt, for the last twenty-five centuries has centered in Europe. Modern industry and commerce, modern systems of government, modern science, art, literature, and philosophy are very much the creation, during this long period, of European peoples. Within the last three hundred years, especially, they have occupied and populated America and Australia and have brought under their control all Asia, except China and Japan, nearly the whole of Africa, and the islands of all the seas. They have introduced into these remote regions their languages, laws, customs, and religion, until to-day the greater part of the world is subject to European influence.

Yet Europe ranks as the smallest, except Australia, of the six continents. Geographically, it is not a continent but a peninsula of Asia. Map makers usually place the dividing line at the Ural Mountains, the Caspian Sea, and the Caucasus. The broad, low range of the Urals provides, however, no continuous crest between Russia and Siberia, while between these mountains and the Caspian the European plain merges insensibly into the Asiatic steppe. Estimates of the total area of Europe vary, therefore, from about 3,600,000 square miles to about 4,100,000 square miles. On the basis of the lower figure mentioned, Europe has considerably less than half the area of either North America or South America, less than one-third that of Africa, and little more
than one-fifth that of Asia. It includes not quite seven percent of the land surface of the globe.

The geographical advantages enjoyed by Europe largely account for its historic importance. It occupies a central position in the land hemisphere, being almost joined to Africa at the strait of Gibraltar, and being separated from America by the comparatively narrow Atlantic. Nearly all the continent lies in the northern half of the North Temperate Zone, that is, within those latitudes most favorable to the development of a high civilization. Nowhere, except beyond the Arctic Circle, does excessive cold stunt body and mind, and nowhere does enervating heat sap human energies.

Of all parts of the world in the same latitude, Europe enjoys the coolest summers, the warmest winters. The climate is profoundly affected by the Gulf Stream drift, which reaches the British Isles and Scandinavia. It gives to Liverpool a milder winter than that of Washington, a thousand miles farther south, keeps the harbors ice-free in the Norwegian fiords, and permits Russia to have an open harbor on the Arctic. Climatic conditions are made still more favorable by the circumstance that Europe lies open to the west, with great inland seas penetrating deeply from the Atlantic, and with the higher mountain ranges extending nearly east and west. The westerly winds, warmed in passing over the Gulf Stream drift, can thus spread far inland, moderating the temperatures as far east as Petrograd and Constantinople. The prevailing "westerlies" also bring an abundant rainfall distributed throughout the year, except in such regions as southern Spain, Italy, Greece, and eastern Russia. Europe, in consequence, is the only continent without extensive deserts.

The Mediterranean and the Baltic divide Europe into a number of peninsulas, which are further intersected by numerous gulfs and bays. Though landlocked on its eastern or Asiatic side, Europe has a longer coast-line than Africa and South America combined. The mean distance from the sea of all points in the interior is only
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209 miles, as compared with 292 miles in the case of North America. No other continent has such opportunities for the development of navigation and sea-borne trade.

Europe is traversed from north to south by many rivers, navigable for long distances. The Rhone, emptying into the Mediterranean, affords ready entrance to the Inland communication interior of France. The Rhine and the Danube provide an almost continuous waterway from the North Sea to the Black Sea. Every part of Russia is penetrated by majestic streams, which still remain, even in the days of railroads, the principal arteries of traffic in that country.

Another feature of European geography is the preponderance of lowlands over highlands. Beginning in the west with southern England, the great European plain stretches across France, Belgium and Holland (the "Low Countries"), and Germany, and broadens eastward into Russia. About two-thirds of Europe is included in this plain. The level country has encouraged the building of canals, which combine with the rivers to connect the Baltic and North seas with the Black and Caspian seas and these, again, with the Mediterranean.

The Alps, stretching from southeastern France to the borders of Hungary and separating the plains of northern Italy and southern Germany, form the backbone of Europe. Their length is over 600 miles, their width, from 90 to 180 miles. The Alps do not present such a continuous barrier as the Himalayas or the Andes, which even birds avoid in their flight. No other high mountains, except the Rockies, have so many easy passes or offer so little impediment to movement across them. Furthermore, the outspurs of the Alps in central and southeastern Europe are separated by transverse valleys, thus establishing convenient routes of communication from one region to another.

Europe, in general, has a fertile soil and a wide variety of products. Only the Arctic tundra and the slopes of the higher mountains are unadapted to either farming, Resources of Europe grazing, or lumbering. Agriculture is still the most important occupation. Wheat, rye, barley, and oats
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can be cultivated from the Mediterranean northward to the head of the Gulf of Bothnia, that is, nearer the pole in Europe than in any other part of the world. Southern Europe, in the latitude of the central United States, produces such semitropical fruits as oranges, lemons, olives, and figs. Stock-raising flourishes on the plains of Russia and Hungary. The Scandinavian countries and parts of Spain, France, Germany, Austria, Hungary, and Russia are heavily timbered. Deposits of coal and iron ore abound in Great Britain, France, Belgium, Germany, and other countries. These varied resources of Europe enable it to support a dense population.

2. The Peoples of Europe

Europe contains more than 400,000,000 inhabitants — a fourth of mankind. Statistics indicate that its population has doubled since the opening of the nineteenth century. The increase is partly due to improved sanitary conditions and the progress of scientific medicine, resulting in a lower death rate, and partly to the greater production and importation of foodstuffs, virtually eliminating famine. The pressure of increased numbers has been to some extent relieved by the enormous emigration of Europeans, during the last hundred years, to the unoccupied or less thickly settled regions of the globe.

A study of the physical characteristics — shape of the skull, features, and coloring of the skin, eyes, and hair — of Europeans leads to the conclusion that they are of diverse origin. Excepting such peoples as the Mongols, Tatars, Turks, Bulgarians, Magyars or Hungarians, Esths or Estonians, and Finns, who came from Asia in antiquity or the Middle Ages, the inhabitants of Europe at the dawn of history may be separated into three racial types. Each has persisted to the present time and each still occupies a fairly well-defined area of the continent.

The Baltic or Nordic type extends over northwestern Europe from the British Isles through northern France, northern
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Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and northern Germany, as far as the Gulf of Finland. It is characterized by narrow head, aquiline nose, high stature, very light hair, blue eyes, and complexion prevailingly blonde. Baltic man probably developed in Europe during prehistoric times.

RACIAL TYPES IN WESTERN EUROPE

The Alpine type spreads throughout central, eastern, and southeastern Europe, including southern Belgium, central France, Switzerland, southern Germany, Austria, Bohemia, Poland, Russia, northern Italy, and the greater part of the Balkan peninsula. It is characterized by broad head, heavy nose, medium height, light chestnut hair, and gray eyes. Alpine man may be of Asiatic derivation.

The Mediterranean type prevails in the peninsulas of southern Europe, specifically, Spain, Portugal, southern France, central
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and southern Italy, and the adjoining islands. It is characterized by narrow head, rather heavy nose, medium height, dark brown or black hair, dark eyes, and brunette complexion. Mediterranean man possibly arose in Africa at a remote period.

About sixty distinct languages are still spoken in Europe. The Turks of the Balkan peninsula and the Mongols and Tatars in Russia keep their Asiatic tongues. The same is true of the Magyars, Estonians, and Finns, who in other respects have been thoroughly Europeanized. The remaining languages belong to the Indo-European family. The peoples of Slavic and Teutonic speech number about 150,000,000 each, and those of Græco-Latin speech, considerably over 100,000,000. The Celtic and Lettic branches of the Indo-European family include comparatively few representatives at the present time.¹

3. European States

Europe in 1914 included twenty sovereign states. More have been added as a result of the World War. Their present boundaries only in part coincide with those fixed by geography. The British Isles, it is true, constitute a single political unit, as nature seems to have intended, but Ireland remains a very unwilling member of the United Kingdom. The Iberian peninsula, bounded on the north by the Pyrenees, seems to form another natural political unit, yet within the peninsula there is the independent state

¹ Indo-European Languages:
5. Slavic:
   a. South Slavs: (Bulgarians), Serbs or Serbians, Montenegrins, Croats or Croatians, Slovenes or Slovenians.
   b. West Slavs: Czechs or Bohemians, Slovaks, Poles.
   c. East Slavs: Great Russians, Little Russians or Ruthenians, White Russians.
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of Portugal. Italy, though marked off from the rest of the Continent by the Alps, continued to be broken up into numerous distinct states until the latter part of the nineteenth century. The Scandinavian peninsula forms perhaps the best example of geographical boundaries, for it is entirely occupied by the two kingdoms of Sweden and Norway, one on each side of the central backbone of mountains. On the whole, however, such great mountain ranges as the Alps, Carpathians, and Balkans, and such great rivers as the Rhine, Danube, and Vistula have failed to provide permanent frontiers for the European states.

Still more difficult is it to trace racial boundaries in modern Europe. Peaceful migrations and armed invasions, beginning in prehistoric times and continuing to the present, have led to much mixture of peoples. For example, there is no physical difference between the average Englishman and the average North Frenchman, Fleming, Dutchman, Dane, or North German. All are Baltic in type. On the other hand, a marked physical difference exists between the Baltic North German and the Alpine South German, between the Baltic North Frenchman and the Mediterranean South Frenchman. These instances, out of many which might be cited, show how complicated is the racial situation in most countries of Europe.

Nor is every European state one in language. France includes the district of Brittany, where a Celtic speech prevails. In Belgium the Walloons use French, and the Flemings, a Teutonic tongue. Switzerland has French, German, and Italian speaking cantons. In the British Isles one may still hear Irish, Welsh, and Gaelic. The possession of a common language undoubtedly tends to bring peoples together and keep them together, but it is not an indispensable condition of their unity.

History, rather than geography, race, or even language, explains the present grouping of European states. When the Christian era opened, all the region between the North Sea and the Black Sea and from the Mediterranean to the Rhine and Danube belonged to the
Roman Empire. This civilized Europe made a solid whole, with one government and one law. Five hundred years passed, and Europe under the influence of the Germanic invasions began to split up into a number of separate, independent countries. The process of state-making continued throughout the Middle Ages, as the result of renewed inroads of the barbarians (Northmen, Slavs, Bulgarians, Magyars, Mongols, Turks). By the middle of the seventeenth century, after the close of the religious wars, many of the principal countries had taken the form and acquired the position in Europe which they hold at the present time. Let us survey the European state system as it existed after the Peace of Westphalia.

The map of western Europe in 1648 was much the same as now. The British Isles had a common ruler, but Scotland continued to be a separate kingdom and Ireland to be only loosely joined to England. The Iberian peninsula included the two kingdoms of Spain and Portugal. France had very nearly her existing boundaries, except on the east and northeast toward the Rhine. Switzerland and the United Netherlands (Holland) were independent. The Spanish Netherlands (Belgium) remained, however, a province of Spain.

The map of central Europe in 1648 was very unlike that of to-day. Most of what is now Germany was then divided among more than three hundred states and feudal domains, owing only a nominal allegiance to the Holy Roman Emperor. If the imperial dignity meant little, the Hapsburg ruler, as archduke of Austria, king of Bohemia, king of Hungary, and lord of many smaller territories, held a proud position in Europe. Italy, like Germany, presented a picture of disunion. The northern part of the peninsula contained the independent duchy of Savoy, the duchy of Milan, a Spanish possession, the republics of Venice and Genoa, and the little states Parma, Modena, and Lucca. Central Italy included the duchy of Tuscany and the States of the Church. The kingdom of the Two Sicilies belonged to Spain.
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In 1648 there were only two Scandinavian kingdoms, for Norway was joined to Denmark. Sweden, then a first-class power, held sway over Finland and adjoining territories. The duchy of East Prussia belonged to the elector of Brandenburg. The huge kingdom of Poland stretched from the Baltic almost to the Black Sea. Farther east lay Russia, so backward in civilization as to be scarcely a European state.

The Ottoman Turks in 1648 ruled in south-eastern Europe. They occupied Greece, all the Balkan peninsula except Montenegro, most of Hungary, and the territory now included in Rumania and southern Russia. Never had the shadow of the Crescent loomed more darkly over Europe.

4. European Governments

Most European states in the seventeenth century were absolute monarchies. Absolutism was as common then as democracy is to-day. The rulers of Europe, having triumphed over the feudal nobility of the Middle Ages, proclaimed themselves to be the sole source of authority. They posed as sovereigns who held their power, not from the choice or consent of their subjects, but by the "grace of God."

Many primitive peoples regard their chiefs as holy and give to them the control of peace and war, of life and death. Oriental rulers in antiquity bore a sacred character. In the lifetime of an Egyptian Pharaoh temples were erected to him and offerings were made to his sacred majesty. The Hebrew monarch was the Lord's anointed. The Hellenistic kings of the East and the Roman emperors received divine honors from their subjects. An element of sanctity also attached to medieval sovereigns, who, at their coronation, were anointed with a magic oil, girt with a sacred sword, and given a supernatural banner. Even Shakespeare could speak of the divinity which "doth hedge a king." 1

1 Hamlet, IV, v, 123. Compare King Richard the Second, III, ii, 54-57.
This belief in the sacred character of royalty had a natural corollary in the theory of divine right. It first took shape during the Middle Ages out of the controversies between the Papacy and the secular rulers of Europe. The popes, as God's vicars on earth, claimed the obedience of all Christians, as well in temporal as in spiritual matters. Emperors and kings, resenting what they regarded as papal interference in politics, then set up a counter-claim for the divine origin of the imperial and royal power. During the Reformation Luther and his followers also exalted the authority of the State against the authority of the Church, which they condemned and rejected. Providence, they argued, had never sanctioned the Papacy, but Providence had really ordained the State and had placed over it a ruler whom it was a religious duty to obey. The Lutherans, therefore, defended the theory of divine right.

A very different theory found acceptance in those parts of Europe where Calvinism prevailed. In his Institutes, one of the most widely read books of the age, Calvin declares that magistrates and parliaments are the guardians of popular liberty "by the ordinance of God." Calvin's adherents, amplifying this statement, argued that rulers derive their authority from the people and that those who abuse it may be deposed by the will of the people. The Christian duty of resistance to royal tyranny became a cardinal principle of Calvinism among the French Huguenots, the Dutch, the Scotch, and most of the American colonists of the seventeenth century. We shall now see how influential it was in seventeenth-century England.

Studies

1. Compare the area of Europe with that of Brazil, of Canada, and of the United States (including Alaska).  
2. What is Eurasia?  
3. Why have the Caspian and Black seas been far less important in European history than the Mediterranean?  
4. Why has the Baltic been called a "secondary Mediterranean"?  
5. Trace on the map the principal rivers which rise either in the Alps or in outspurs of the Alps.  
6. Trace on the map the principal Russian rivers.  
7. What mountain systems of Europe are not offshoots from the Alps?  
8. Locate the principal Alpine passes.

1 Institutes of the Christian Religion, IV, xx, 31.
9. Is the influence on civilization of such physical conditions as climate, fertility of soil, rainfall, mountain ranges, and rivers greater or less to-day than in earlier times? 10. "Europe resembles the human hand, from the elaborate division of its parts and the opportunities it affords for contact." Comment on this statement. 11. "In many respects Europe may be considered the most favored among the Continents." Explain this statement in detail. 12. Show that the racial types (Baltic, Alpine, and Mediterranean) do not, in general, coincide with the linguistic groups (Teutonic, Slavic, and Graeco-Roman) in Europe. 13. "Similarity of language invites the unity of a people, but does not compel it." Comment on this statement. 14. Enumerate the sovereign states of Europe before and after the World War. 15. Where are the republics of Andorra and San Marino, the principalities of Monaco and Liechtenstein, and the grand duchy of Luxemburg? 16. Do any European monarchs still claim to rule by divine right?
CHAPTER II

CONSTITUTIONAL MONARCHY IN ENGLAND, 1603-1714

5. Absolutism of the Stuarts, 1603–1642

Absolutism in England dated from the time of the Tudors. Henry VII humbled the nobles, while Henry VIII and Elizabeth brought the Church into dependence on the Crown. These three sovereigns, though despotic, were excellent rulers and were popular with the influential middle class in town and country. The Tudors gave England order and prosperity, if not political liberty.

The English Parliament in the thirteenth century had become a body representative of the different estates of the realm, and in the fourteenth century it had separated into the two houses of Lords and Commons. Parliament enjoyed considerable authority at this time. The kings, who were in continual need of money, often summoned it, sought its advice upon important questions, and readily listened to its requests. The despotic Tudors, on the other hand, made Parliament their servant. Henry VII called it together on only five occasions during his reign; Henry VIII persuaded or frightened it into doing anything he pleased; and Elizabeth consulted it as infrequently as possible. Parliament under the Tudors did not abandon its old claims to a share in the government, but it had little chance to exercise them.

The death of Elizabeth in 1603 ended the Tudor dynasty and

---

placed James I, the first of the Stuarts, on the English throne. England and Scotland were now joined in a personal union, though each country retained its own Parliament, laws, and established Church. The new king was well described by a contemporary as the “wisest fool in Christendom.” He had a good mind and abundant learning, but throughout his reign he showed an utter inability to win either the esteem or the affection of his subjects. This was a misfortune, for the English had now grown weary of despotism and wanted freedom. They were not prepared to tolerate in James, an alien, many things which they had overlooked in “Good Queen Bess.”

One of the most fruitful sources of discord between James and the English people was his exalted conception of monarchy. The Tudors, indeed, claimed to rule by divine right, but James went further and argued for divine hereditary right. Providence, he declared, had chosen the principle of heredity in order to fix the succession to the throne. This principle, being divine, lay beyond the power of man to alter. Whether the king was fit or unfit to rule, Parliament might not change the succession, depose a sovereign, or limit his authority in any way. James rather neatly summarized his views in a Latin epigram, *a deo rex, a rege lex* — “the king is from God, and law is from the king.”

The extreme pretensions of James encountered much opposition from Parliament. That body felt little sympathy for a ruler who proclaimed himself the source of all law. When James, always extravagant and a poor financier, came before it for money, Parliament insisted on its right to withhold supplies until grievances were redressed.

\[1\] James VI of Scotland (1567–1625). His mother, Mary Queen of Scots, was a granddaughter of Henry VII, the first of the Tudors.
James would not yield, and got along as best he could by levying customs duties, selling titles of nobility, and imposing excessive fines, in spite of the protests of Parliament. This situation continued to the end of the king’s reign.

A religious controversy helped to embitter the dispute between James and Parliament. The king, who was a devout Anglican, made himself very unpopular with the Puritans, as the reformers within the Church of England were called. The Puritans had at first no intention of separating from the national or established Church, but they wished to "purify" it of certain customs which they described as "Romish." Among these were the use of the surplice, of the ring in the marriage service, and of the sign of the cross in baptism. Some Puritans wanted to get rid of the Book of Common Prayer altogether.

Since the Puritans had a large majority in the House of Commons, it was inevitable that the parliamentary struggle against Stuart absolutism should assume in part a religious character.

The political and religious difficulties which marked the reign of James I did not disappear when his son, Charles I, came to the throne. Charles was a true Stuart in his devotion to absolutism and divine right. Almost immediately he began to quarrel with Parliament. When that body withheld supplies, Charles resorted to forced loans from the wealthy and even imprisoned a number of persons who refused to contribute. Such arbitrary acts showed plainly that Charles would play the tyrant if he could.
The king's attitude at last led Parliament to a bold assertion of its authority. It now presented to Charles the celebrated Petition of Right. One of the most important clauses provided that loans without parliamentary sanction should be considered illegal. Another clause declared that no one should be arrested or imprisoned except
according to the law of the land. The Petition thus repeated and reinforced some of the leading principles of Magna Carta. The people of England, speaking this time through their elected representatives, asserted once more their right to limit the power of kings.

Charles signed the Petition, as the only means of securing parliamentary consent to taxation; but he had no intention of observing it. For the next eleven years he managed to govern without calling Parliament in session. The conduct of affairs during this period lay largely in the hands of Sir Thomas Wentworth, afterwards earl of Strafford, and William Laud, who later became archbishop of Canterbury. The king made these two men his principal advisers and through them carried on his despotic rule. Arbitrary courts, which tried cases without a jury, punished those who resisted the royal will. A rigid censorship of the press prevented any expression of popular discontent. Public meetings were suppressed as seditious riots. Even private gatherings were dangerous, for the king had swarms of spies to report disloyal acts or utterances.

Since Charles ruled without a Parliament, he had to adopt all sorts of devices to fill his treasury. One of these was the levying of "ship-money." According to an old custom, seaboard towns and counties had been required to provide ships or money for the royal navy. Charles revived this custom and extended
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it to towns and counties lying inland. It seemed clear that the king meant to impose a permanent tax on all England without the assent of Parliament. The demand for "ship-money" aroused much opposition, and John Hampden, a wealthy squire of Buckinghamshire, refused to pay the twenty shillings levied on his estate. Hampden was tried before a court of the royal judges and was convicted by a bare majority. He became, however, a popular hero.

Execution of the Earl of Strafford

After a contemporary print. The Tower of London is seen in the background.

Archbishop Laud, the king's chief agent in ecclesiastical matters, detested Puritanism and aimed to root it out from the Anglican Church. He put no Puritans to death, but he sanctioned cruel punishments of those who would not conform to the established religion. While the restrictions on Puritans were increased, those affecting Roman Catholics were relaxed. Many people thought that Charles, through Laud and the bishops, was preparing to lead the Church of England back to Rome. They therefore
opposed the king on religious grounds, as well as for political reasons.

But the personal rule of Charles was now drawing to an end. In 1637 the king, supported by Archbishop Laud, tried to introduce a modified form of the English prayer book into Scotland. The Scotch, Calvinistic to the core, drew up a national oath, or Covenant, by which they bound themselves to resist any attempt to change their religion. Rebellion quickly passed into open war, and the Covenanters invaded northern England. Charles was then obliged to summon Parliament in session. It met in 1640 and did not formally dissolve until twenty years later. Hence it came to be known as the Long Parliament.

The Long Parliament no sooner assembled than it assumed the conduct of government. The leaders, including John Hampden, John Pym, and Oliver Cromwell, openly declared that the House of Commons, and not the king, possessed supreme authority in the state. Parliament began by sending Strafford and subsequently Laud to the scaffold and by abolishing the arbitrary courts. It forbade the imposition of "ship-money" and other irregular taxes. It also took away the king's right of dissolving Parliament at his pleasure and ordered that at least one parliamentary session should be held every three years. These measures stripped the Crown of the despotic powers acquired by the Tudors and the Stuarts.

6. Oliver Cromwell and the Civil War, 1642-1649

The Long Parliament thus far had acted along the line of reformation rather than revolution. Had Charles been content to accept the new arrangements, there would have been little more trouble. But the proud and imperious king was only watching his chance to strike a blow at Parliament. Taking advantage of some differences of opinion among its members, Charles summoned his soldiers, marched to Westminster, and demanded
the surrender of five leaders, including Pym and Hampden. Warned in time, they made their escape, and Charles did not find them in the chamber of the Commons. "Well, I see all the birds are flown," he exclaimed, and walked out baffled. The king's attempt to intimidate the Commons was a grave blunder. It showed beyond doubt that he would resort to force, rather than bend his neck to Parliament. Both Charles and Parliament now began to gather troops and prepare for the inevitable conflict.

The opposing parties seemed to be very evenly matched. Around the king rallied nearly all the nobles, the Anglican clergy, the Roman Catholics, a majority of the "squires," or country gentry, and the members of the universities. The royalists received the name of "Cavaliers." The parliamentarians, or "Roundheads,"\(^1\) were mostly recruited from the trading classes in the towns and the small landowners in the country. The working people remained as a rule indifferent and took little part in the struggle.

Both Pym and Hampden died in the second year of the war, and henceforth the leadership of the parliamentarians fell to Oliver Cromwell. He was a country gentleman from the east of England, and Hampden's cousin.

Cromwell represented the university of Cambridge in the Long Parliament and displayed there great audacity in opposing the government. An unfriendly critic at this time describes "his countenance swollen and reddish, his voice sharp and untuneable, and his eloquence full of fervor." Though a zealous Puritan, who believed himself to be the chosen agent of the Lord, Cromwell was not an ascetic. He hunted, hawked, played bowls and other games, had an ear for music, and valued art and learning. In public life he showed himself a statesman of much insight and a military genius.

Fortune favored the royalists, until Cromwell assumed command of the parliamentary forces. To him was due the for-

\(^1\) So called, because some of them wore closely cropped hair, in contrast to the flowing locks of the "Cavaliers."
mation of a cavalry regiment of "honest, sober Christians," whose watchwords were texts from Scripture and who charged in battle singing psalms. These "Ironsides," as Cromwell said, "had the fear of God before them and made some conscience of what they did." They were so successful that Parliament permitted

**INTERIOR OF WESTMINSTER HALL**

Next to the Tower and the Abbey, Westminster Hall, adjoining the Houses of Parliament, is the most historic building in London. The hall was begun by William Rufus in 1097, and was enlarged by his successors. Richard II in 1397 added the great oak roof, which has lasted to this day. Here were held the trials of Strafford and Charles I.

Cromwell to reorganize a large part of the army into the "New Model," a body of professional, highly disciplined soldiers. The "New Model" defeated Charles decisively at the battle of Naseby, near the center of England (1645). Charles then surrendered to the Scotch, who soon turned him over to Parliament.

The surrender of the king ended the Great Rebellion, but left the political situation in doubt. The Puritans by this time had divided into two rival sects. The Presbyterians wished to make the Church of England, like that of Scotland, Presbyterian in faith and worship. Through their control of Parliament, they were able
to pass acts doing away with bishops, forbidding the use of the
Book of Common Prayer, and requiring every one to accept
Presbyterian doctrines. The other Puritan sect, known as
Independents,\(^1\) felt that religious beliefs should not be a matter
of compulsion. They rejected both Anglicanism and Presby-
terianism and desired to set up churches of their own, where
they might worship as seemed to them right. The Inde-
pendents had the powerful backing of Cromwell and the "New
Model," so that the stage was set for a quarrel between Parlia-
ment and the army.

King Charles, though a prisoner in the hands of his enemies,
hoped to profit by their divisions. The Presbyterian majority
in the House of Commons was willing to restore
the king, provided he would give his assent to
the establishment of Presbyterianism in England.

But the army wanted no reconciliation with the captive monarch
and at length took matters into its own hand. A party of
soldiers, under the command of a Colonel Pride, excluded the
Presbyterian members from the floor of the House, leaving the
Independents alone to conduct the government. This action
is known as "Pride's Purge." Cromwell approved of it, and
from this time he became the real ruler of England.

The "Rump," as the remnant of the House of Commons
was contemptuously called, immediately brought the king
before a High Court of Justice composed of his
bitterest enemies. He refused to acknowledge
the right of the court to try him and made no
defense whatever. Charles was speedily convicted and sen-
tenced to be beheaded, "as a tyrant, traitor, murderer, and
public enemy to the good of the people." He met death with
quiet dignity and courage on a scaffold erected in front of White-
hall Palace in London. The king's execution went far beyond
the wishes of most Englishmen; "cruel necessity" formed
its only justification; but it established once for all in England
the principle that rulers are responsible to their subjects.

---

\(^1\) Also called Separatists, and later known as Congregationalists.
7. The Commonwealth and the Protectorate, 1649–1660

The "Rump" also abolished the House of Lords and the office of king. It named a Council of State, most of whose members were chosen from the House of Commons, to carry on the government. England now became a national republic, or Commonwealth, the first in
the history of the world. The new republic was clearly the creation of a minority. Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Roman Catholics were ready to restore the monarchy, but as long as the power lay with the army, the small sect of Independents could impose its will on the great majority of the English people.

Cromwell had to deal with a serious uprising in Ireland, where Prince Charles, the oldest son of the dead sovereign, had been proclaimed king. Invading the country with his trained soldiers, Cromwell captured town after town, slaughtered many royalists, and shipped many more to the West Indies as slaves. This time Ireland was completely subdued. Cromwell confiscated the estates of those who had supported the royalist cause and planted colonies of English Protestants in Ulster, Leinster, and Munster. The Roman Catholic gentry were compelled to remove beyond the Shannon River to unfruitful Connaught. Even there the public exercise of their religion was forbidden them. Cromwell's harsh measures brought peace to Ireland, but only intensified the hatred felt by Irish Roman Catholics for Protestant England.

While Cromwell was still in Ireland, Prince Charles came to Scotland and by promising to be a Presbyterian king secured the support of the whole nation. Cromwell, however, destroyed the Scotch armies in two pitched battles. Prince Charles escaped capture and after thrilling adventures as a fugitive took refuge in France.

Meanwhile, the "Rump" had become more and more unpopular. The army, which had saved England from Stuart despotism, did not relish the spectacle of a small group of men, many of them selfish and corrupt, presuming to govern the country. Cromwell found them "horribly arbitrary," and at last resolved to have done with them. He entered the House of Commons with a band of musketeers and ordered the members home. "Come, come," he cried, "I will put an end to your prating. You are

1 The Swiss Confederation (1301) and the United Netherlands (1581) were federative republics.
OLIVER CROMWELL
After the painting by Sir Peter Lely in 1653.
Pitti Gallery, Florence.
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no Parliament. I say you are no Parliament. I will put an end to your sitting.". Another Parliament, made up of "God-fearing men" chosen by Cromwell and his associates, proved equally incapable and after a few months resigned its authority into Cromwell's hands.

Great Seal of England under the Commonwealth (reduced)

The reverse represents the House of Commons in session.

Though now a virtual dictator, Cromwell did not want absolute power. He therefore accepted a so-called Instrument of Government drawn up by some of his officers, and notable as the only written constitution which England has ever had. It vested supreme power in a single person styled the Lord Protector, holding office for life. He was to be assisted, and to some extent controlled, by a council and a parliament. The Protectorate, which thus supplanted
the Commonwealth, really formed a limited or constitutional monarchy in all but name.

The Lord Protector governed England for five years. His successful conduct of foreign affairs gave to that country an importance in European politics which it had not enjoyed since the time of Elizabeth. He died in 1658. Two years later the nation, weary of military rule, recalled Prince Charles, who mounted the throne as Charles II.

It seemed, indeed, as if the Puritan Revolution had been a complete failure. But this was hardly true. The revolution arrested the growth of absolutism and divine right in England. It created among Englishmen a lasting hostility to despotic rule, whether exercised by King, Parliament, Protector, or army. Furthermore, it sent forth into the world ideas of popular sovereignty, which, during the eighteenth century, helped to produce the American and French revolutions.

8. The Restoration and the "Glorious Revolution," 1660–1689

Charles II pledged himself to maintain Magna Carta, the Petition of Right, and various statutes limiting the royal power. The people of England wished to have a king, but they also wished their king to govern by the advice of Parliament. Charles, less obstinate and more astute than his father, recognized this fact, and, when a conflict threatened with his ministers or Parliament, always avoided it by timely concessions. Whatever happened, he used to say, he was resolved "never set out on his travels again." Charles's charm of manner, wit, and genial humor made him a popular monarch, in spite of his grave faults of character. He was a
king who "never said a foolish thing and never did a wise one."

The period of the Restoration was characterized by a reaction against the austere scheme of life which the Puritans had imposed on society. Puritanism not only deprived the people of evil pleasures, such as bear-baiting, cock-fighting, and tippling, but it also prohibited the Sunday dances and games, the village festivals, and the popular drama. When Puritanism disappeared, the people went to the opposite extreme and cast off all restraint. England was never more merry and never less moral than under its "Merry Monarch."

The Restoration brought back the Church of England, together with the Stuarts. Parliament, more intolerant than the king, made the use of the Book of Common Prayer compulsory and required ministers to express their consent to everything contained in it. Rather than do so, nearly two thousand clergymen resigned their positions. Among them were found Presbyterians, Independents (or Congregationalists), Baptists, and Quakers. The members of these sects, since they refused to accept the national church, were henceforth classed as Dissenters.¹ They might not hold meetings for worship, or teach in schools, or hold any public office. Thus Dissenters, as well as Roman Catholics, had to endure persecution.

One of the most important events belonging to the reign of Charles II was the passage by Parliament of the Habeas Corpus Act. The writ of habeas corpus ² is an order, issued by a judge, requiring a person held in custody to be brought before the court. If upon examination good reason is shown for keeping the prisoner, he is to be remanded for trial; otherwise he must either be freed or released on bail. This writ had been long used in England, and one of the clauses of Magna Carta expressly provided

¹ Or Nonconformists. This name is still applied to English Protestants not members of the Anglican Church.

² A Latin phrase meaning "You may have the body."
against arbitrary imprisonment. It had always been possible, however, for the king or his ministers to order the arrest of a person considered dangerous to the state, without making any formal charge against him. The Habeas Corpus Act established the principle that every man, not charged with or convicted of a known crime, is entitled to his liberty. Most of the British possessions where the Common Law prevails have accepted the act, and it has been adopted by the federal and state legislatures of the United States.

The reign of Charles II also saw the beginning of the modern party system in Parliament. Two opposing parties took shape, Whigs and Tories, very largely out of a religious controversy. The king, from his long life in France, was partial to Roman Catholicism, though he did not formally embrace that faith until the moment of death. His brother James, the heir to the throne, became an avowed Roman Catholic, much to the disgust of many members of Parliament. A bill was now brought forward to exclude Prince James from the succession, because of his conversion. Its supporters received the nickname of Whigs, while those who opposed it were called Tories. The former were successors of the old “Roundheads,” the latter, of the “Cavaliers.” ¹ The bill did not pass the House of Lords, but the two parties in Parliament continued to divide on other questions. They survive to-day as the Liberals and the Conservatives, and still dispute the government of England between them.

James II lacked the attractive personality which had made his brother a popular ruler; moreover, he was an avowed Roman Catholic and a staunch believer in the divine right of kings. James soon managed to make enemies of most of his Protestant subjects by “suspending” the laws against Roman Catholics and by appointing them to positions of authority and influence. He also dismissed Parliament. Englishmen might have tolerated James to the end of his reign (he was then nearing sixty), in the hope that he would be succeeded by his Protestant

¹ See page 20 and note 1.
daughter Mary. But the birth in 1688 of a son to his Roman Catholic second wife changed the whole situation by opening up the prospect of a Roman Catholic succession to the throne. At last a number of Whig and Tory leaders invited William Prince of Orange, stadholder or governor-general of Holland, to rescue England from Stuart despotism.¹

William landed in England with a small army and marched unopposed to London. The wretched king, deserted by his retainers and soldiers, soon found himself alone. He fled to France, where he lived the remainder of his days as a pensioner at the French court. Parliament granted the throne conjointly to William and Mary, William to rule during his lifetime and Mary to have the succession if she survived him.² Should they have no children, the throne was to go to Mary’s sister Anne.

At the same time Parliament took care to perpetuate its own authority and the Protestant religion by enacting the Bill of Rights, which has a place by the side of Magna Carta and the Petition of Right among the great documents of English constitutional history. This act decreed that the sovereign must henceforth be a member of the Anglican Church. It forbade him to “suspend” the operation of the laws, or to levy money or maintain a standing army except by

¹ William was Mary’s husband. See the genealogical table, page 32, note 1.
² Mary, however, died in 1694.
consent of Parliament. It also declared that election of members of Parliament should be free; that they should enjoy freedom of speech and action within the two Houses; and that excessive bail should not be required, or excessive fines imposed, or cruel and unusual punishments inflicted. Finally, it affirmed the right of subjects to petition the sovereign and ordered the holding of frequent Parliaments. These were not new principles of political liberty, but now the English people were strong enough to give them the binding form of laws. They reappear in the first ten amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

Parliament also passed a Toleration Act, conceding to Dissenters the right of public worship, though not the right of holding any civil or military office. The Dissenters might now worship as they pleased, without fear of persecution. Unitarians and Roman Catholics, as well as Jews, were expressly excluded from the benefits of the act. The passage of this measure did much to remove religion from English politics as a vital issue.

The Revolution of 1688-1689 struck a final blow at absolutism and divine right in England. An English king became henceforth the servant of Parliament, holding office only on good behavior. An act of Parliament had made him and an act of Parliament might depose him. It is well to remember, however, that the Revolution did not form a popular movement. It was a successful struggle for parliamentary supremacy on the part of the upper classes. The government of England still remained far removed from democracy.

9. William III and Anne, 1689-1714

The supremacy won by Parliament was safeguarded, a few years later (1701), by the passage of the Act of Settlement. It provided that in case William III or his sister-in-law Anne died without heirs, the crown should pass to Sophia, electress of Hanover, and her descendants. She was the granddaughter of
James I and a Protestant. This arrangement deliberately excluded a number of nearer representatives of the Stuart house from the succession, because they were Roman Catholics. Parliament thus asserted in the strongest way the right of the English people to choose their own rulers.

The Act of Settlement not only fixed the succession, but also imposed additional restrictions upon the power of an English sovereign. For instance, no person having an office by appointment of the king or receiving a pension from him was henceforth allowed to sit in the House of Commons. In order to prevent any royal interference with the conduct of justice, judges were permitted to hold their places during good behavior and were made removable only by Parliament.

Several other important steps in political liberty were taken during the reign of William III. Parliament passed an act limiting the king’s control over the army to only six months (later, to only a year), at a time. Parliament also fell into the habit of making annual appropriations for government expenses, instead of for longer periods. The result was that the king had to call the legislature in session each year and to submit every item of expenditure to the scrutiny of the legislators. Finally, must be noted the refusal of Parliament to continue the censorship of books, pamphlets, and newspapers, by means of which the expression of public opinion had long been muzzled. England now began to enjoy a free press — an essential accompaniment of a free government.

Upon the death of William III in 1702, Queen Anne mounted the throne. Her short reign saw the union of England and Scotland. The two countries, which had had a common king since the accession of James I, were henceforth to have a common Parliament with complete freedom of trade between them. The Scotch, however, retained their own laws and Presbyterian Church. After 1707 it is proper to speak of the kingdom of Great Britain, and of the English, Welsh, and Scotch as forming the British people.
Constitutional Monarchy in England

Queen Anne died in 1714, and in accordance with the Act of Settlement, George I, the son of Sophia of Hanover, ascended the throne. He was the first member of the Hanoverian dynasty, which has since continued to reign in Great Britain.¹

10. England during the Seventeenth Century

The population of England at the close of the seventeenth century exceeded five millions, of whom at least two-thirds lived in the country. Except for London, there were only four towns of more than ten thousand inhabitants. London counted half a million people within its

¹ Stuart and Hanoverian Dynasties.

JAMES I (1603–1625)

Charles I (1625–1649) Elizabeth, m. Frederick V, Elector of the Palatinate

Charles II (1660–1685) James II (1685–1688)

Mary, m. William, Prince of Orange

William III, m. Mary Anne (1689–1694) (1702–1714) (1727–1760)
Prince of Orange, King of England (1689–1702)

George II (1727–1760) Frederick, Prince of Wales (d. 1751)

George III (1760–1820)

George IV (1820–1830) William IV (1830–1837) Edward, Duke of Kent

Victoria (1837–1901)

Edward VII (1901–1910)

George V (1910– )
limits and had become the largest city in Europe. Town life still wore a medieval look, but the increase of wealth gradually introduced many new comforts and luxuries. Coal came into use instead of charcoal; tea, coffee, and chocolate competed with wine, ale, and beer as beverages; the first newspapers appeared, generally in weekly editions; amusements multiplied; and passenger coaches began to ply between London and the provincial centers. The highways, however, were wretched and infested with robbers. The traveler found some recompense for the hardships of a journey in the country inns, famous for their plenty and good cheer. The transport of goods was chiefly by means of pack horses, because of the poor roads and the absence of canals. Postal arrangements also remained very primitive, and in remote districts letters were not delivered more than
once a week. The difficulties of travel and communication naturally made for isolation; and country people, except the wealthy, rarely visited the metropolis.

As the population of England increased, old industries developed and new ones sprang up. The chief manufacture was that of wool, while that of silk flourished after the influx of Huguenots which followed the revocation of the Edict of Nantes.¹ The absence of large textile mills made it necessary to carry on spinning and weaving in the homes of the operatives. Coal mines and iron mines, which in later times became so important a source of England’s prosperity, were then little worked. Farming and the raising of sheep and cattle still remained the principal occupations. Agriculture, however, was retarded by the old system of common tillage and open fields, just as manufacturing was fettered by the craft guilds. These survivals of the Middle Ages had not yet disappeared.

The seventeenth century in England saw a notable advance in science. At this time Harvey revealed the circulation of the blood. Boyle, an Irishman, has been called the “father of modern chemistry,” so many were his researches in that subject. Napier, a Scotchman, invented logarithms, which lie at the basis of the higher mathematics.

A still greater man was Sir Isaac Newton (1642–1727), who discovered the infinitesimal calculus.² Knowledge of the calculus, which deals with quantities infinitely small, has been of immense service in engineering and other applied sciences. The profound mind of Newton also formulated the so-called law of gravitation. He showed by mathematical calculation

¹ See page 49.
² Credit for the discovery is shared by Newton with his German contemporary Leibniz (1646–1716).
that the motion of the planets about the sun, and of the moon about the earth, can be explained as due to the same mysterious force of gravity which makes the apple fall to the ground. This discovery that all the movements of the heavenly bodies obey one simple physical law forms perhaps the greatest achievement in the history of science. Shortly after the "Glorious Revolution" a group of investigators obtained a charter forming them into the Royal Society of London. It still exists and enrolls the most distinguished scientists of Great Britain. The Royal Observatory at Greenwich also dates from this period. Altogether much was being done to uncover the secrets of nature.

Seventeenth-century England produced no very eminent painters or sculptors, though foreign artists, such as Rubens and Van Dyck, were welcomed there. Among architects the most famous was Sir Christopher Wren, who did much to popularize the Renaissance style of building. A great fire, which destroyed most of old London during the reign of Charles II, gave Wren an opportunity to rebuild about fifty parish churches, as well as St. Paul's Cathedral.

English literature in the seventeenth century covered many fields. Shakespeare and Bacon, the two chief literary ornaments of Elizabeth's reign, did some of their best work during the reign of James I. In 1611 appeared the Authorized Version of the Bible, sometimes called the King James Version because it was dedicated to that monarch. The simplicity, dignity, and eloquence of this translation have never been surpassed, and it still remains in ordinary use among Protestants throughout the English-speaking world. The Puritan poet, John Milton, composed his epic
of *Paradise Lost* during the reign of Charles II. About the same
time another Puritan, John Bunyan, wrote the immortal
*Pilgrim's Progress*, a book which gives an equal though different
pleasure to children and adults, to the ignorant and the learned.
The representative man of letters of the Restoration period
was John Dryden, poet laureate, playwright, and essayist.
But these are only a few of the eminent poets and prose
writers of the age.

**Studies**

1. Explain: the “Rump”; “Pride’s Purge”; the “Ironsides”; “Cavalier”; and “Roundhead.”
2. What circumstances gave rise to (a) the Petition of Right; (b) the Instrument of Government; (c) the Habeas Corpus Act; (d) the Bill of Rights; and (e) the Act of Settlement?
3. Why were the reformers within the Church of England called Puritans?
4. Contrast the Commonwealth as a national republic with the medieval Italian cities, the Swiss Confederation, and the United Netherlands.
5. Under what circumstances does the Constitution of the United States provide for the suspension of the writ of *habeas corpus*?
6. Why has the Bill of Rights been called the “third great charter of English liberty”?
7. Show that the Revolution of 1688-1689 was a “preserving” and not a “destroying” revolution.
8. Trace the downfall of divine right as a political doctrine in seventeenth-century England.
9. What is the essential distinction between a “limited” or “constitutional” monarchy and an “absolute” or “autocratic” monarchy?
10. Using the genealogical table (page 32, note 1), show the claim of the Hanoverians to the English throne.
CHAPTER III

ABSOLUTE MONARCHY IN FRANCE, 1610-1715

11. Absolutism of Louis XIV

France in the seventeenth century furnished the best example of an absolute monarchy supported by pretensions to divine right. French absolutism owed most of all to Cardinal Richelieu, chief minister of Louis XIII (1610-1643). Though of weak physique and in poor health, Richelieu possessed such strength of will and so thorough an understanding of politics that he was able to dominate the king and through the king to govern France for eighteen years.

Richelieu's foreign policy — to aggrandize France at the expense of the Hapsburgs — led to his successful intervention on the side of the Catholics at a decisive moment in the Thirty Years' War. His domestic policy — to exalt the French monarchy — met equal success. Though the nobles were still rich and influential, Richelieu beat down their opposition by forbidding the practice of dueling, that last remnant of private warfare, by ordering many castles to be blown up with gunpowder, and by bringing rebellious

1 Webster, Readings in Medieval and Modern History, chapter xxviii, "Louis XIV and His Court."
dukes and counts to the scaffold. The nobles henceforth were no longer feudal lords but only courtiers.

Richelieu died in 1642, and the next year Louis XIII, the master whom he had served so faithfully, also passed away. The new ruler, Louis XIV, was only a child, and the management of affairs for a second period of eighteen years passed into the hands of Cardinal Mazarin. He was an Italian by birth, but he became a naturalized Frenchman and carried out Richelieu’s policies. Mazarin continued the war against the Hapsburgs, upon which Richelieu had entered, and brought it to a satisfactory conclusion. The Peace of Westphalia was Mazarin’s greatest triumph. He also crushed a formidable uprising against the Crown, on the part of discontented nobles. Having achieved all this, the cardinal could truly say that “if his language was not French, his heart was.”

His death in 1661 found the royal authority more firmly established than ever before.

Louis XIV, who now in his twenty-third year took up the reins of government, ranks among the ablest of French monarchs. He was a man of handsome presence, slightly below the middle height, with a prominent nose and abundant hair, which he allowed to fall over his shoulders. In manner he was dignified, reserved, courteous, and as majestic, it is said, in his dressing-gown as in his robes of state. A contemporary wrote that he would have been every inch a king, “even if he had been born under the roof of
The palace of Versailles now forms a magnificent picture gallery and museum of French history, while the park, with its fountains and ornamental shrubbery, is a place of holiday resort for Parisians. It is estimated that Louis XIV spent one hundred million dollars on the
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a beggar.” Louis possessed much natural intelligence, a re-
tentive memory, and great capacity for work. It must be added, however, that his general education had been neglected, and that throughout his life he remained ignorant and super-
stitious. Vanity formed a striking trait in the character of Louis. He accepted the most fulsome compliments and de-
lighted to be known as the “Grand Monarch” and the “Sun-
king.”

Louis gathered around him a magnificent court at Versailles, near Paris. Here a whole royal city, with palaces, parks, groves, and fountains, sprang into being at his order. Many French nobles now spent little time on their country estates; they preferred to remain at Versailles in attendance on the king, to whose favor they owed offices, pensions, and honors. The king’s countenance, it was said, is the courtier’s supreme felicity; “he passes his life looking on it and within sight of it.”

The famous saying, “I am the State,”¹ though not uttered by Louis, accurately expressed his conviction that in him were embodied the power and greatness of France. Few monarchs have tried harder to justify their despotic rule. He was fond of gayety and sport, but he never permitted himself to be turned away from the punctual dis-
charge of his royal duties. Until the close of his reign — one of the longest in the annals of Europe — Louis devoted from five to nine hours a day to what he called the “trade of a king.”

Conditions in France made possible the absolutism of Louis. Richelieu and Mazarin had labored with great success to strengthen the Crown at the expense of the nobles and the commons. The nation lacked a Parlia-
ment to represent it and voice its demands, for the Estates-
General had not been summoned since 1614. It did not meet again till 1789, just before the outbreak of the French Revolu-
tion. In France there was no Magna Carta to protect the liberties of the people by limiting the right of a ruler to impose taxes at will. The French, furthermore, did not have inde-

¹ “L’État, c’est moi.”
LOUIS XIV

After the painting by Hyacinthe Rigaud.
Louvre, Paris.
The Wars of Louis XIV

pendent law courts which could interfere with the king’s power of exiling, imprisoning, or executing his subjects. Absolute monarchy thus became so firmly rooted in France that a revolu-
tion was necessary to overthrow it.

Absolutism, as a principle of government, received its fullest justification in a famous work written by Bossuet, a learned French bishop, for the instruction of Louis XIV’s son. A hereditary monarchy, declared Bossuet, is the most ancient and natural, the strongest and most efficient of all forms of government. Royal power emanates from God; hence the person of the king is sacred and it is sacrilege to conspire against him. No one may rightfully resist the king’s commands; his subjects owe him obedience in all matters. To the violence of a king the people can only oppose respectful remonstrances and prayers for his conversion. A king, indeed, ought not to be a tyrant, but he can be one in perfect security. “As in God are united every perfection and virtue, so all the power of all the individuals in a community is united in the person of the king.”

12. The Wars of Louis XIV

How unwise it may be to concentrate authority in the hands of one man is shown by the melancholy record of the wars of Louis XIV. To make France powerful and gain fame for himself, Louis plunged his country into a series of struggles from which it emerged completely exhausted. He dreamed of dominating all western Europe, but his aggressions provoked against him a constantly increasing number of allies, who in the end proved to be too strong even for the king’s able generals and fine armies.

Louis himself lacked military talent and did not take a prominent part in any campaign. He was served, however, by excellent commanders, including Condé and Turenne. Vauban, an accomplished engineer, especially developed siege-craft. It was said of Vauban that

1 Politics as derived from the Very Words of the Holy Scriptures.
he never besieged a fortress without taking it and never lost one which he defended. Louvois, the war minister of the king, recruited, equipped, and provisioned larger bodies of troops than ever before had appeared on European battlefields. It was Louvois who introduced the use of distinctive uniforms for soldiers and the custom of marching in step. He also established field hospitals and ambulances and placed camp life on a sanitary basis. The labors of these men gave Louis the best standing army of the age.

Of the four great wars which filled a large part of Louis's reign, all but the last were designed to extend the dominions of
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France on the east and northeast as far as the Rhine. That river in ancient times had separated Gaul and Germany, and Louis, as well as Richelieu and Mazarin before him, regarded it as a "natural boundary" of France. Some expansion in this direction had already been made by the Peace of Westphalia, when France gained much of Alsace and secured the recognition of her old claims to the bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun in Lorraine. A treaty which Mazarin negotiated with Spain in 1659 also gave to France possessions in Artois and Flanders. Louis thus had a good basis for further advance toward the Rhine.

The French king began his aggressions by an effort to annex the Belgian or Spanish Netherlands, which then belonged to Spain. A triple alliance of Holland, England, and Sweden forced him to relinquish all his conquests, except some territory in Flanders (1668). Louis blamed the Dutch for his setback and determined to punish them. Moreover, the Dutch represented everything to which he was opposed, for Holland was a republic, the keen rival of France in trade, and Protestant in religion. By skillful diplomacy he persuaded England and Sweden to stand aloof, while his armies entered Holland and drew near to Amsterdam. At this critical moment William, prince of Orange, became the Dutch leader. He was a descendant of that William the Silent, who, a century before, had saved the Dutch out of the hands of Spain. By William's orders the Dutch cut the dikes and interposed a watery barrier to further advance by the French. William then formed another Continental coalition, which carried on the war till Louis signified his desire for peace. The Dutch did not lose a foot of territory, but Spain was obliged to cede to France the important province of Franche Comté (1678). A few years later Louis sought additional territory in the Rhinelands, but again an alliance of Spain, Holland, England, and the Holy Roman Empire compelled him to sue for terms (1697).  

2 In America this third war was known as "King William's War."
The treaty of peace concluding the third war for the Rhine confirmed the French king in the possession of Strassburg, together with other cities and districts of Alsace which he had previously annexed. Alsace was now completely joined to France, except for some territories of small extent which were acquired about a century later. The Alsatians, though mainly of Teutonic extraction, in process of time considered themselves French and lost all desire for union with any of the German states. The greater part of Lorraine was not added to France until 1766, during the reign of Louis's successor. The Lorrainers, likewise, became thoroughly French in feeling.

13. War of the Spanish Succession, 1702–1713

The European balance of power had thus far been preserved, but it was now threatened in another direction. The king of Spain lay dying, and as he was without children or brothers to succeed him, all Europe wondered what would be the fate of his vast possessions in Europe and America. Louis had married one of his sisters, and the Holy Roman Emperor another, so both the Bourbons and the Austrian Hapsburgs could put forth claims to the Spanish throne. When the king died, it was found that he had left his entire dominions to one of Louis's grandsons, in the hope that the French might be strong enough to keep them undivided. Though Louis knew that acceptance of the inheritance would involve a war with Austria and probably with England, whose ruler, William III, was Louis's old foe, ambition triumphed over fear and the desire for glory over consideration for the welfare of France. Louis proudly presented his grandson to the court at Versailles, saying, "Gentlemen, behold the king of Spain."

In the War of the Spanish Succession France and Spain faced the Grand Alliance, which included England, Holland, Austria, several of the German states, and Portugal. Europe had never known a war that concerned so many countries and peoples. William III died
shortly after the outbreak of hostilities, leaving the continuance of the contest as a legacy to his sister-in-law, Queen Anne.\(^1\) England supplied the coalition with funds, a fleet, and also with the ablest commander of the age, the duke of Marlborough. In Eugène, prince of Savoy, the Allies had another skillful and daring general. Their great victory at Blenheim in 1704 was the first of a series of successes which finally drove the French out of Germany and Italy and opened the road to Paris. But dissensions among the Allies and the heroic resistance of France and Spain enabled Louis to hold his enemies at bay, until the exhaustion of both sides led to the conclusion of the Peace of Utrecht.

This peace ranks among the most important diplomatic arrangements of modern times. First, Louis's grandson was recognized as king of Spain and her colonies, on condition that the Spanish and French crowns should never be united. Since this time Bourbon sovereigns have continued to rule in Spain. Next, the Austrian Hapsburgs gained the Spanish dominions in Italy, that is, Milan and Naples, the island of Sardinia, and the Belgian or Spanish Netherlands (thenceforth for a century called the Austrian Netherlands). Finally, England obtained from France extensive possessions in North America and from Spain, Minorca and the rock of Gibraltar, commanding the narrow entrance to the Mediterranean.

Two of the smaller members of the Grand Alliance likewise

\(^1\) In America the war was known as “Queen Anne's War.”
GIBRALTAR

Though not an island, Gibraltar is connected with the Spanish mainland only by a flat strip of sandy ground. The rock, which is about 2½ miles in length, rises to a height of 1,400 feet. At the base and on the summit are powerful batteries, while the sides are pierced with loopholes and galleries for cannon. There is also an inclosed harbor in which a fleet can safely anchor. Gibraltar has remained in British hands since 1704.
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profited by the Peace of Utrecht. The right of the elector of Brandenburg to hold the title of king of Prussia was acknowledged. This formed an important step in the fortunes of the Hohenzollern dynasty. The duchy of Savoy also became a kingdom and received the island of Sicily (shortly afterwards exchanged for Sardinia). The house of Savoy in the nineteenth century provided Italy with its present reigning family.

France lost far less by the war than at one time seemed probable. Louis gave up his dream of dominating Europe, but he kept all the Continental acquisitions made earlier in his reign. Yet the price of the king's warlike policy had been a heavy one. France paid it in the shape of famine and pestilence, excessive taxes, huge debts, and the impoverishment of the people. Louis, now a very old man, survived the Peace of Utrecht only two years. As he lay dying, he turned to his little heir and said, "Try to keep peace with your neighbors. I have been too fond of war; do not imitate me in that, nor in my too great expenditure." These words showed an appreciation of the errors which robbed his long reign of much of its glory.

14. France during the Seventeenth Century

No absolute ruler, however conscientious and painstaking, can shoulder the entire burden of government. Louis XIV necessarily had to rely very much on his ministers, of whom Colbert was the most eminent. Colbert gave France the best administration it had ever known. His reforming hand was especially felt in the finances. He made many improvements in the methods of tax-collection and turned the annual deficit in the revenues into a surplus. One of his innovations, now adopted by all European states, was the budget system. Expenditures had previously been made at random, whether the treasury was full or empty. Colbert drew up careful estimates, one year in advance, of the probable

---

1 His great-grandson, then a child of five years. The reign of Louis XV covered the period 1715-1774.
receipts and expenses, so that outlay should never exceed income.

Colbert realized that the chief object of a minister of finance should be the increase of the national wealth. Hence he tried in every Economic measures of way to Colbert foster manufactures and commerce. Among other measures, Colbert placed heavy duties on the importation of foreign products, as a means of protecting the "infant industries" of France. This was the beginning of the protective system, since followed by many European countries and from Europe introduced into America. Colbert regarded protectionism as only a temporary device, however, and spoke of tariffs as crutches by the help of which manufacturers might learn to walk and then throw them away.

Colbert shared the erroneous views of many economists of his age in supposing that the wealth of a country is measured by the amount of gold and silver which it possesses. He wished, therefore, to provide the French with colonies, where they could obtain the products which they had previously been obliged to purchase from the Spaniards, Dutch, and English. At this time many islands in the West Indies were acquired, Canada was developed, and Louisiana, the vast territory drained by the Mississippi, was opened up to settlement. France thus became one of the leading colonial powers of Europe.

As long as Colbert lived, he kept on good terms with the
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Huguenots, who formed such useful and industrious subjects. Louis, however, had no love for the Huguenots, whom he regarded as heretics, and whose Calvinistic principles, he knew, endowed them with scant respect for absolute monarchy. Accordingly, the king revoked the Edict of Nantes, which Henry IV had issued in 1598. The Huguenots, after nearly a century of religious toleration, were now denied freedom of worship and were also deprived of their rights as citizens. They continued to be an outlawed and persecuted sect until shortly before the French Revolution.

The revocation of the Edict of Nantes resulted in a considerable emigration of Huguenots from France. What was a loss to that country was a gain to England and Holland, where they introduced their arts and trades. Prussia, also, profited by the emigration of the Huguenots. Many of them went to Berlin, and that capital owed the beginning of its importance to its Huguenot population. Louis by his bigotry thus strengthened the chief Protestant foes of France.

Louis was a generous patron of art. One of his architects, Mansard, invented the mansard roof, which has been largely used in France and other European countries. This architectural device makes it possible to provide extra rooms at a small expense, without adding an
additional story to the building. Among the monuments of Louis’s reign are the Hôtel des Invalides, now the tomb of Napoleon, additions to the Louvre, and the huge palace of Versailles. Louis also founded the Gobelins manufactory, so celebrated for fine carpets, furniture, and metal work.

The long list of French authors who flourished during Louis XIV’s reign includes Corneille and Racine, the tragedians, Molière, the comic dramatist, La Fontaine, whose fables are still popular, Perrault, now remembered for his fairy tales, and Madame de Sévigné, whose letters are regarded as models of French prose. Probably the most famous work composed at this time is the Memoirs of Saint-Simon. It presents an intimate and not very flattering picture of the king and his court.

Louis and his ministers believed that the government should encourage research and the diffusion of knowledge. Richelieu founded and Colbert fostered the French Academy. Its forty members, sometimes called the “Immortals,” are chosen for their eminent contributions to language and literature. The great dictionary of the French language, on which they have labored for more than two centuries, is still unfinished. The academy now forms a section of the Institute of France. The patronage of Colbert also did much to enrich the National Library at Paris, which contains the largest collection of books in the world.

The brilliant reign of Louis XIV cast its spell upon the rest
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of Europe. Other sovereigns looked to him as the model of what a king should be, and set themselves to imitate the splendor of his court. During this period the French language, manners, dress, art, literature, and science became the accepted standards of good society in all civilized lands. France still retains in large measure the preëminent position which she secured under the "Grand Monarch."

Studies

1. Give dates for (a) accession of Louis XIV, (b) revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and (c) Peace of Utrecht. 2. By reference to the map on page 42, show how far the "natural boundaries" of France were attained during the reign of Louis XIV. 3. How did the condition of Germany after the Thirty Years' War facilitate the efforts of Louis XIV to extend the French frontiers to the Rhine? 4. What is the origin of the name Franche Comté? 5. Read Southey's poem After Blenheim. Does it rightly appreciate the significance of this battle in European history. 6. Show that by the Peace of Utrecht nearly all the combatants profited at the expense of Spain. 7. Compare the map of Europe in 1648 with that of Europe in 1713. Which states show the most marked changes in boundaries? 8. Why was the revocation of the Edict of Nantes economically injurious to France? 9. "The age of Louis XIV in France is worthy to stand by the side of the age of Pericles in Greece and of Augustus in Italy." Does this statement appear to be justified? 10. "Louis XIV was by far the ablest man who was born in modern times on the steps of a throne." Comment on this statement.
CHAPTER IV

THE EUROPEAN BALANCE OF POWER, 1715–1789

15. Statecraft and Diplomacy

The death of Louis XIV, shortly after the Peace of Utrecht, brought one historical epoch to a close and began another. Seventy-four years were to intervene before the meeting of the Estates-General ushered in the French Revolution, which has so profoundly affected all modern Europe to the present day. These seventy-four years from 1715 to 1789 really constitute the eighteenth century, a period preparatory to the revolutionary period by which it was succeeded.

Absolutism continued to be the system of government throughout the eighteenth century. Absolute monarchies prevailed everywhere on the Continent, except in such small states as Holland, Switzerland, and Venice, where aristocracies held the reins of power. Democracy was non-existent. The middle and lower classes had no real part in law-making, no representative assemblies, and no constitutional safeguards against arbitrary rule. The kings were everything; their subjects nothing.

The interests of the ruling families — Bourbons, Hapsburgs, Hohenzollerns and the rest — received far more consideration in eighteenth-century politics than those of peoples. Monarchs paid scant heed to geographical, racial, or linguistic boundaries, but cut and pared countries "as if they were Dutch cheeses." Thus, at the Peace of Utrecht, large portions of Italy, together with the Spanish Netherlands, were taken from Spain and given to Austria. The idea, now so prevalent, that each people should determine its own destiny then found little favor.
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A cardinal principle of diplomacy in the eighteenth century was that of the balance of power. After the Peace of Westphalia statesmen generally agreed that the various European states, so unlike in size, population, and resources, ought to form a sort of federal community in which the security of all was ensured. If any state became so strong as to overshadow the others, then they must combine against it and endeavor to hold it in check. Louis XIV, who ignored this principle, had repeatedly to face the coalitions of his enemies.

But the balance of power remained only an ideal, in an age when diplomacy was corrupt and international immorality was universal. Strong countries often robbed their weaker neighbors with impunity. The result was that the vanity, selfishness, or ambition of individual rulers and dynasties plunged Europe into one war after another. From now on national aggrandizement replaced religious dissensions as the main cause of European strife.

The special interest of this age in political history lies in the emergence of new states above the horizon of Continental politics. Spain, Holland, and Sweden, three great nations of the seventeenth century, retired to the background; Germany and Italy remained disunited; Turkey declined in importance; and Poland disappeared from the map. Their place was taken by Russia and Prussia. These two countries, together with Great Britain, France, and Austria, formed henceforth the leading powers.

16. Rise of Russia

The influence of geographical conditions is clearly seen in Russian history. European Russia forms an immense, unbroken plain, threaded by numerous rivers which facilitate movement into every part of the country. Geography in Russian history

While the rest of Europe, with its mountain ranges and deep inlets of the sea, tended to divide into many separate states, Russia just as naturally became a single state.
the tenure of land by military service (a form of feudalism),
and the privilege of electing their own hetman, or supreme
leader.

Cossacks, Russian peasants, and adventurers also spread
over the gentle slopes of the Urals and between these moun-
tains and the Caspian into Siberia. Before the
end of the sixteenth century they captured Sibir,
a Mongol capital from which the whole region
takes its name. By the middle of the seventeenth century they
had penetrated to the Sea of Okhotsk; by 1700 they had
occupied Kamchatka and faced the Pacific. The foundations
of Russian supremacy were thus laid throughout northern
Asia, a vast wilderness previously inhabited only by half-
savage, heathen tribes.

Over these dominions in Europe and Asia reigned the mon-
arch who called himself the tsar and autocrat of all Russia.
The family of tsars, descended from the North-
man Ruric in the ninth century, became extinct
seven hundred years later, and disputes over the
succession led to civil wars and foreign invasions.
The Russians then proceeded to select a new tsar, and for this
purpose a general assembly of nobles and delegates from the
towns met at Moscow. Their choice fell upon one of their
own number, Michael Romanov by name, whose family was
related to the old royal line. He proved to be an excellent
ruler in troublous times. His grandson was the celebrated
Peter the Great.

17. Russia under Peter the Great, 1689–1725

Peter became sole ruler of Russia when only seventeen years
of age. His character almost defies analysis. An English
contemporary, who knew him well, described him
as "a man of a very hot temper, soon inflamed,
and very brutal in his passion." Deeds of fiendish cruelty were
congenial to him. After a mutiny of his bodyguard he edified
the court by himself slicing off the heads of the culprits. In
order to quell opposition in his family, he had his wife whipped
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by the knout and ordered his own son to be tortured and executed. He was coarse, gluttonous, and utterly without personal dignity. The companions of his youth were profiteers; his banquets were orgies of dissipation. Yet Peter could be often frank and good-humored, and to his friends he was as loyal as he was treacherous to his foes. Whatever his weaknesses, few men have done more than Peter to change the course of history, and few have better deserved the appellation of "the Great." ¹

Peter grew up wild and undisciplined, and he had to educate himself. The practical bent of his mind disclosed itself in the interest he took in mechanics, ship-building, siege-craft, and military drill. Association with foreigners at Moscow gave him some knowledge of European arts and sciences and first suggested to him the need of introducing western culture into Russia.

Soon after becoming tsar Peter sent fifty young Russians of the best families to England, Holland, and Venice to absorb all they could of European ideas. Afterwards he came himself, traveling incognito as "Peter Mikhailov." He spent two years abroad, particularly in Holland and England, where he studied ship-building and navigation. He also collected miners, mechanics, engineers, architects, and experts of every sort for the roads and bridges, the ships and palaces, the schools and hospitals which were to arise in Russia.

Many of Peter's reforms were intended to introduce the customs of western Europe into Russia. The long Asiatic robes of Russian nobles had to give way to short German jackets and hose. Long beards, which the people considered sacred, had to be shaved, or else a tax paid for the privilege of wearing one. Women, previously kept in seclusion, were permitted to appear in public without veils and to mingle at dances and entertainments with men. A Russian order of chivalry — that of St. Andrew — was founded. The Bible was translated into the vernacular

¹ Read Longfellow's poem, *The White Czar*. 
and sold at popular prices. Peter adopted the "Julian calendar," in place of the old Russian calendar, which began the year on the first of September, supposed to be the date of the creation. He also improved the Russian alphabet by omitting some of its cumbersome letters and by simplifying others. Such innovations were accepted only by the upper classes. The peasants clung tenaciously to their old ways and remained little affected by the sudden inrush of European ideas and manners.

Peter found in Russia no regular army; he organized one after the German fashion. The soldiers (except the Cossacks) were uniformed and armed like European troops. He found no fleet; he built one, modeled upon that of Holland. He opened mines, cut canals, laid out roads, introduced sheep breeding, and fostered by protective tariffs the growth of silk and woolen manufactures. He instituted a police system and a postal service. He established schools of medicine, engineering, and navigation, as well as those of lower grade. He also framed a code of laws based upon the legal systems of western Europe.

The tsar’s reforming measures encountered much opposition on the part of the clergy. He therefore made the Russian Church entirely a state institution by vesting ecclesiastical authority in the Holy Synod, whose members were chosen by himself. Like the clergy, the old nobility had opposed Peter's innovations. He consequently transformed it into an aristocracy of office-holders, whose rank depended, not upon their birth or wealth, but upon their service to the tsar. Any family which for two generations had not taken part in the government ceased to be noble. In place of an ancient assembly (Duma) of nobles, Peter instituted a Council of State, directly responsible to himself. Peter in these ways established an absolutism as unlimited as that of his contemporary, Louis XIV.

Very different views have been expressed as to the value of Peter's work. It is said, on the one side, that Russia could only be made over by such measures as he used; that the
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Russian people had to be dragged from their old paths and pushed on the broad road of progress. On the other side, it is argued that Peter's reforms were too sudden, too radical, and too little suited to the Slavic national character. The upper classes acquired only a veneer of western civilization, and with it many vices. The nobles continued to be indolent, corrupt, and indifferent to the public welfare. The clergy became merely the tools of the tsar. The common people remained as ignorant and oppressed as ever and without any opportunity of self-government. Whatever may be the truth as to these two views, no one disputes the fact that in a single reign, by the action of one man, Russia began to pass from semi-barbarism to civilization.

As the ancient capital, Moscow, formed a stronghold of conservatism, Peter determined to build a new capital, less Asiatic in character and more susceptible to European influence. The site chosen was an unhealthy swamp on the river Neva, not far from the Gulf of Finland. The laborers perished by thousands, but Peter cared little for human life and with resistless energy urged forward the work of draining the marshes and digging canals to carry away the stagnant waters. Russian traders were forced to settle in the city, and all the great landowners were required to build mansions there. To this northern Venice Peter gave the German name of (St.) Petersburg.¹

The remaking of Russia according to European models formed only a half of Peter's program. His foreign policy was equally ambitious. He realized that Russia needed readier access to the sea than could be found through the Arctic port of Archangel. Peter made little headway against the Turks, who controlled the Black Sea, but twenty years of intermittent warfare with the Swedes enabled him to carry the western frontier of Russia to the Baltic. Russian history at this point connects closely with the history of Sweden.

¹ In 1914 the name was changed to the Slavic equivalent, Petrograd.
The Baltic resembles the Mediterranean in its narrow entrance, numerous islands, and deeply indented shores. But the lands adjoining the northern sea are less fertile than those which surround the Mediterranean; it is of much smaller size; and many of its harbors are icebound during half the year. For these reasons the historic importance of the Baltic cannot compare with that of the Mediterranean, except in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries when Sweden became a great power.

The inhabitants of Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, though one in blood and almost one in speech, have never coalesced into a single nation. The Union of Calmar, which they formed in 1397, gave them a common ruler, but permitted each state to keep its own constitution and laws. Even this feeble confederation broke down during the storms of the Reformation. It was finally dissolved in 1524, and Sweden again became independent.

The kings of Sweden were both patriotic and able, and under them the country, though thinly populated and poor in natural resources, rose to a leading place among European states. Finland had been a Swedish dependency since the twelfth century. Esthonia, on the southern shore of the Gulf of Finland, was conquered in the sixteenth century. Three other provinces, namely, Karelia, Ingria, and Livonia, were acquired by the Swedish king, Gustavus Adolphus. As the result of his participation in the Thirty Years’ War, Sweden also secured, at the Peace of
Sweden

Westphalia, western Pomerania and other possessions in the north of Germany. She thus controlled nearly all the Baltic.

The greatness of Sweden culminated and then declined during the spectacular reign of Charles XII. His youth was prophetic of his career. Indoors he read the exploits of Alexander the Great and the sagas of the Vikings; out of doors he devoted himself to hunting and

Reign of Charles XII, 1697–1718

warlike exercises. He came to the throne a lad of only fifteen, but already daring, ambitious, and eager for military glory. Events soon thrust into his hand the sword he was never to relinquish.

Sweden could not be mistress of the Baltic without provoking the jealousy of various neighboring states, in particular, Russia,
Poland, and Denmark. Shortly after the accession of
Charles XII they formed a coalition to seize and dismember
the Swedish possessions. The boy-king, far from
being dismayed by the odds against him, turned
fiercely upon his enemies before they could unite. He invaded
Denmark, appeared before the walls of Copenhagen, and com-
pelled the terrified Danes to conclude a separate peace. He
won almost fabulous victories in Russia and Poland, at one time
overthrowing a Russian army five times as large as his own.
The Poles, also badly beaten, were required to depose their
ruler and accept the nominee of the Swedish king.

But Charles was like a meteor which flashed across the
European sky to disappear as quickly as it came. Rejecting
all overtures for peace, he determined to march
on Moscow and dictate terms to Peter the Great.

The Russian resistance stiffened as the Swedes
approached the capital along much the same route which the
French under Napoleon followed one hundred years later.
Charles had to turn south to the Ukraine, where he hoped to
raise the Cossacks against the tsar. Here, however, he was
defeated by Peter in the decisive battle of Poltava. Charles
afterwards returned to his kingdom, but soon perished in an
obscure conflict in Norway.

Exhausted Sweden had now no choice but to make terms
with her foes. She lost nearly all her foreign possessions except
Finland.\(^1\) The greater part of western Pomerania
went to Prussia, which thus secured valuable
territory at the mouth of the Oder. Russia profited
even more, for she took the four Swedish provinces on the
eastern shores of the Baltic. Much of this region had been
colonized in the Middle Ages by the knights of the Teutonic
Order. It was now to become a Slavic land. Here Peter the
Great founded his new capital, thus realizing a long-cherished
dream of opening a "window" through which the Russian
people might look into Europe.

\(^1\) A small part of Finland, lying along the gulf of that name, was ceded to Russia.
The rest of the country did not enter the Russian Empire until 1809.
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19. Russia under Catherine II, 1762–1796; the Decline of Turkey

Shortly after the death of Peter the Great, at the early age of fifty-three, the male line of the Romanov dynasty became extinct. The succession now passed to women, who intermarried with German princes and thus increased the German influence in Russia. It was a German princess, Catherine II, who completed Peter’s work of remaking Russia into a European state. She, also, has been called “the Great,” a title possibly merited by her achievements, though not by her character. Catherine came to Russia as the wife of the heir-apparent. Once in her adopted country, she proceeded to make herself in all ways a Russian, learning the language and even conforming, at least outwardly, to the Orthodox (or Russian) Church. Her husband was a weakling, and Catherine managed to get rid of him after he had reigned only six months. She then mounted the throne and for thirty-four years ruled Russia with a firm hand.

The overthrow of Sweden left Poland and Turkey as the two countries which still blocked the path of Russia toward the sea. Catherine warred against them throughout her reign. She took the lion’s share of Poland, when that unfortunate kingdom, as we shall shortly learn, was divided among Russia, Austria, and Prussia. Catherine also secured from the Turks an outlet for Russia on
The European Balance of Power

the Black Sea, though she never realized her dream of expelling them from European soil.

When Constantinople fell to the Turks in 1453, their European dominions already included a considerable part of the Balkan peninsula. The two centuries following witnessed the steady progress of the Ottoman arms. What are now Bulgaria, Rumania, Serbia, Bosnia, Albania, and Greece were incorporated within the Turkish Empire. Only tiny Montenegro, protected by mountain ramparts and a heroic soldiery, preserved its independence. Pressing northward, the Turks conquered part of Hungary and made the rest of that country a dependency. They overran the Crimea and bestowed it upon a Mongol khan as a tributary province. They annexed Egypt, Syria, Armenia, Mesopotamia, and the coast of northern Africa. The Black Sea and the eastern Mediterranean became Turkish lakes.

Two dramatic events showed that the Christian soldiery of Europe could still oppose a successful resistance to the Moslem warriors. The first was the crippling of Turkish sea-power by the combined fleets of Venice, Genoa, and Spain at Lepanto (1571). The second was the defeat suffered by the Turks under the walls of Vienna (1683). They marched on the Austrian capital, two hundred thousand strong, laid siege to it, and would have taken it but for the timely appearance of a relieving army commanded by the Polish king, John Sobieski. Poland at that time saved Austria from destruction and definitely stopped the land advance of the Turks in Europe.

After 1683 the boundaries of European Turkey gradually receded. The Hapsburgs won back most of Hungary by the close of the seventeenth century and during the eighteenth century further enlarged their possessions at the expense of the Sultan. Catherine II, as the result of two wars with the Turks, secured the Crimea and the northern coast of the Black Sea. Russian merchant ships also received the right of free navigation in the Black
Sea and of access through the Bosporus and Dardanelles to the Mediterranean. In this way Catherine opened for Russia another "window" on Europe.

Turkey lost more than territory. Russian consuls were admitted to Turkish towns, and Russian residents in Turkey were granted the free exercise of their religion. As time went on, the tsars even claimed the right of protecting Christian subjects of the Sultan and consequently of interfering at will in Turkish affairs. The Sultan thus tended to become the "sick man" of Europe, the disposition of whose possessions would henceforth form one of the thorny problems of European diplomacy. In a word, what is called the Eastern Question began.

20. Austria and Maria Theresa

The Hapsburgs were originally feudal lords of a small district in what is now northern Switzerland, where the ruins of their ancestral castle ¹ may still be seen. Count Rudolf, the real maker of the Hapsburg fortunes, secured the archduchy of Austria, with its capital of Vienna, and in 1273 was chosen Holy Roman Emperor. The imperial title afterwards became hereditary in the Hapsburg family.

The name "Austria" is loosely applied to all the territories which the Hapsburgs acquired by marriage, inheritance, or conquest. The accompanying map shows their possessions early in the sixteenth century and their gains and losses from this time until the close of the eighteenth century.

The Hapsburgs ruled over the most extraordinary jumble of peoples to be found in Europe. There were Germans in Austria proper and Silesia, Czechs in Bohemia and Moravia, Magyars, Croatians, and Slovenes in Hungary and its dependencies, Italians in Milan and Tuscany, and Flemings and Walloons in the Netherlands. It was impossible to group such widely

¹ German Habichtsburg ("Hawk's Burgh").
scattered peoples into one centralized state; it was equally impossible to form them into a federation. Their sole bond of union was a common allegiance to the Hapsburg monarch.

The Hapsburg realm threatened to break up in the eighteenth century upon the death of the emperor Charles VI, who lacked male heirs. Charles, however, had made a so-called Pragmatic Sanction, or solemn compact, declaring his dominions to be indivisible and, leaving them to his eldest daughter, Maria Theresa. Most of the European powers pledged themselves by treaty to observe this arrangement.

The emperor died in 1740 and Maria Theresa became archduchess of Austria, queen of Hungary, queen of Bohemia, and sovereign of all the other Hapsburg lands. She was then only twenty-three years old, strikingly handsome, and gifted with much charm of manner. Her youth, her beauty, and her sex might have entitled her to consideration by those states which had agreed to respect the
Pragmatic Sanction. But a paper bulwark could not safeguard Austria against Prussia and Prussia's allies.

21. The Rise of Prussia

Prussia, the creator of modern Germany, was the creation of the Hohenzollerns. Excluding Frederick the Great, no Hohenzollern deserves to be ranked as a genius; but it would be hard to name another dynasty with so many able, ambitious, and unscrupulous rulers. The Hohenzollerns prided themselves on the fact that almost every member of the family enlarged the possessions received from his ancestors. They did this by purchase, by inheritance, by shrewd diplomacy, and, most of all, by hard fighting.

The veil of obscurity hanging over the early history of the Hohenzollerns lifts early in the fifteenth century, when one of them received the mark of Brandenburg from the Holy Roman Emperor, as compensation for various sums of money advanced to him. Brandenburg in the Middle Ages had formed a German colony planted among the Slavs beyond the Elbe. With the margraviate went the electoral dignity, that is to say, the ruler of Brandenburg was one of the seven German princes who enjoyed the privilege of choosing the emperor.

The Hohenzollerns as yet had no connection with Prussia. That country received its name from the Borussi, a heathen people most closely related to the Lithuanians. The Borussi

---

1 The name is derived from that of their castle on the heights of Zollern in southern Germany. Emperor William II was the twenty-fourth ruler of the line.
occupied the Baltic coast east of the Vistula. They were
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conquered in the thirteenth century by the knights
of the Teutonic Order, who exterminated many
of them and kept the rest in subjection by force
and terrorism. The Prussian landed aristocracy (Junkers)
has largely descended from these hard-riding, hard-fighting,
fierce, cruel knights. They made Prussia a thoroughly
German land in speech, customs, and religion. The decline
of their order in the fifteenth century enabled the king of
Poland to annex West Prussia. During the Reformation the
Teutonic grand master, who was a near relative of the Hohen-
zollerns of Brandenburg, dissolved the order and changed East
Prussia into a secular duchy. His family became extinct
early in the seventeenth century, and the duchy then passed
to the elector of Brandenburg.

The period between the close of the Thirty Years’ War
and the accession of Frederick the Great saw many additions
to the Hohenzollern domains. The most impor-
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tant were eastern Pomerania, the acquisition of
which extended Brandenburg to the Baltic (1648); certain districts along the lower Rhine (1666); and most of
western Pomerania, which was secured after the defeat of
Sweden (1720). The Hohenzollerns were now powerful enough
to aspire to royal dignity. At the outbreak of the War of the
Spanish Succession, the emperor, who was anxious to receive
the elector’s support, allowed him to assume the title of “king”
and to claim, henceforth, that he ruled by divine right. Prus-
sia, rather than Brandenburg, gave its name to the new king-
dom, because the former was an independent state, while the
latter was a member of the Holy Roman Empire.

Only a strong hand could hold together the scattered pos-
sessions of the Hohenzollerns. Their hand was strong. No

Prussian
absolutism

monarchs of the age exercised a more unlimited
authority or required more complete obedience
from their subjects. Nicht raisonniren — “no reasoning here”
— was their motto. According to the Hohenzollern principle,
the government could not be too absolute, provided it was
efficient. The ruler, working through his ministers, who were merely his clerks, must foster agriculture, industry, and commerce, promote education, and act as the guide of his people in religion and morals.

This type of Prussian ruler was well exemplified in the person of Frederick William, commonly called the Great Elector. Unattractive in character, cunning and deceitful, he showed, nevertheless, a single-hearted devotion to the interests of the state and spared neither himself nor others in its service. His long reign of forty-eight years marked out the paths which Prussia henceforth followed. He suppressed such representative assemblies as existed in his dominions, replacing them by a central council of his ministers and provincial governors. A Hohenzollern could not tolerate free institutions; the will of the ruler must be supreme. In religious matters the Great Elector adopted a wise policy of toleration. Though Brandenburg was staunchly Protestant, he opened it to Jews from Austria and Huguenots from France and thus added many useful citizens to the population. His domestic measures were equally wise. By building roads, draining marshes, cutting canals, and encouraging scientific farming, he did much to develop the resources of a country little favored by nature. Finally, he managed to form a standing army, supported by taxation and entirely dependent on himself.

The Hohenzollerns, from the time of the Great Elector, devoted themselves consistently to the upbuilding of their military forces. Prussia was to have an army sufficiently strong to defend a kingdom without natural boundaries and stretching in detached provinces all the way from the Rhine to the Niemen. The soldiers at first were volunteers, recruited in different parts of Germany, but it became necessary to fill up the gaps in the ranks by compulsory levies among the peasants. Carefully trained officers, appointed from the nobility and advanced only on merit, enforced an iron discipline. The soldiers, it was said, feared their commanders more than they did the enemy.
The Great Elector's grandson, Frederick William I, may stand as the representative of Prussian militarism. His brother monarchs were greatly amused when he formed a company of giant grenadiers, whom he treated as his pets and for whom he ransacked Europe. It was the king's sole indulgence; otherwise he lived with the utmost frugality and saved every possible penny for his army and his war chest. At the end of Frederick William's reign, Prussia, with a population of only two and a half millions, could put eighty thousand men in the field, half as many as France and nearly as many as Austria. The king himself did almost no fighting. He was too fond of his well-drilled regiments, his "blue children," as he called them, to risk them in battle. What could be done with them was shown by his son and successor, Frederick the Great.

22. Prussia under Frederick the Great, 1740–1786

As crown prince of Prussia Frederick had led a hard life. His stern and crabbed father wished to make him only a soldier and discouraged every pursuit which did not contribute to this end. But the young man developed other tastes. He learned to play the flute, received secret lessons in Latin, read French plays, and filled his mind with the speculations of French philosophers. William, seeing his son apparently absorbed in frivolity, treated him with such harshness that he even tried to run away. The attempt failed, and the crown prince lay for a time under sentence of death as a deserter. His punishment took the form of an arduous, slavelike training for the duties of future kingship. "If he kicks or rears again," said his father, "he shall forfeit the succession to the crown, and even life itself." But Frederick did not kick or rear again. Henceforth he labored so diligently as to win back the esteem of his father, who no longer feared to leave the throne to one unworthy of occupying it.

Frederick became king at the age of twenty-eight. He was
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After the painting by Antoine Pesne.
Berlin Museum.
rather below the average height and inclined to stoutness, good
looking, with the fair hair of North Germans and
blue-gray eyes of extraordinary brilliancy. His
character had been shaped by the stern experiences
of his youth, which left him selfish and unsym-
pathetic, cynical and crafty. He was not a man to inspire
affection among his in-
timates, but with the
mass of his subjects
he was undeniably
popular. Innumerable
stories circulated in
Prussia about the sim-
plicity, good humor,
and devotion to duty
of old “Father Fritz.”

The year 1740, when
both Frederick and
Maria Theresa mounted
the throne, saw the
beginning of a long
struggle between them.
The responsibility for
it rests on Frederick’s
shoulders. The Prus-
sian king coveted Sile-
sia, an Austrian province lying to the southeast of Branden-
burg and mainly German in population. Of all
the Hapsburg possessions it was the one most
useful to the Hohenzollerns. Frederick suddenly led his
army into Silesia and overran the country without much diffi-
culty. No justification existed for this action. As the king
afterwards confessed in his Memoirs, “Ambition, interest,
and desire of making people talk about me carried the day;
and I decided for war.”

Frederick’s action precipitated a general European conflict.
France, Spain, and Bavaria allied themselves with Prussia,
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in order to partition the Hapsburg possessions, while Great Britain and Holland, anxious to preserve the balance of power, took the side of Austria. Things might have gone hard with Maria Theresa but for the courage and energy which she displayed and the support of her Hungarian subjects. She had to cede Silesia to Frederick, but lost no other territory. In 1748 all the warring countries agreed to a mutual restoration of conquests (with the exception of Silesia) and signed the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle.¹

Maria Theresa still hoped to recover her lost province. As most of the European sovereigns were either afraid or jealous of Frederick, she found no great difficulty in forming a coalition against him. Russia, France, Sweden, and Saxony entered it. Most of Europe thus united in arms to dismember the small Prussian state.

It happened, however, that at the head of this small state was a man of military genius, capable of infusing into others his own undaunted spirit and supported by subjects disciplined, patient, and loyal. Furthermore, Great Britain in the Seven Years’ War was an ally of Prussia. British gold subsidized the Prussian armies, and British troops, by fighting the French in Germany, India, and America, weakened Prussia’s most dangerous enemy. Frederick conducted a purely defensive warfare, thrusting now here and now there against his slower-moving adversaries, who never learned to act in concert and exert their full force simultaneously. Even so, the struggle was desperately unequal. The Russians occupied East Prussia, penetrated Brandenburg, and even captured Berlin. Faced by the gradual wearing-down of his armies, an empty treasury, and an impoverished country, Frederick more than once meditated suicide. What saved him was the accession of a new tsar. This ruler happened to be a warm admirer of the Prussian king and at once withdrew from the war. Maria Theresa, deprived of her eastern ally, now had to come to terms and leave Fred-

¹ For the War of the Austrian Succession outside of Europe see pages 92 and 118.
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erick in secure possession of Silesia. Soon afterwards the Peace of Paris between France and Great Britain brought the Seven Years' War to an end (1763).\(^1\)

This most bloody contest, which cost the lives of nearly a million men, seemed to settle little or nothing in Europe except the ownership of Silesia. Yet the Seven Years' War really marks an epoch in European history. The young Prussian kingdom appeared henceforth as one of the great powers of the Continent and as the only rival in Germany of the old Hapsburg monarchy. From this time it was inevitable that Prussia and Austria would struggle for predominance, and that the smaller German states would group themselves around one or the other. Frederick, of course, like all the Hohenzollerns, fought simply for the aggrandizement of Prussia, but the results of his work were disclosed a century later when the German Empire came into being.

23. Poland

Our first glimpse of the Poles reveals them as a Slavic people, still wild and heathen, who occupied the region between the upper waters of the Oder and the Vistula. They began to adopt Roman Christianity toward the close of the tenth century. The Poles suffered terribly from the Mongol invasions, but, unlike the Russians, never bowed to the yoke of the Great Khan. The military-religious order of the Teutonic Knights also made persistent attacks on the Poles, thus endeavoring, even in medieval times, to bring their country within the German sphere of influence.

The early history of the Poles is closely linked with that of the Lithuanians, a kindred though distinct people. The Lithuanians originally dwelt among the forests and marshes of the Niemen River. They were almost the last of the barbarous inhabitants of Europe to be civilized and Christianized.

Common fear, at first of the Germans and then of the Russians, brought the Poles and Lithuanians together. By the

\(^1\) For the Seven Years' War outside of Europe, see pages 93 and 118.
Union of Lublin (1569) Poland proper and the grand duchy of Lithuania became a single state, with one king, one Diet, and one currency. After the union the old Polish capital of Cracow gave way to Warsaw, now one of the largest and finest cities of eastern Europe.
Poland

THE PARTITION OF POLAND

A contemporary cartoon which represents Catherine II, Joseph II, and Frederick II pointing out on the map the boundaries of Poland as divided between them. Stanislaus II, the Polish king, is trying to keep his crown from falling off his head.

Poland, as the new state may be henceforth called, was badly made. It formed an immense, monotonous plain, reaching from the Baltic almost to the Black Sea. No natural barriers of rivers or mountains clearly separated the country from Russia on the east, the lands of the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs on the west, and the Ottoman Empire on the south. Even the Baltic Sea
did not provide a continuous boundary on the north, for here the duchy of East Prussia cut deeply into Polish territory. Poland, with its artificial frontiers, lacked geographical unity.

Poland was not racially compact. Besides Poles and Lithuanians, the inhabitants included many Russians, a considerable number of Germans and Swedes, and a large Jewish population in the towns. The differences between them in race and language were accentuated by religious dissensions. The Poles and most of the Lithuanians belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, the Germans and Swedes adhered to Lutheranism, while the Russians accepted the Greek Orthodox faith.
Feudalism, though almost extinct in western Europe, flourished in Poland. There were more than a million Polish nobles, mostly very poor, but each one owning a share of the land. No large and wealthy middle class existed. The peasants were miserable serfs, over whom their lords had the power of life and death.

The Polish monarchy was elective, not hereditary, an arrangement which converted the kings into mere puppets of the noble electors. A Polish sovereign could neither make war or peace, nor pass laws, nor levy taxes without the consent of the Polish national assembly. In this body, which was composed of representatives of the nobility, any member by his single adverse vote—"I object"—could block proposed legislation. The result was that the nobles seldom passed any measures except those which increased their own power and privileges. The wonder is, not that Poland collapsed, but that it survived so long under such a system of government.

Russia, Austria, and Prussia had long interfered in the choice of Polish rulers. Now they began to annex Polish territory. It was not necessary to conquer the country, but only to divide it up like a thing ownerless and dead. In 1772 Catherine II joined with Maria Theresa and Frederick the Great in the first partition of Poland. Russia took a strip east of the Duna and Dnieper rivers inhabited entirely by Russians. Austria took Galicia and neighboring lands occupied
by Poles and Russians. Prussia received the coveted West Prussia, whose inhabitants were mainly Germans. Altogether Poland lost about one-third of its territory.

The first partition opened the eyes of the Polish nobles to the ruin which threatened their country. Something like a patriotic spirit now developed, and efforts began to remove the glaring absurdities of the old government. The reform movement encountered the opposition of the neighboring sovereigns, who wished to keep Poland as weak as possible in order to have an excuse for further spoliation. The second partition (1793), in which only Russia and Prussia shared, cut deeply into Poland. Two years later came the final dismemberment of the country among its three neighbors. The brave though futile resistance of the Polish patriots, led by Kosciuszko, who had fought under Washington in the Revolutionary War, threw a gleam of glory upon the last days of the expiring kingdom.

Neither Great Britain nor France interfered to save the Poles. Great Britain was fully occupied with her rebellious American colonies, while France, then ruled by the wretched Louis XV, had for the time being lost all weight in the councils of Europe.

The suggestion for the dismemberment of Poland came from Frederick the Great, who with his usual frankness admitted that it was an act of brigands. In Catherine II he found an ally as unprincipled as himself. Maria Theresa expressed horror at the crime and even declared that it would remain a blot on her whole reign. "She wept indeed, but she took."

This shameful violation of international law produced a Polish Question. From the eighteenth century to the twentieth century the Poles never ceased to be restless and unhappy under foreign overlords. They developed a new national consciousness after the loss of their freedom, and the severest measures of repression failed to break their spirit. One happy result of the World War has been the restoration of Poland as an independent country.
Great Britain and George III

24. Great Britain and George III

At a time when absolute monarchs held sway in Prussia, Russia, Austria, France, and other Continental countries, the people of Great Britain had a constitutional monarchy limited by Parliament. The concessions which they had wrung from their reluctant sovereigns in the seventeenth century were embodied in great state papers, including the Petition of Right, the Habeas Corpus Act, and the Bill of Rights. To these documents of political liberty was added the Act of Settlement in 1701, which led, thirteen years later, to the accession of the first of the Hanoverians.\(^1\) George I could not speak English and preferred Hanover to his adopted country. George II, though less a German than his father, also took more interest in Hanoverian than in British affairs. Both kings were therefore willing to give their ministers a free hand in government. The result was that under the first two Georges what is called the cabinet system assumed very much its present form.

The cabinet consists of a small number of ministers, who sit in Parliament and shape legislative measures. This body received its name because it met, not in the larger council chamber, but in a "cabinet," or smaller room, apart. The development of political parties during the reign of William III made it desirable for the king to select all his cabinet ministers from that party — either Whigs or Tories — which commanded a majority in the House of Commons; for otherwise the royal measures were likely to encounter opposition. King William and Queen Anne always attended cabinet meetings; George I did not do so because he could not either understand or be understood in the deliberations. Since this time the British sovereign has not been a member of the cabinet. His place is taken by the prime minister, or premier.

The first two Hanoverians naturally favored the Whigs, who had brought about the "Glorious Revolution" and passed the Act of Settlement. The Whig party included the great

\(^1\) See page 32.
lords, most of the bishops and town clergy, the Nonconformists, and the merchants, shopkeepers and other members of the middle class. The Tories, whose strength lay in the landed gentry and rural clergy, were very unpopular, being supposed to desire a second restoration of the Stuarts. The Whigs, in consequence, monopolized office for more than half a century. They kept a large majority in the House of Commons and practically decided who should be members of the all-powerful cabinet.

The leading man in the Whig cabinet for many years was Sir Walpole's ministry, Robert Walpole. We may call him the first prime minister, though he did not actually have that title. Walpole followed a peaceful policy, aimed to keep Great Britain out of Continental entanglements, and fostered British trade and industry. In order to maintain the Whig majority, Walpole bought votes unblushingly and, when open bribery would not suffice, corrupted members of the House of Commons by gifts of offices with large pay and few or no duties. "All these men have their price," he once remarked, pointing to a group of commoners.

After Walpole the Whigs found a leader in William Pitt, the Elder, a fiery orator, an ardent patriot, and an incorruptible statesman. He became the real, though not the nominal, head

---

1 Namely, James, the "Old Pretender," son of James II by his second wife, and his grandson Charles Edward, the "Young Pretender." Their supporters were called "Jacobites" (Latin *Jacobus*, James).
of the cabinet shortly after the opening of the Seven Years’ War. It was a dark hour for the British. Frederick the Great, their ally on the Continent, had met severe reverses, and the French under Montcalm threatened to overrun the American colonies. But Pitt had confidence in his ability. “I am sure,” he said, “that I can save the country, and that no one else can.” Save it he did. The “Great Commoner” infused new vigor into the conduct of the war; aroused the martial spirit of the nation; and selected the commanders who gained victory after victory over the French on the sea, in India, and in America. Great Britain, as Frederick the Great said, had at length “borne a man.” Thanks to Pitt’s memorable leadership that country emerged from the Seven Years’ War a world-power and great imperial state.

The accession in 1760 of George III marked a notable attempt to revive in Great Britain the ideas of personal rule associated with the Stuarts. “George, be a king,” his German mother had told him, and this advice he tried his best to follow. Taking advantage of a House of Commons then utterly unrepresentative of the

William Pitt, Earl of Chatham
After a painting by Richard Brompton in the National Portrait Gallery, London.
people and packed with his supporters (the "king's friends"), George III set about the restoration of absolutism. His money, patronage, and influence were liberally used to bribe and reward the men who would do the royal bidding.

After ten years of unremitting effort the triumph of George III appeared to be complete. Pitt and the Whigs retired to the background, and a Tory ministry, headed by Lord North, came into office. North was a mere figurehead; behind the scenes and moving them as he willed stood the sinister figure of the king. To this would-be despot, therefore, belongs the chief responsibility for the measures of oppression which provoked the resistance of the Thirteen Colonies and resulted in their separation from the mother country. The American Revolution was to a large extent the work of George III.

The failure of George III to subdue the colonists led to a political upheaval. The House of Commons adopted a resolution that "the influence of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished." Lord North's ministry resigned, and the discredited king became the most unpopular of sovereigns. Great Britain now returned to the principles of constitutional or limited monarchy, which have since been adopted by so many countries in the Old World. In the New World, as we shall shortly learn, the American Revolution
gave birth to a nation dedicated to the principles of republican government.

Studies

1. On an outline map indicate the territorial gains made by Russia in Europe under Peter the Great. 2. On an outline map indicate the additions to the Hohenzollern dominions made by Frederick the Great. 3. What illustrations of international immorality are found in this chapter? 4. How was Russia until the time of Peter the Great rather an “annex of Asia” than a part of Europe? 5. “Russia is the last-born child of European civilization.” Comment on this statement. 6. What did Peter the Great mean by saying, “It is not land I want, but water”? 7. “The Dnieper made Russia Byzantine, the Volga made it Asiatic. It was for the Neva to make it European.” Can you explain this statement? 8. Why has Charles XII been called the “last of the Vikings”? 9. Why has the defeat of Charles XII at Poltava been included among the world’s decisive battles? 10. On the map (page 54) indicate the Russian acquisitions from Sweden, Poland, and Turkey, respectively, to the end of the eighteenth century. 11. Enumerate the principal Hapsburg possessions in 1526 (map on page 66). What permanent additions of territory were made between 1526 and 1789? 12. Account for the development of both absolutism and militarism in Prussia. 13. How did Frederick II win the designation of “the Great”? 14. Why may the Polish state be described as both a monarchy and a republic? 15. Compare Russia’s share of Poland with the shares of Austria and Prussia (map on page 76)? 16. Show that the geographical situation of West Prussia made it an extremely important addition to the Hohenzollern possessions. 17. What is “cabinet government”? 18. What did George II mean by saying that “ministers are kings in this country”? 19. Mention some of the accusations against George III as set forth in the Declaration of Independence.
CHAPTER V

COMMERCE AND COLONIES DURING THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES

25. Mercantilism and Trading Companies

PORTUGAL and Spain had chiefly profited by the geographical discoveries and colonizing movements of the sixteenth century. The decline of these two countries after 1600 enabled other European nations to step into their place as rivals for commerce, colonies, and the sovereignty of the seas. The Dutch were first in the field, followed later by the French and the English.

Many motives inspired the colonizing movement of the seventeenth century. Political aims had considerable weight. Holland, France, and England wanted dependencies overseas as a counterpoise to those obtained by Portugal and Spain. The religious impulse also played a part, as when Jesuit missionaries penetrated the American wilderness to convert the Indians to Christianity and when the Pilgrim Fathers sought in the New World a refuge from persecution. But the main motive for colonization was economic in character. Colonies were planted in order to furnish the home land with raw materials for its manufactures, new markets, and favorable opportunities for the investment of capital in commerce and industry.

Most European statesmen in the seventeenth century accepted the principles of the mercantile system. Mercantilism

---

Mercantilism and Trading Companies

is the name given to an economic doctrine which emphasized the importance of manufactures and foreign trade, rather than agriculture and domestic trade, as sources of national wealth. Some Mercantilists even argued that the prosperity of a nation is in exact proportion to the amount of money in circulation within its borders. They urged, therefore, that each country should so conduct its dealings with other countries as to attract to itself the largest possible share of the precious metals. This could be most easily done by fostering exports of manufactures, through bounties and special privileges, and by discouraging imports, except of raw materials. If the country sold more to foreigners than it bought of them, then there would be a "favorable balance of trade," and this balance the foreigners would have to make up in coin or bullion. As one Mercantilist expressed it, the regular means "to increase our wealth and treasure is by foreign trade, wherein we must ever observe this rule: to sell more to strangers yearly than we consume of theirs in value."¹

Large and flourishing colonies seemed essential to the success of the mercantile system. Colonies were viewed simply as estates to be worked for the advantage of the country fortunate enough to possess them. The home government did its best to prevent other governments from trading with its dependencies. At the same time, it either prohibited or placed serious restrictions on colonial manufactures which might compete with those of the mother country. Portugal and Spain in the sixteenth century, and now Holland, France, and England in the seventeenth century, pursued this colonial policy.

The home government did not itself engage in colonial commerce. It ceded this privilege to private companies organized for the purpose. A company, in return for the monopoly of trade with the inhabitants of a colony, was expected to govern and protect them.

The first form of association was the regulated company. Each member, after paying the entrance fee, traded with his

own capital at his own risk and kept his profits to himself. After a time this loose association gave way to the joint-stock company. The members contributed to a common fund and, instead of trading themselves, intrusted the management of the business to a board of directors. Any one who invested his capital would then receive a "dividend" on his "shares" of the joint stock, provided the enterprise was successful. The joint-stock companies of the seventeenth century thus formed a connecting link with modern corporations.

Trading companies were very numerous. For instance, Holland, France, England, Sweden, and Denmark, as well as Scotland and Prussia, each chartered its own "East India Company." England had many trading companies, particularly those which operated in the Baltic lands, Russia, Turkey, India, Morocco, West Africa, and North America.

26. The Dutch Colonial Empire

Holland lies at the mouths of the largest rivers of western Europe, the Scheldt, Meuse, and Rhine, thus securing easy communication with the interior. It is not far distant from Denmark and Norway and is only a few hours' sail from the French and English coasts. These advantages of position, combined with a small, infertile territory, never capable of supporting more than a fraction of the inhabitants by agriculture, naturally turned the Dutch to the sea. They began their maritime career as fishermen, "exchanging tons of herring for tons of gold," and gradually built up an extensive transport trade between the Mediterranean and Baltic lands. After the discovery of the Cape route to the Indies, Dutch traders met Portuguese merchants at Lisbon and there obtained spices and other eastern wares for distribution throughout Europe.

But the Dutch were soon to become seamen on a much more extensive scale. The union of Portugal with Spain in 1581

1 Dissolved in 1640.
enabled Philip II to close the port of Lisbon to the Nether-
landers, who had already begun their revolt against the
Spanish monarch. Philip also seized a large number of Dutch ships lying in Spanish and
Portuguese harbors, thus disclosing his purpose
to destroy, if possible, the profitable commerce of
his enemies. The Dutch now began to make expeditions
directly to the East Indies, whose trade had been monopolized
by Portugal for almost a century. They captured many
Portuguese and Spanish ships, obtained ports on the coasts of
Africa and India, and soon established themselves securely in the
Far East.

In 1602 the Dutch government chartered the East India
Company and gave to it the monopoly of trade and rule from
the Cape of Good Hope eastward to the Strait
of Magellan. The company operated chiefly
in the rich islands of the Malay Archipelago.
Here much bitter fighting took place with the Portuguese,
who were finally driven from nearly all of their eastern posses-
sions. Ceylon, Malacca, Sumatra, Java, Celebes, and the
Moluccas, or Spice Islands, passed into the hands of the Dutch. The headquarters of the Dutch East India Company were located at Batavia in Java. This city still remains one of the leading commercial centers of the East Indies.

The Dutch possessions included the Cape of Good Hope, where the Dutch East India Company made a permanent settlement (Cape Town) in 1652. It was intended, at first, to be simply a way-station or port of refreshment for ships on the route to the Indies. Before long, however, Dutch emigrants began to arrive in increasing numbers, together with Huguenots from France after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. These farmer-settlers, or Boers, passed slowly into the interior and laid there the foundation of Dutch sway in South Africa. The Cape of Good Hope became a British possession at the opening of the nineteenth century, but the Boer republics retained their independence until our own day.

![New Amsterdam in 1655](image)

*After Van der Donck's *New Netherland.*

Fired by their success and enriched by their gains in the East, the Dutch started out to form another colonial empire in the West. It was an agent of the Dutch East India Company, Henry Hudson, who, seeking a northwest passage to the East Indies, discovered in 1609 the river which bears his name. The Dutch sent out ships to trade with the natives and built a fort on Manhattan Island. In 1621 the Dutch West India Company received a
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charter for commerce and colonization between the west coast of Africa and the east coast of the Americas. The company's little station on Manhattan Island became the flourishing port of New Amsterdam, from which the Dutch settlement of New Netherland spread up the Hudson River. The company also secured a large part of Guiana, as well as some of the West Indies. New Netherland before long passed into the hands of the English, but Holland has still a foothold in America in the island of Curaçao and the province of Surinam or Dutch Guiana.

The Dutch in the seventeenth century were the leaders of commercial Europe. They owned more merchant ships than any other people and almost monopolized the carrying trade from the East Indies and between the Mediterranean and the Baltic. Yet with the advent of the eighteenth century the Dutch had begun to fall behind their French and English rivals in the race for commerce and colonies. They suffered from trade warfare with England during the Commonwealth and the reign of Charles II. The long and exhausting War of the Spanish Succession, in which Holland was a member of the Grand Alliance against Louis XIV, struck a further blow at Dutch prosperity. Though Holland fell from the first rank of commercial states, it has kept most of its dominions overseas to the present time.

27. Rivalry of France and England in India (to 1763)

The Indian Ocean forms a vast gulf of crescent shape, having on the western side Africa and Madagascar and on the eastern side Australia and the Malay Islands, while directly opposite its northern extremity lies Asia. The Red Sea and Persian Gulf, which form the two most important offshoots of the Indian Ocean, approach within a short distance of the Mediterranean. These maritime thoroughfares furnished the Mediterranean peoples with the shortest and most convenient routes to India, until the discovery of the Cape route by the Portuguese.

The Portuguese and Dutch enjoyed a profitable trade with India, which supplied them with cotton, indigo, spices, dyes,
drugs, precious stones, and other articles of luxury in European demand. In the seventeenth century, however, the French and English became the principal competi-
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tors for Indian trade, and in the eighteenth century the rivalry between them led to the defeat of the French and the secure establishment of England's rule over India. A region half as large as Europe, with a population of about 200,000,000, began to pass under the control of a single European power.

The conquest of India was made possible by the decline of the Mogul (or Mongol) Empire, which had been founded by the Turkish chieftain Baber in the sixteenth century. That empire, though renowned for its luxury and magnificence, never achieved a real unification of India. The country continued to be a collection of separate provinces, whose inhabitants were isolated from one another by differences of race, language, and religion. The Indian peoples had no feeling of nationality, and when the Mogul Empire broke up they were ready, with perfect indifference, to accept any other government able to keep order among them.

Neither France nor England began by making annexations in India. Each country merely established an East India company, giving to it a monopoly of trade between India and the home land. The French company, chartered during the reign of Louis XIV, had its headquarters at Pondicherry, on the southeastern coast of India. The English company, which received its first charter from Elizabeth in 1600, possessed three widely separated settlements at Bombay, Madras, and Calcutta.

The French were the first to attempt the task of empire-making in India, under the leadership of Dupleix, the able governor-general of Pondicherry. Dupleix saw clearly that the dissolution of the Mogul Empire and the defenseless condition of the native states opened the way to the European conquest of India. In order that the French should profit by this unique opportunity, he entered into alliance with some of the Indian princes, fortified Pondicherry, and managed to form an army by enlisting native soldiers ("sepoys"), who were drilled by French officers. The English afterwards did the same thing, and to this day "sepoys" comprise the bulk of the Indian forces of Great Britain.
Upon the outbreak of the War of the Austrian Succession the French captured Madras, but it was restored to the English by the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. Dupleix continued, however, to extend French influence in the south and east of India.

The English could not look unconcernedly upon the progress of their French rivals, and it was a young Englishman, Robert Clive, whose genius checkmated Dupleix's ambitious schemes. To Clive, more than any other man, Great Britain owes the beginning of her present Indian Empire. Clive had been a clerk in the employ of the East India Company at Madras, but he soon got an ensign's commission and entered upon a military career. His first success was gained in southeastern India. Here he managed to overthrow an upstart prince whom Dupleix supported and to restore English influence in that part of the peninsula. Dupleix was recalled in disgrace to France, where he died a disappointed man.

Clive now found an opportunity for even greater service. The native ruler of Bengal, a man ferocious in temper and consumed with hatred of the English, suddenly captured Calcutta. He allowed one hundred and forty-six prisoners to be confined in a tiny room, where they passed the sultry night without water. Next morning only twenty-three came forth alive from the "Black Hole." This atrocity was sufficiently avenged by the wonderful victory of Plassey, in which Clive with a handful of soldiers overthrew an Indian army of fifty thousand men. Plassey
showed conclusively that native troops were no match for Europeans and made the English masters of Bengal, with its rich delta, mighty rivers, and teeming population.

Meanwhile, the outbreak of the Seven Years' War in Europe renewed the contest between France and England on Indian soil. The English were completely successful, for their control of the sea prevented the French government from sending reinforcements to India. France recovered her territorial possessions by the Peace of Paris in 1763, but agreed not to fortify them. This meant that she gave up her dream of an empire in India. England henceforth enjoyed a free hand in shaping the destinies of that vast region.

28. Virginia and Massachusetts

Englishmen, under the Tudors, had done very little as colonizers of the New World. Henry VII, indeed, encouraged John Cabot to make the discoveries of 1497–1498, on which the English claims to North America were based. During Elizabeth's reign Sir Martin Frobisher explored the coasts of Greenland and Labrador, and another "sea-dog," Sir Humphrey Gilbert, sought without success to colonize Newfoundland. Gilbert's half-brother, Sir Walter Raleigh, planned a settlement in the region then called Virginia, but lack of support from home caused it to perish miserably. The truth was that sixteenth-century Englishmen had first to break the power of Spain in Europe before they could give much attention to America. The destruction of the Spanish Armada in 1588 at length enabled them to establish American colonies without interference from Spain.

Having found the task of private colonization too great for his energies and purse, Raleigh assigned his interests in Virginia to a group of merchants and adventurers. Nothing was done for several years, but at last in 1606 they obtained from James I a charter for the incorporation of a joint-stock association, whose members resided in London and Plymouth. One branch of

1 After Elizabeth, the "Virgin Queen."
this organization was hence called the London Company and the other, the Plymouth Company. The charter claimed for England all the North American continent from the thirty-fourth to the forty-fifth degree, north latitude. The London Company had the exclusive right to colonize the territory between Cape Fear and the Potomac River, and the Plymouth Company had a similar right in the area between the Hudson River and the Bay of Fundy. Both companies might occupy the intervening region, but neither was to establish a colony within one hundred miles of a settlement made by the other.

The London Company promptly took steps to colonize its share of Virginia. A party of one hundred and twenty men left the shores of England on New Year's Day, 1607, and after four wearisome months on the ocean reached the capes of Chesapeake Bay.¹ They entered the bay, and on a peninsula in the broad river which they named after the king who gave them their charter founded Jamestown, the first permanent settlement of Englishmen in the New World.

Colonization in the seventeenth century formed a death-struggle with nature; and the privations endured by the settlers of Virginia are a familiar story in American history.

Of more than six thousand people who arrived between 1607 and 1624, four-fifths died of hunger and disease or at the hands of the Indians. The future of Virginia was not assured until the colonists turned to tobacco raising, for which

¹ Named Cape Henry and Cape Charles, for the two sons of James I.
the yellow soil is unsurpassed. "The weed," as King James called it in derision, brought a high price abroad, and its cultivation quickly became the principal industry of Virginia. It was the only staple product which the colony exported to England.

The London Company did not long enjoy the favor of James I. He had no liking for the Puritans who controlled it and turned the meetings of the stockholders into political gatherings for resistance to his measures. James finally brought suit against the company in the courts and had its charter annulled. Virginia now be-

RUINS OF THE BRICK CHURCH AT JAMESTOWN

Jamestown is now an island, for the sandy beach which once connected it with the mainland has disappeared. Only the ruins of the brick church erected in 1639 and some of the tombs in the churchyard remain.

came a royal province and so remained throughout the colonial period, except for a few years of Puritan supremacy in England. The English king appointed the governor, but as a rule allowed the settlers to manage their own affairs.

The colonization of New England was begun by the Pilgrims, who belonged to the sect of Independents or Separatists.¹

¹ See page 22 and note 1.
Persecuted by Elizabeth and James I, many Separatists went to Holland, where liberty of conscience was allowed. The prospect of losing their English speech and customs among the Dutch did not please them, and presently the exiles began to long for another home, where

“they might more glorify God, do more good to their country, better provide for their posterity, and live to be more refreshed by their labors, than ever they could do in Holland.” One congregation, dwelling at Leyden, decided to emigrate to America. Having obtained from the London Company a patent to colonize within the limits of Virginia, a party of one hundred and two men, women, and children set sail in the
**Mayflower.** They intended to settle somewhere south of the Hudson River, but when they sighted land it was the peninsula of Cape Cod. After exploring the coast, the emigrants came to the sheltered harbor which John Smith had already named Plymouth on his map, and here they landed.

The Pilgrims found themselves outside the territory granted to the London Company and hence could not use their patent for colonization. Before leaving the *Mayflower*, therefore, they took steps to provide for the orderly rule of their little community. The leaders of the party signed their names to an agreement establishing a "civil body politic," and they promised to obey all laws necessary for the "general good." The Mayflower Compact reveals the Pilgrim instinct for self-government.

To settle on the New England coast in mid-winter was a grim business. More than half of the Pilgrims died before spring came, and after ten years they had increased to little more than three hundred. Yet the Pilgrims did not despair, for they were determined to found a religious asylum in the American wilderness.

"Let it not be grievous to you," said their friends in England, "that you have been instruments to break the ice for others; the honor shall be yours to the world's end." Instruments they were. The Pilgrim settlement at Plymouth formed the

---

1 Read *The Landing of the Pilgrims* by Felicia Hemans.
forerunner of that great Puritan exodus which in the third decade of the seventeenth century colonized Massachusetts.

The colony of Massachusetts had its origin in the desire of the Puritans to found a self-governing community far removed from Stuart absolutism in politics and religion. Some Puritan leaders purchased a large tract of land from the Plymouth Company and obtained from Charles I a charter incorporating them as the

Massachusetts, 1630-1640

In the name of God, Amen. The within names are underwritten, the loyal subjects of our dread sovereign lord king James by the grace of God, of great Britain, France, and Ireland king, defender of the faith, &c.

Having undersigned, for the glory of God, and advancement of Christian and honour of our king and country, a voyage to plant first colony in the northern parts of Virginia. God by these presents solemnly in the presence of God, and one of another, consent, a combine our selves together into one civil body politic, for better ordering and preservation of ourselves and of our posterity, and by virtue hereof to enact, constitute, and frame such just and equal laws, ordinances, acts, constitutions, and offices, from time to time, as shall be thought most meet and convenient for the general good of the colony. Into which we promise all due submission and obedience. And whereas we have hereunder subscribed our names at Cape Cod 11 of November in the year of our sovereign lord king James of England, France, and Ireland, 

THE MAYFLOWER COMPACT

Facsimile from History of Plymouth Plantation by Governor Bradford; State House, Boston

Company of Massachusetts Bay. The “great emigration” began in 1630 under the guidance of John Winthrop, who served as the first governor. The settlers established themselves at Salem, Boston, Charlestown, and other places on Massachusetts Bay. More than twenty thousand Puritans left England for America during the next ten years. This was the period when Charles I ruled without a Parliament, and when Archbishop Laud harbied so cruelly all who did not

1 An Algonkin Indian word meaning “Great Hills.”
conform to the Anglican Church. After the opening of the Long Parliament in 1640 the Puritans found enough to do at home, and Massachusetts received few more immigrants during the colonial period.

The charter which Charles I gave to the Puritans did not require that the seat of government should be in England, as had been the case with previous grants. Accordingly, the company decided to take its charter to Massachusetts and to found there an almost independent state. King Charles was too busy with domestic problems to interfere with these bold Puritans overseas, and their friend, Cromwell, after his rise to power, did not molest them. Charles II, however, took away their cherished charter, and James II treated the liberties of Englishmen in America with the same contempt with which he treated
their liberties at home. Soon after his accession William III granted them a new charter. It allowed the people to have a representative assembly, but required them to accept a governor appointed by the king. Massachusetts henceforth formed a royal province.

29. The Thirteen Colonies

Massachusetts was the foremost of the Puritan settlements. Before the end of the seventeenth century it had absorbed Plymouth and had thrown out the offshoots which presently became Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New Hampshire. These four New England colonies formed a distinct geographical group, while the circumstances of their foundation also gave them a political and religious character unlike that of the other colonies.

Another group of colonies grew up around Maryland and Virginia as their center. To the north of Virginia arose the colony of Maryland, which Charles I granted to George Calvert, Lord Baltimore. He died before the charter was actually issued, and it was given to his son Cecil, who estab-

William Penn

After a painting of Penn at the age of twenty-two. Attributed to Sir Peter Lely. In the possession of the Pennsylvania Historical Society.

1 The territory now included within Vermont was claimed by both New York and New Hampshire in colonial times. Maine continued to be a part of Massachusetts until 1820.
lished the first settlement. Maryland, so called in honor of the queen of England, became a refuge for persecuted Roman Catholics, as well as a great family estate of the barons of Baltimore. The charter conferred upon them the rights and privileges of feudal lords. They owned the land, appointed officers, and made the laws with the assistance of the free settlers. Maryland, therefore, stands as the type of a proprietary colony.

To the south of Virginia arose the colony of Carolina, out of a grant by Charles II to a number of nobles whose property had been confiscated in the Great Rebellion. The charter created a proprietary form of government similar to that of Maryland. It proved to be very unpopular, however, and in the eighteenth century the two Carolinas—for they had now divided—voluntarily put themselves under the king’s protection as royal colonies.

The most important colonial achievement of the reign of Charles II was the filling up of the gap between the northern and southern colonies. English settlement in this central
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region began as the result of conquest from another European power. New York was originally New Netherland, a Dutch colony planted by the Dutch West India Company. In 1664 the colony passed into the hands of the English. Charles II granted it to his brother James, duke of York and Albany, who afterwards became king of England. James, in turn, bestowed the region between the Hudson and Delaware rivers to two court favorites, and it received the name of New Jersey. The English possessions now stretched without a break along the whole Atlantic coast from Nova Scotia to Florida.

The colony of Pennsylvania likewise dated from the time of Charles II, who granted it to William Penn, the Quaker, as an asylum for his sect. Penn was made proprietor, with much the same rights which Lord Baltimore possessed in Maryland. The small Swedish settlement on the Delaware had been established by the South Company of Sweden, under the auspices of Gustavus Adolphus, who hoped that it would become the "jewel of his kingdom." The Dutch soon annexed New Sweden, only to relinquish it, together with their own colony, to the English. William Penn secured a grant of the Delaware country, but at the opening of the eighteenth century it became a separate colony.

The southernmost of the Thirteen Colonies was also the last to be settled. James Oglethorpe, a gallant English soldier, founded Georgia in 1733, partly as a military outpost against the Spaniards, but chiefly as a resort for poor debtors. The colony received its name in honor of the reigning king, George II.

Both New England and the southern colonies were chiefly English in blood. Many immigrants also came from other parts of the British Isles, especially the so-called Scotch-Irish — really Englishmen who had settled in the Lowlands of Scotland and afterwards in northeastern Ireland. The emigrants from Continental Europe included French Huguenots, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and Germans from the Rhenish Palatinate. The population
of the middle colonies was far more mixed. Besides English and a sprinkling of Celtic Scotch and Irish, it comprised Dutch in New York, Swedes in Delaware, and Germans in Pennsylvania. But neither France, Holland, Sweden, nor Germany contributed largely to the settlement of the Thirteen Colonies.

30. Transit of Civilization from England to America

The English language prevailed almost everywhere in the colonies, not, however, without quaint modifications of spelling and pronunciation introduced by emigrants from different parts of the mother country. The emigrants also brought many proverbs and traditional sayings, some of which were afterwards printed by Benjamin Franklin in *Poor Richard's Almanac*. Old ballads, once sung in medieval England, were chanted in colonial America. Old fairy tales and nursery rhymes, which had delighted generations of English children, found equally appreciative audiences in the American wilderness. These varieties of folk-literature were not at first written down, but were carried in the memory by young and old.

Nearly all the popular festivals of the colonists came from...
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England. The only important exception was Thanksgiving Day, which the Pilgrims began to celebrate immediately after their first harvest. Many superstitions of the Middle Ages, including those relating to astrology, unlucky days, demons, and magic, crossed the Atlantic to the New World. The belief in witchcraft was likewise very common, and at Salem, Massachusetts, in 1692, twenty persons suffered death for this supposed crime. Witchcraft persecutions also occurred in several other colonies.

Almost every variety of Protestantism was represented in the colonies.

The Church of England from the start had its strongholds in Virginia, Maryland, and the Carolinas, and later in New York. After the Revolutionary War it took the name of the Protestant Episcopal Church, but retained nearly all the Anglican doctrines and ceremonies. Puritanism flourished in New England, especially in Massachusetts and Connecticut. The Puritan churches usually had the Congregational form. Baptists were numerous in Rhode Island, and Quakers in Pennsylvania. Wherever the Scotch-Irish settled, they established Presbyterian churches.
The Toleration Act of 1689\footnote{See page 30.} commended itself to the colonists, many of whom were Dissenters or Nonconformists.\footnote{See page 27 and note 1.} It was generally reënacted by the colonial assemblies, including those of Massachusetts, New York, and Virginia. Toleration did not extend, however, to Roman Catholics, who encountered much suspicion. Rhode Island, which Roger Williams had founded as “a shelter for persons distressed for conscience,” disfranchised Roman Catholics in the eighteenth century. Maryland began with a broad measure of religious liberty, for Lord Baltimore had opened the colony to Anglicans and Puritans, as well as to members of his own faith. Later, when the Protestants became a majority in Maryland, severe anti-Catholic laws were passed. Even Pennsylvania, where Penn had established complete toleration, subsequently excluded Roman Catholics from public office. Outside of these three colonies they remained under many disabilities until after the Revolution. The same was true of Unitarians. Jews enjoyed freedom of worship, but did not possess political rights.

The Puritan clergy were generally well educated; and some
of them were very learned. They introduced into the New World the English tradition in favor of higher education. Harvard College was founded as early as 1636, and Yale, in 1701. Before the Revolution colleges or universities also existed in Rhode Island (Brown), New Hampshire (Dartmouth), New York (King's, later Columbia), New Jersey (Rutgers and Princeton), Pennsylvania (University of Pennsylvania), and Virginia (William and Mary 1). These institutions devoted themselves chiefly to the training of ministers.

New England led the other colonies in popular education. A Massachusetts law, enacted as early as 1647, required every town of fifty families to establish an elementary school where children could learn to read and write. The teachers were to be paid either by the parents of the children or by public taxation. Every town of one hundred families was further required to set up a grammar school, in which students might be prepared for college. This law became the model for similar legislation throughout the United States. The middle and southern colonies did not have a system of popular education.

31. Economic Development of the Colonies

Farming was the chief occupation in colonial times. The Americans not only fed themselves, but also exported large quantities of wheat, rice, tobacco, indigo, and other products to the West Indies and the mother country. Many vegetables and fruits known in Europe early made their way to America, but did not displace the native potato in importance. The clearing of the land for agriculture led to a large export of lumber in the shape of boards, shingles, masts, and spars, and to the production of naval stores, such as tar, pitch, and turpentine. Cattle raising was carried on to a considerable extent, especially in the South. New England found a source of wealth in its fisheries of cod, mackerel, and whale, while all the colonies enjoyed a very profitable trade in furs.

Geographic and climatic conditions largely account for the

1 Named after King William III and his queen.
different systems of land holding in colonial America. New
England, so mountainous, so ill provided with
navigable rivers and good harbors, with a sterile
soil and a harsh climate, naturally became a
region of small farms and diversified crops. The circumstances
of its colonization also helped to produce this result. The
New Englanders settled in agricultural villages like those of the
old England from which they came. Meadow, forest, and
waste remained the common possession of the villagers, but each
man received a share of the arable land to own and cultivate
himself. In order to prevent the growth of large estates, the
practice of primogeniture was forbidden. This system of land
tenure fostered a democratic spirit in New England.

Small farming and individual ownership of the land generally
prevailed in the middle colonies. In New York, however,
there were extensive estates on the Hudson,
originally granted to the Dutch colonists and by
them subdivided and rented out to tenant
farmers. No aristocrats in America so nearly resembled the
feudal nobility of the Old World as these Dutch proprietors,
or patroons. Virginia and Maryland, with their great bays
and rivers, wide stretches of fertile land, and genial climate,
proved to be well adapted to tobacco farming on a large scale.
The colonists settled, not in compact villages, but in private
plantations along the banks of the rivers. As time went on,
the size of the plantations steadily increased and rose as high
as twenty thousand acres. They were cultivated by white
servants and negro slaves, neither of whom had any rights in
the soil. The outcome of these conditions was social inequality
and the growth of an aristocratic class of planters. A similar
aristocracy grew up in the Carolinas and Georgia, where rice
and indigo competed with tobacco as staple crops.

The exploitation of a vast and undeveloped continent created
a keen demand for unskilled labor. Laborers were few and
wages were high. On New England farms and
those in the middle colonies the work was largely
performed by the owner and the members of his family, some-
times with the assistance of hired "help." Indentured white servants also formed an important element in many colonies, particularly in Virginia, Maryland, and Pennsylvania. Of these, some were voluntary servants, or "redemptioners," who sold their services for a limited term, usually five years, to pay their expenses to America. After receiving freedom, they often acquired farms of their own and became respected members of society. The involuntary servants included
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criminals, vagrants, and kidnapped children, who were transported from England by the shipload. The prevalence of negro slavery in the South made it difficult for indentured servants to find profitable and honorable employment after the expiration of their term of service.

The first negroes arrived in 1619 — a fateful date in American history — from a Dutch ship which touched at Jamestown. Thus began the African slave trade, which was to be carried

---

1 An indenture is a contract by which an apprentice is bound to a master, or a servant to service in a colony.
on for nearly two hundred years. Slaves were brought from the West Indies and afterwards direct from Africa. In 1763 they numbered about four hundred thousand, of whom three-fourths lived in the colonies south of Maryland. Slaves were least numerous in New England, not because of any widespread moral sentiment against keeping them, but simply because New England had no plantations of tobacco, rice, and cotton on which their labor could be profitably employed. Slaves did not make good farmers or seamen. They were equally inefficient as traders or artisans.

The contrasts between North and South in systems of land tenure and labor make it easy to understand why Maryland, Virginia, and the Carolinas remained chiefly agricultural during the colonial era, while Pennsylvania, New York, and Massachusetts developed both manufactures and commerce. There were many household industries, including those of nails and other small articles of iron, pottery, wooden implements, shoes, and coarse textiles. The distillation of molasses into rum, much of which was sent to West Africa in exchange for slaves, formed a profitable business. Ship-building became a very important industry in New England. That section also had an extensive commerce with other colonies, the West Indies, and Europe. The development of manufactures in the colonies was retarded by lack of capital and credit, scarcity of labor, high wages, and the greater profits often to be gained from agriculture, lumbering, and the fisheries.
32. Political Development of the Colonies

All the colonists possessed the private rights which Englishmen had won during centuries of struggle against despotic kings. Free speech, freedom from arbitrary imprisonment as secured by the writ of *habeas corpus*, and trial by jury formed part of our legal inheritance from England. These and other private rights were embodied in the Common Law, as introduced into colonial America. At the time of the Revolution the Common Law was adopted by the several states, thus becoming the foundation of our own system of jurisprudence.

The English principle of representation was also carried to the New World. Each colony had a representative assembly modeled after the House of Commons. Virginia early led the way. The Puritans, who had gained control of the London Company, permitted the Virginia colonists to form an assembly consisting of two deputies freely elected by the inhabitants of each settlement. The House of Burgesses, as it soon came to be called, met for the first time in 1619, in the chancel of the little church at Jamestown. A few years later (1634) the freemen of each Massachusetts town were allowed to send two deputies to act for them at the General Court of the colony. New York, which had been a Dutch possession, was the last of the colonies to receive representative self-government (1684).

The assemblies of Virginia, Massachusetts, New York, and the other colonies were more truly representative of the great body of the people than was the English Parliament of the period. In England a small number of persons — nobles, country squires, and rich merchants — controlled elections to the House of Commons. In the colonies all free adult white men, who owned a moderate amount of property, usually had the right to vote. Religious qualifications, limiting the franchise to Protestants, also existed in some of the colonies.

The separation of Parliament into two houses, which had
prevailed in England since the fourteenth century, accustomed the colonists to the bicameral system. In all but two of the colonies the legislature consisted of a representative assembly, forming a lower house, and a small council, forming an upper house.¹ The council assisted the governor and had some power of amending the acts of the assembly.

The governor served as the link between the colonists and England. In Rhode Island and Connecticut he was elected by the people; in Maryland and Pennsylvania² he was appointed by the hereditary proprietor; and in the other (royal) colonies he was named by the king. The governor might veto the bills passed by a colonial legislature. Just as quarrels between king and Parliament were frequent in England, so in colonial America there was constant wrangling between governor and assembly, especially over money matters. The assembly held the purse-strings, however, and usually triumphed by refusing to grant supplies until the governor came to its terms.

The unit of representation in the assemblies of the southern colonies was the county, corresponding to the English shire. The county also formed a judicial area. Justices of the peace, chosen from the more important landowners of the county, met regularly as a

¹ Pennsylvania and Georgia did not adopt the bicameral system until after the Revolution.
² Delaware had the same governor as Pennsylvania.
court to try cases and assess taxes. The citizens of a New England town, or township, governed themselves directly and sent their own representatives to the colonial assemblies. In frequent town meetings they discussed all local affairs, made appropriations for all local expenses, and chose the town officials. The titles of these officials, as well as their functions, were often borrowed from the mother-land, showing that the colonists reproduced on American soil the characteristic features of old English local government. The middle colonies adopted a mixture of the New England and southern systems. Here both town and county were found, each with its elective officers. This mixed system now prevails in perhaps most of the American states.

No close political ties united the colonies. The differences between them in industries, religion, manners, and customs prevented their effective coöperation. Yet preparations for union there had been, and signs of its coming. As early as 1643 Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Haven (then a separate colony), and Plymouth entered into a league "for mutual help and strength in all our future concerns." This league, known as the United Colonies of New England, held together for forty years. Delegates from seven colonies met in the Albany Congress of 1754 and discussed Benjamin Franklin's plan for forming a defensive union of all the colonies. The plan fell through, but it set men to thinking about the advantages of federation. After the close of the "French and Indian War" the colonists, who had learned the value of concerted action against a common foe, began to unite in defense of their rights against king and Parliament.
33. Canada and Louisiana

The French at the opening of the seventeenth century had gained no foothold in the New World. For more than fifty years after the failure of Jacques Cartier's settlement (1542), they were so occupied with the Huguenot wars that they gave little thought to colonial expansion. The single exception was the ill-starred colony which Admiral de Coligny attempted to establish in Florida (1564). The Spaniards quickly destroyed it, not only because the settlers were Protestants, but also because a French settlement in Florida directly threatened their West Indian possessions. The growing weakness of Spain, together with the cessation of the religious struggle, made possible a renewal of the colonizing movement. The French again turned to the north, attracted by the fur trade and the fisheries, and founded Canada during the same decade that the English were founding Virginia.

The first great name in Canadian history is that of Samuel de Champlain, who enjoyed the patronage of Henry IV. Champlain explored the coast of Maine and Massachusetts as far south as Plymouth, discovered the beautiful lake now called after him, traced the course of the St. Lawrence River, and also came upon lakes Ontario and Huron. He set up a permanent French post at Quebec in 1608 and three years later founded Montreal. Champlain served as the first governor of Canada.

The seventeenth century was an era of missionary zeal in the Roman Catholic Church, and Canada became the favorite mission field. Champlain brought in the Franciscans, who were followed in greater numbers by the Jesuits. The story of the Jesuits in North America is an inspiring record of self-sacrifice and devotion. Many of them suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Indians. The journeys made by the Jesuits in the wilderness of the Northwest added much to geographical knowledge, while their mission stations often grew into flourishing towns. After Cardinal
Richelieu had forbidden the Protestants to settle in Canada, the Jesuit influence became dominant there. It has not yet entirely disappeared, in spite of a century and a half of English rule.

La Salle's Explorations

When Colbert, the able minister of Louis XIV, came to power, the exploration of Canada went on with renewed energy. The French, hitherto, had been spurred by the hope of finding in the Great Lakes a western passage to Cathay. Joliet, the fur trader, and Mar-
quette, the Jesuit missionary, believed that they had actually found the highway uniting the Atlantic and the Pacific when their birchbark canoes first glided into the upper Mississippi. It was reserved for the most illustrious of French explorers, Robert de La Salle, to discover the true character of the "Father of Waters" and to perform the feat of descending it to the sea (1682). He took possession of all the territory drained by the Mississippi for Louis XIV, naming it Louisiana.

Where La Salle had shown the way, missionaries, fur traders, hunters, and adventurers quickly followed. The French now began to realize the importance of the Mississippi Valley, which time was to prove the most extensive fertile area in the world. Efforts were made to occupy it and to connect it with Canada by a chain of forts reaching from Quebec and Montreal on the St. Lawrence to New Orleans at the mouth of the Mississippi. All of the continent west of the Alleghenies was to become New France.

However audacious this design, it seemed not impossible of fulfillment. New France, a single royal province under one military governor, offered a united front to the divided English colonies. The population, though small compared with the number of the English colonists, consisted mostly of men of military age, good fighters, and aided by numerous Indian allies. Lack of home support largely offset these real advantages. While the French were contending for colonial supremacy, they were constantly at war in Europe. They wasted on European battle-fields the resources which might otherwise have been expended in America. Furthermore, the despotism of Louis XIV and Louis XV hampered private enterprise in New France by vexatious restrictions on trade and industry and at the same time deprived the inhabitants of training in self-government. The French settlers never breathed the air of liberty, while the English colonists in political matters were left almost entirely to themselves. The failure of France to become a world-power at this

1 Founded in 1718 and named after the Duc d'Orléans, who was regent of France during the minority of Louis XV. See page 47, note 1.
time must be ascribed, therefore, to the unfortunate policies of her rulers.

NORTH AMERICA AFTER THE PEACE OF UTRECHT, 1713 A.D.

34. Rivalry of France and England in North America (to 1763)

The struggle between France and England began, both in the Old World and the New, in 1689, when the “Glorious Revolution” drove out James II and placed William of Orange on the English throne as William III. The Dutch and English, who had previously been enemies, now became friends and united in resistance to Louis XIV. The French king not only threatened the Dutch, but also incensed the English by receiving the fugitive James
and aiding him to win back his crown. England at once joined a coalition of the states of Europe against France. This was the beginning of a new Hundred Years' War between the two countries.¹ The struggle extended beyond the Continent, for each of the rivals tried to destroy the commerce and annex the colonies of the other.

The first period of conflict closed in 1713, with the Peace of Utrecht, which was as important in the history of colonial America as in the history of Europe. England secured Newfoundland, Acadia (rechristened Nova Scotia), and the extensive region drained by the rivers flowing into Hudson Bay. France, however, kept the best part of her American territories and retained control of the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi. The possession of these two waterways gave her a strong strategic position in the interior of the continent.

The two great European wars which came between 1740 and 1763 were naturally reflected in the New World. The War of the Austrian Succession, known in American history as “King George’s War,” proved to be indecisive. The Seven Years’ War, similarly known as the “French and Indian War,” resulted in the expulsion of the French from North America. France had no resources to cope with those of England in America, and the English command of the sea proved decisive.

¹ War of the League of Augsburg, 1689–1697 (“King William’s War”).
War of the Spanish Succession, 1702–1713 (“Queen Anne’s War”).
War of the Austrian Succession, 1740–1748 (“King George’s War”).
Seven Years’ War, 1756–1763 (“French and Indian War”).
War of the American Revolution, 1776–1783.
One French post after another was captured: Louisburg, on Cape Breton Island, commanding the Gulf of St. Lawrence; Fort Duquesne, at the junction of the Allegheny and Ohio rivers; Fort Niagara, which guarded the route between Lake Ontario and Lake Erie; and Fort Ticonderoga between Lake
George and Lake Champlain. In 1759 Wolfe defeated the gallant Montcalm under the walls of Quebec, and the fall of that stronghold quickly followed. A year later what remained of the French army surrendered at Montreal. The British flag was now raised over Canada, where it has flown ever since.¹

The second period of conflict closed in 1763, with the Peace of Paris. France ceded to England all her North American possessions east of the Mississippi, except two small islands kept for fishing purposes off the coast of Newfoundland. Spain, which had also been involved in the war, gave up Florida to England, receiving as compensation the French territories west of the Mississippi. New France was now only a memory. But modern Canada has two millions of Frenchmen, who still hold aloof from the British in language and religion, while Louisiana, though shrunk to the dimensions of an American state, still retains in its laws and in many customs of its people the French tradition.

The Peace of Paris marked a turning point in the history of the Thirteen Colonies. Relieved of pressure from without and free to expand toward the west and south, they now felt less keenly their dependence on England. Close ties, the ties of common interests, common ideals, and a common origin, still attached them to the mother country; but these were soon to be rudely severed during the period of disturbance, disorder, and violence which culminated in the American Revolution.

¹ Fenimore Cooper's *The Last of the Mohicans* and Sir Gilbert Parker's *The Seats of the Mighty* are works of fiction dealing with this period.
35. The American Revolution, 1776–1783

Englishmen in the New World for a long time had been drawing apart from Englishmen in the Old World. The political training received by the colonists in their local meetings and provincial assemblies fitted them for self-government, while the hard conditions of life in America fostered their energy, self-reliance, and impatience of restraint. The important part which they played in the conquest of Canada gave them confidence in their military abilities and showed them the value of coöperation. Renewed interference of Great Britain in what they deemed their private concerns before long called forth their united resistance.

Some of the grievances of which the colonists complained were the outcome of the British colonial policy. The home government discouraged the manufacture in the colonies of goods that could be made in England. Parliament, for instance, prohibited the export of woolens, not only to the British Isles and the Continent, but also from one colony to another, and forbade the colonists to set up mills for making wrought iron or its finished products.
Such regulations aimed to give British manufacturers a monopoly of the colonial markets.

The home government also interfered with the commerce of the colonies. As early as 1660 Parliament passed a "Navigation Act" providing that sugar, tobacco, cotton, and indigo might not be exported direct from the colonies to foreign countries, but must be first brought to England, where duties were paid on them. A subsequent act required all imports to the colonies from Continental Europe to have been actually shipped from an English port, thus compelling the colonists to go to England for their supplies. These acts, however, were so poorly enforced for many years that smuggling became a lucrative occupation.

All this legislation was not so repressive as one would suppose, partly because it was so constantly evaded and partly because Great Britain formed the natural market for most colonial products. Moreover, the home government gave some special favors in the shape of "bounties," or sums of money to encourage the production of food and raw materials needed in Great Britain. Twenty-four colonial industries were subsidized in this manner. Colonial shipping was also fostered, for ships built in the colonies enjoyed the same exclusive privileges in the carrying trade as British-built ships. In fact, the regulations which the American colonists had to endure were light, compared with the shackles laid by Spain and France upon their colonial possessions. It must always be remembered, finally, that Great Britain defended the colonists in return for trade privileges. As long as her help was needed against the French, they did not protest seriously against the legislation of Parliament.

After the close of the Seven Years' War George III and his ministers determined to keep British troops in America as a protection against outbreaks by the French or Indians. The colonists, to whose safety an army would add, were expected to pay for its partial support. Parliament, accordingly, took steps to enforce the laws regulating colonial commerce and also passed
the Stamp Act (1765). The protests of the colonists led to the repeal of this obnoxious measure, but it was soon replaced by the Townshend Acts (1767), levying duties on certain commodities imported into America. These acts, in turn, were repealed three years later. Parliament, however, kept a small duty on tea, in order that the colonists might not think that it had abandoned its assumed right to tax them.

The Stamp Act and the Townshend Acts thus brought up the whole question as to the extent of parliamentary control over the colonists. They argued that taxes could be rightfully voted only by their own representative assemblies. It was a natural attitude for them to take, since Parliament, sitting three thousand miles away, had little insight into American affairs. The English view was that Parliament "virtually" represented all Englishmen and hence might tax them wherever they lived. This view can also be understood, for the "Glorious Revolution" had definitely established the supremacy of Parliament in England.¹ In any case, however, taxation of the colonies was clearly contrary to custom and very impolitic in the face of the popular feeling which it aroused in America.

Some British statesmen themselves espoused the cause of the colonists. Edmund Burke, the great Irish orator, declared that the idea of a virtual representation of America in Parliament was "the most contemptible idea that ever entered the head of a man." Even William Pitt (then earl of Chatham), while maintaining the right of Parliament to legislate for America, applauded the "manly wisdom and calm resolution" displayed by the colonists. But these were the voices of a minority, of a helpless minority. Parliament was then under the thumb of George III and the "king's friends."²

¹ See page 30.
² See pages 81–82.
The colonists were so opposed to the principle of parliamentary taxation that they refused to buy tea from British merchants and in Boston even boarded a tea ship and threw the cargo into the water. Parliament replied to the “Boston Tea Party” by closing the harbor of that city to commerce and by depriving Massachusetts of self-government. These measures, instead of bringing the recalcitrant colony to terms, only aroused the apprehension of her neighbors and led to the meeting of delegates from all the colonies, except Georgia, in the First Continental Congress (1774). It recommended a policy of non-intercourse with Great Britain until the colonists had recovered their “just rights and liberties.” The Second Congress (1775), which met after blood had been shed at Lexington and Concord, prepared for war and appointed George Washington to command the colonial forces. On July 4, 1776, after the failure of all plans for conciliation with the mother country, it declared that “these united colonies are, and of right ought to be, free and independent states.”
No colony at first contained a large majority in favor of separation, and even after the Declaration of Independence numerous loyalists, or "Tories," continued to espouse the British cause. Some of them even fought against their native land, while others did everything they could to prevent the success of the Revolution by sowing sedition, spreading false news, concealing spies, and selling goods to the enemy. It was necessary to adopt the sternest measures in dealing with men whom Washington called "execrable parri-cides," and many were imprisoned or confined in concentration camps. After the conclusion of peace the "Tories" emigrated in great numbers to Canada, where they were the first English settlers. They prospered in their new home, and their descendants, who form a considerable part of the Canadian population, are to-day among the most devoted members of the British Empire.

Even had the colonists been unanimous in resistance to Great Britain, they stood little chance of winning against a wealthy country with a population nearly three times their own, trained armies supported by German mercenaries, and a powerful navy.

**MEDAL COMMEMORATING THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE**

A medal designed and engraved by C. C. Wright. The reverse, here figured, is copied from Trumbull's picture of the signing of the Declaration of Independence.

**The French alliance, 1778**
When, however, the resources of France were thrown into the scale, the issue became less doubtful. France, still smarting from the losses incurred in the Seven Years' War, desired to recover as much as possible of her colonial dominion and secretly aided the Americans with money and supplies for some time
before the victory at Saratoga led her to enter into a formal alliance with them. It must never be forgotten, also, that many Frenchmen felt a genuine sympathy for the colonists in their struggle for liberty. The Marquis de Lafayette was only the most illustrious of the French nobles who crossed the Atlantic to fight side by side with American soldiers.

The war now merged into a European conflict, in which France was joined by Spain and Holland. Great Britain needed all her reserve power to prevent rebellion in Ireland, defend Gibraltar, and keep her possessions in the West Indies and India. The struggle in America practically closed in 1781, when Cornwallis, blockaded at Yorktown by a French fleet and
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**Signatures of the Treaty of Paris, 1783**
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closely invested by the combined French and American armies, surrendered the largest British force still in the colonies. Nearly two years passed, however, before the contestants made peace.

The Treaty of Paris between Great Britain and the United States recognized the independence of the former Thirteen Colonies and fixed their boundaries at Canada and the Great Lakes, the Atlantic Ocean, Florida, and the Mississippi River. The Treaty of Versailles between Great Britain, France, and Spain restored to France a few colonial possessions and gave to Spain
the island of Minorca \(^1\) and the Florida territory \(^2\), Holland, which concluded a separate peace with Great Britain, was obliged to cede to that country some stations in India and to throw open to British merchants the valuable trade of the East Indies.

The successful revolt of the Thirteen Colonies dealt a staggering blow at the old colonial policy. The Americans continued to trade with the mother country from self-interest, although they were no longer compelled to do so by law. The result was that British commerce with the United States doubled within fifteen years after the close of the Revolutionary War. This formed an object-lesson in the futility of commercial restrictions.

The American War of Independence reacted almost at once on Europe. The Declaration of Independence, setting forth the "unalienable rights of man" as against feudal privilege and oppression, provided ardent spirits in France with a formula of liberty which they were not slow in applying to their own country. The French Revolution of 1789 was the child of the American Revolution. Early in the nineteenth century still another revolutionary movement stripped Spain and Portugal of all their continental possessions in the New World. America was, indeed, teaching by example.

36. Formation of the United States

The Continental Congress, which had framed the Declaration of Independence in 1776, continued to govern the United States until the adoption of the Articles of Confederation in 1781. This constitution established a mere league of states, like the United Colonies of New England in the seventeenth century \(^3\) and the still earlier Dutch and Swiss confederations. The authority of Congress under the Articles was practically limited to war,

---

\(^1\) See page 45.  
\(^2\) See page 120.  
\(^3\) See page 113.
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peace, and foreign affairs. It could not levy taxes, could not regulate interstate commerce, and had no power to enforce obedience in either a state or an individual. Every attempt to amend the Articles by legislative action failed, and the weak and clumsy government which they had set up threatened to collapse.

Such were the distressing circumstances under which the Federal Convention met at Philadelphia in May, 1787. To this body the states sent fifty-five delegates, including Washington, who presided, Franklin, James Madison, and Alexander Hamilton. Instead of merely amending the Articles, they decided to prepare an entirely new constitution, and accomplished the task within four months.

Necessary though the Constitution was, if the American people were not to face anarchy and civil war, it satisfied neither the advocates of states' rights nor the extreme democrats. Nearly a year elapsed before eleven states ratified the instrument. North Carolina and Rhode Island did not ratify it until after the inauguration of Washington as President in 1789.

The concessions made to the opponents of the Constitution, as originally framed, were embodied in the first ten amendments. These provided for religious freedom, the separation of Church and State, free speech, a free press, the privileges of assembly and petition, the right to bear arms, speedy and public jury trials, and other safeguards of personal liberty. In short, the amendments were a Bill of Rights for the American people.

The Constitution, in many features, reflects the political experience of the colonists and their familiarity with British methods of government. Accustomed to a bicameral legislature, they retained this arrangement in the Senate and House of Representatives, but made the upper, as well as the lower house elective. The President's powers of military command, appointment, and veto resembled those of the colonial governor, though here,

1 See pages 29–30.
again, the framers of the Constitution departed from precedent in making the executive elective. The national courts were modeled after those of the colonies. The Supreme Court, with its power of declaring acts of Congress unconstitutional, found a prototype in the Privy Council of Great Britain, which had formerly exercised the right of annulling acts of the colonial legislatures. It is noteworthy, however, that the Constitution contains no provision for the cabinet system, something unknown to the colonists and at this time not fully developed in Great Britain.\footnote{See page 79.}

As a whole, the Constitution formed a novelty in politics. It established, for the first time in history, a federal union, rather than a mere league of states or confederation. The objects of the new government were concisely stated in the immortal preamble: "We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this constitution for the United States."

37. Progress of Geographical Discovery

Great Britain soon found at least partial compensation for the loss of the Thirteen Colonies in the occupation of Australia and the islands of the Pacific. That vast ocean, covering more than one-third of the globe, remained little known to Europeans until the latter part of the eighteenth century. Soon after Magellan's voyage in 1520, the Spaniards established a regular commercial route between Mexico and the Philippines and gradually discovered some of the innumerable archipelagoes which stud the intervening seas. Sir Francis Drake's circumnavigation of the world (1577-1580) first drew the attention of Englishmen to the Pacific Ocean, but a long time passed before they began its systematic exploration.

The unveiling of the Pacific was closely connected with the
Antarctic problem. Geographers from the time of the Greeks had a vague idea that a region of continental proportions lay to the southeast of the Indian Ocean. The idea found expression in Ptolemy’s map of the world, and Marco Polo during his stay in China heard about it. After the Dutch became established in the East Indies, they made renewed search for the “Great South Land” and carefully explored the western coast of Australia or “New Holland.”

In 1642 the Dutch East India Company sent Abel Tasman from Batavia to investigate the real extent of Australia. Tasman’s two voyages — among the most notable on record — led to the discovery of Van Diemen’s Land (Tasmania) and New Zealand, and proved conclusively that Australia had no connection with the supposed Antarctic continent. The Dutch, however, manifested little interest in the regions which they had found, and more than one hundred years elapsed before Tasman’s work was continued by Captain James Cook.

This famous navigator, the son of a farm laborer, entered the British navy at an early age and by his unaided efforts rose to high command. Cook’s first voyage in the Pacific resulted in the exploration of the coast of New Zealand and the eastern shore of Australia. The second voyage finally settled the question as to the existence of a southern continent, for Cook sailed three times across the Pacific Ocean without finding it. At the instance of
George III, Cook undertook a third voyage to locate, if possible, an opening on the coast of Alaska which would lead into Hudson Bay. He followed the American coast through Bering Strait until an unbroken ice field barred further progress. On the return from the Arctic region Cook visited the Hawaiian Islands, where he was murdered by the natives. Thus closed the career of one who, more than any other explorer, revealed to European gaze the island world of the Pacific.

Captain Cook on his third voyage was the first British navigator to sight Alaska. Here, however, he had been preceded by the Russians, who reached the Pacific by way of Siberia and the Arctic Ocean. It still remained uncertain whether Siberia did not join on to the northern part of the New World. Peter the Great, who showed a keen interest in geographical discovery, commissioned Vitus Bering, a Dane in the Russian service, to solve the problem. Bering explored the strait and sea named after him and made clear the relation between North America and Asia.

The eighteenth century thus added greatly to man’s knowledge of the world, especially in the Pacific area. Cook’s voyages, in particular, left the main outlines of the southern part of the globe substantially as they are known to-day. From this time systematic exploration for scientific purposes more and more took the place of voyages by private adventurers for the sake of warfare or plunder. Geographical discovery must be included, therefore, among the influences which made the eighteenth century so conspicuously an age of enlightenment.

Studies

1. On outline maps represent the division of North America (a) after the Peace of Utrecht and (b) after the Peace of Paris. 2. Locate these places: Calcutta; Batavia; Sidney; Madras; Sitka; Bombay; and Pondicherry. 3. Identify these dates in American colonial history: 1607; 1620; 1664; 1713; and 1763. 4. According to the mercantile theory, what constituted a “favorable” and what an “unfavorable” balance of trade? 5. How was the colonial policy based on mercantilism opposed to modern ideas of commercial freedom? 6. What was meant by the saying that colonies were “like so many farms of the mother country”? 7. Why was the joint-stock company a more successful method of fostering colonial
trade than the regulated company? 8. Show that the seventeenth century belonged commercially to the Dutch, as the sixteenth century had belonged to the Portuguese and Spaniards. 9. On the map (page 87) indicate what East Indian islands still remain Dutch possessions. 10. Why was it possible for European powers to secure dominions in India? 11. State the basis of the claims of England, France, Spain, Holland, and Sweden to territory in North America during the seventeenth century. 12. "The breaking of Spain's naval power is an incident of the first importance in the history of the English colonies." Comment on this statement. 13. "To Virginia men went for profit; principle drove them to New England." Comment on this statement. 14. Why was the acquisition of New Netherland an important step in the building up of colonial America? 15. Show how the Stuart kings fostered England's expansion in North America. 16. "The expansion of England in the New World and in Asia is the formula which sums up for England the history of the eighteenth century." Comment on this statement. 17. Set forth the importance of the Seven Years' War in the history of India and of colonial America. 18. Show that "no taxation without representation" was a slogan which could hardly have arisen in any but an English country. 19. "The Declaration of Independence was the formal announcement of democratic ideas that had their tap-root in English soil." Comment on this statement. 20. How did the American Revolution become a world war? 21. In what sense was the American Revolution "a civil war within the British Empire"? 22. Show that the American Constitution established, not a confederation, but a federal state. 23. From what Dutch source were the names Tasmania, Van Diemen's Land, and New Zealand derived? 24. Trace on the map (between pages 130-131) the three voyages of Captain Cook.
CHAPTER VI

THE OLD RÉGIME IN EUROPE.

38. Reform

The student will recall the more significant transformations of European society which closed the Middle Ages and ushered in modern times. The Renaissance of literature, art, and learning; geographical discovery, exploration, and colonization; and the Protestant Reformation and Catholic Counter Reformation all helped to complete the transition from the medieval to the modern world. To these three movements we may now add the extraordinary awakening of the European mind in the eighteenth century. It was an age of reason, an age of enlightenment.

The thinkers of the eighteenth century pursued knowledge not so much for its own sake as for its social usefulness. They felt that the time had come when mankind might well discard many ideas and customs, once serviceable, perhaps, but now outworn. To them the chief obstacle in the way of progress was found in human ignorance, prejudice, and unreasoning veneration for the past. Systematic and accurate knowledge, they believed, would destroy this attachment to "the good old days" and would make it possible to create more reasonable and enlightened institutions. In other words, thinkers were animated by the reforming spirit.

Reform was sorely needed. Absolute monarchies claiming to rule by divine right, aristocracies in the possession of privileges and honors, the masses of the people excluded from any part in the government and burdened with taxes and feudal dues — such were some of the survivals.
The Privileged Classes

of medievalism which formed the Old Régime. The eighteenth century abolished it in France: the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have done much to abolish it in other European countries. Let us examine it more closely.

39. The Privileged Classes

Where absolutism prevailed, everything depended upon the personal character of the sovereign. A Peter the Great might set his country upon the road to civilization; a Louis XIV, on the contrary, might plunge his people into indescribable misery as the result of needless wars and extravagant expenditures. As time went on, it began to appear more and more unreasonable that a single person should have the power to make the laws, levy the taxes, spend the revenues, declare war, and conclude peace according to his own inclination. England in the seventeenth century had shown that a divine-right monarchy might be replaced by a constitutional monarchy and parliamentary control of legislation. The reformers wished to secure for France and other Continental countries at least an equal measure of political liberty.

Not less insistent was their demand for social equality. The feudal system had bequeathed as part of its heritage to modern Europe a system of class distinctions which honeycombed society. The highest place was occupied by the clergy and nobility, who constituted the First and Second Estates, respectively. These two privileged classes formed a very small minority of the population in any European country. Of twenty-five million Frenchmen, for instance, less than half a million were clerics or nobles.

Reverence felt by kings and lords for mother Church had dowered her representatives with rich and broad domains. In France, Spain, Italy, and those parts of Germany where Church property had not been confiscated by Protestants, the archbishops, bishops, abbots,

1 In French, ancien régime.
and cardinals ruled as veritable princes and paid few or no taxes to the government. These members of the higher clergy were recruited mainly from the noble families and naturally took the side of the absolute monarchs. The lower clergy, the thousands of parish priests, who came from the common people, just as naturally espoused the popular cause. They saw the abuses of the existing system and supported the demands for its reform.

By the eighteenth century the old feudal nobility had largely disappeared from Europe, except in Germany. A new aristocracy arose, consisting of those who had been ennobled by the king for various services or who had held certain offices which conferred noble rank. The nobles, like the higher clergy, were great landed proprietors, though without the military obligations which rested on feudal lords during the Middle Ages.

Great Britain is almost the only modern state where the nobility still keeps an important place in the national life. There are several reasons for this fact. In the first place, British nobles are few in number in consequence of the rule of primogeniture. Only the eldest son of a peer inherits his father's title and estate; the younger sons are commoners. Even the eldest son during his father's lifetime is styled "Lord" simply by courtesy. In the second place, the social distinction of the nobility arouses little antagonism, because a peer is not bound to marry into another noble family but may take his wife from the ranks of commoners. In the third place, the nobility is from time to time enlarged through the creation of new peers, very often men who have distinguished themselves by their public services as generals or statesmen or by their contributions to science, art, or letters. During the eighteenth century, for instance, 34 dukes, 29 marquises, 109 earls, 85 viscounts, and 248 barons were created. This constant supply of new blood has helped to preserve the British aristocracy from stagnation and incompetence. Finally, nobles in Great Britain are taxed as are other citizens and are equally amenable to the laws.
Very different was the situation in eighteenth-century France. Here there were as many as one hundred thousand nobles, for the French did not observe the rule of primogeniture. Their "gentle birth" enabled them to monopolize the important offices in the government, the army, and the Church. They claimed, and largely secured, exemption from taxation. The result was that most of the expense of the wars, the magnificent palaces, and gorgeous ceremonial of Louis XIV and Louis XV was borne by the middle and lower classes of France. The provincial nobles, who lived on their country estates, usually took more or less part in local affairs and felt an interest in the welfare of the peasantry. But many members of the nobility were absentee landlords, leading a fashionable existence at the court and dancing attendance on the king. Nobles of this type were ornamental rather than useful. Their luxury and idleness made them objects of odium in the minds of all who wished to renovate society. As one reformer declared, "Through all the vocabulary of Adam, there is not such an animal as a duke or a count."

"RIDICULOUS TASTE, OR THE LADIES' ABSURDITY"

One of the many caricatures of the extravagant fashions in headdress of both sexes during the eighteenth century.
40. The Unprivileged Classes

Such were the two privileged orders, or estates. Beneath them came the unprivileged order known as the Third Estate in France. It consisted of three main divisions.

The middle class, or bourgeoisie, included all those who were not manual laborers. Professional men, such as magistrates, lawyers, physicians, and teachers, together with bankers, manufacturers, wholesale merchants, and shopkeepers, were bourgeois. The British middle class enjoyed representation in Parliament and frequently entered the nobility. The French bourgeoisie, on the contrary, could not hold the positions of greatest honor in the government. Though well educated and often wealthy, they were made to feel in every way their inferiority to the arrogant nobles. They added their voices, therefore, to those who demanded political liberty and social equality.

The next division of the Third Estate comprised the artisans living in the towns and cities. They were not very numerous, except in Great Britain, France, western Germany, and northern Italy, where industrial life had reached a much higher development than elsewhere in Europe.

The craft guilds, so characteristic of urban life during the Middle Ages, had begun to disappear from eighteenth-century England, but still maintained their importance on the Continent. Each trade had its own guild, controlling methods of manufacture, quantity and quality of the article produced, wages and hours of labor, and number of workmen to be employed. In many places, the masters, who owned the shops, machines, or tools, alone belonged to the guilds. Even where journeymen and apprentices became members, after paying excessive entrance fees, they were not admitted to all the privileges of the craft. This exclusive policy of the masters provoked much opposition on the part of

1 From French bourg, "town."
the poorer workmen⁴ and led to a demand for the abolition of their monopoly of industry.

The last and by far the largest division of the Third Estate was that of the peasants. In Prussia, Austria, Hungary, Poland, Russia, and Spain they were still serfs. The peasants. They might not leave their villages or marry without their lord's consent; their children must serve in his family for several years at a nominal wage; and they themselves had to work for a number of days each week on their lord's land. It is said that this forced labor sometimes took so much of the peasant's time that he could only cultivate his own holding by moonlight. Conditions were better in Italy and western Germany, though it was a Hessian prince who sold his subjects to Great Britain to fight as mercenaries in the American War of Independence. In France, serfdom still existed only in Alsace, Lorraine, and Franche Comté,² three provinces which had been acquired by Louis XIV and Louis XV. The great majority of the French peasants enjoyed complete freedom, and many of them owned their own farms.

But even the free peasants of France carried a heavy burden. The king imposed the hated land tax (taille), assessing a certain amount on each village and requiring the money to be paid whether the inhabitants could afford it or not. Still more hated was the corvée, or forced labor exacted by the government from time to time on roads and other public works. The clergy demanded tithes, which amounted to perhaps a thirteenth of the produce. The nobles levied various feudal dues for the use of oven, mill, and wine press, and tolls for the use of roads and bridges. The game laws were especially vexatious, because farmers were obliged to allow the game of neighboring lords to invade their fields and destroy the crops. Slight wonder that the peasants also formed a discontented class, anxious for any reforms which would better their hard lot.

¹ The so-called urban proletariat (from Latin proles, "offspring," "progeny" — referring to those whose only wealth is in their children).
² See the map on page 42.
41. The Church

 Practically all European peoples in the eighteenth century called themselves Christians. The majority of them were Catholics. The eastern and western branches of Catholic Christianity began to draw apart during the earlier Middle Ages and finally separated in the eleventh century. This schism was never afterwards healed. The Eastern or Greek Church found its adherents principally among the inhabitants of the Balkan peninsula and the Russians. We have already learned how Peter the Great made the church in Russia to all intents and purposes a department of the tsar's autocratic government.\textsuperscript{1} Such it remained until the Russian Revolution of 1917.

 The Western or Roman Church held undisputed sway throughout the rest of Europe before the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century. Even after this religious upheaval, it continued to be the state church in Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, Austria proper, the Austrian Netherlands, Bavaria, Poland, and several of the Swiss cantons. Moreover, there were numerous Roman Catholics in Bohemia, Hungary, and Ireland.

 The success of the Roman Church in combating Protestantism had been mainly due to the Society of Jesus. That great order, founded by Loyola in 1534, covered Europe with its schools and Asia and America with its missions. As time went on, the increasing wealth, business activity, and political influence of the Jesuits raised up many enemies for them among the clergy, public officials, and the middle and lower classes. The result was the suppression of the order in Portugal, France, Spain, and other countries, and finally altogether by a papal decree of 1773.\textsuperscript{2} That both European rulers and the Papacy should take this extreme step shows the growing strength of public opinion in the eighteenth century.

\textsuperscript{1} See page 58.
\textsuperscript{2} The Society of Jesus was revived by Pius VII in 1814.
The Church

The Reformation made Lutheranism the state church in Prussia, Saxony, and the three Scandinavian countries. Anglicanism in England, Wales, and Ireland, and Presbyterianism in Scotland and Holland held a similarly privileged position. There were also many Protestants in France, Switzerland, and southern Germany.

The divisions among Protestants gave rise to new sects. The Unitarians, who rejected the doctrine of the Trinity, gained followers in Poland and Hungary as early as the sixteenth century and subsequently in the British Isles and the United States. Seventeenth-century England produced the Baptists, whose name was derived from their insistence on immersion of adults as the only proper form of baptism. The Society of Friends, or Quakers, as they are commonly called, also arose in England at this time. Their founder was George Fox, a weaver’s son. The Quakers rejected all religious ceremonial, had no paid ministers, and did not observe the two sacraments of baptism and the Lord’s Supper. War and negro slavery were condemned as unchristian by the Quakers.

Methodism took its start in the eighteenth century out of the preaching of John Wesley and his associates. They worked among the common people of England and won a large following by the fervor, piety, and strictness of their ways. The Methodists finally separated from the Anglican Church and became an independent denomination.

The union of Church and State in both Catholic and Protestant countries seemed to make conformity to the established
religion essential for all citizens. Non-conformity was considered a crime, which the government stood ready to punish by fines, imprisonment, and even death. Heretics were burnt at the stake in eighteenth-century Spain. In France, after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes (1685), Huguenots who held religious services were sent to the galleys. The Toleration Act (1689) in England, while allowing the Dissenters to worship publicly in their own way, did not extend this privilege to Roman Catholics, Unitarians, and Jews. Even where active persecution of non-conformists had ceased, the strict press censorship in most countries interfered with the free expression of thought on religious subjects. Only Holland, Switzerland, and Great Britain had accepted John Milton's noble plea for unlicensed printing. "Give me," wrote Milton, "liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all other liberties."¹

The clergy in Catholic lands kept much of the authority which they had exercised throughout the Middle Ages. Cases involving heresy or blasphemy were tried in their own courts. They alone registered births and deaths and solemnized legal marriages. Hospitals and charitable institutions remained under their direction. Clergymen taught and generally controlled the elementary and higher schools. One result of the Reformation was the introduction into some of the German states, Holland, Scotland, and the Puritan colonies of New England of schools supported by general taxation, so that every one might be able to read and interpret the Scriptures. But with such exceptions the public school system was almost unknown in Europe. The common people were usually uneducated.

42. Liberal Ideas of Industry and Commerce; the Economists

The abuses of the Old Régime were not greater in the eighteenth century than for hundreds of years before, but now they were to be seriously attacked by thinkers who applied the

¹ Areopagitica (1644).
test of *reasonableness* to every institution. It was at this time that political economy, or economics, came into being. Economic science, which investigates such subjects as the production of wealth and its distribution as rent, interest, profits, and wages, the functions of money and credit, and the methods of taxation, had been studied in earlier times by those whose chief motive was to increase the riches of merchants and fill the treasuries of kings. Students in the eighteenth century took a wider view and began to search for the true causes of national well-being.

The economists who flourished in France received the name of Physiocrats,¹ because they believed that natural laws ruled in the economic world. In opposition to the Mercantilists, who held that the wealth of a nation comes from industry and commerce, some of the Physiocrats declared that it comes from agriculture. Manufacturers, said they, merely give a new form to materials extracted from the earth, while traders do nothing more than transfer commodities from one person to another. Farmers are the only productive members of society. It was a striking doctrine to enunciate at a time when the peasantry formed, as has been said, the "beast of burden" of the Old Régime. This group of Physiocrats did a real service in insisting upon the importance of agriculture, even though they erred in assuming that it is the sole source of wealth.

Another group of Physiocrats protested against the burden-come restraints imposed upon industry by the guilds and upon commerce by the governments. They advocated *laissez-faire* economic freedom. Any one should be allowed to make what things he likes; all occupations should be open to everybody; trade between different parts of the country should not be impeded by tolls and taxes; customs duties should not be levied on foreign goods. The Physiocratic teaching was summed up in the famous phrase *laissez-faire* — "let alone."

A Scotch professor of philosophy, Adam Smith, who had visited France and knew the Physiocrats, carried their ideas

¹ *A term derived from two Greek words meaning "nature" and "to rule."*
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across the Channel. His famous work on the *Wealth of Nations* appeared in 1776, the year of American independence. It formed a new declaration of independence for industry and commerce. According to Smith the State should limit itself to only three duties: "first, the duty of protecting the society from the violence and invasion of other independent societies; secondly, the duty of protecting, as far as possible, every member of the society from the injustice or oppression of every other member of it, or the duty of establishing an exact administration of justice; and thirdly, the duty of erecting and maintaining certain public works and certain public institutions, which it can never be for the advantage of any individual or small number of individuals to erect and maintain. . . ."¹

Smith set forth the doctrine of *laissez-faire* so clearly and persuasively as to make a profound impression upon business men and statesmen. His arguments against monopolies, bounties, and protective tariffs did much to secure the subsequent adoption of free trade by Great Britain and even affected Continental legislation. Thus the *Wealth of Nations*, judged by its results, must be accounted one of the most important books ever written.

43. Liberal Ideas of Religion and Politics; the English Philosophers

The eighteenth century was remarkable for eminent scientists. They continued the epoch-making work in mathematics and

¹ *Wealth of Nations*, bk. iv, chap. ix.
astronomy started during the Renaissance and made many contributions to physics, chemistry, geology, botany, and zoology. Scientific investigations, in previous times pursued by lonely thinkers, now began to be carried on systematically by the members of learned societies. Italy led the way with the foundation at Naples and Rome of the first academies of science, and her example was followed at London, Paris, Berlin, and other European capitals. Never before had there been such widespread interest in nature and so many opportunities to uncover nature's secrets.

The advance of science, which immensely broadened men's conceptions of the universe, could not fail to affect their attitude toward religion. The idea of the reign of Rationalism in religion natural law in the physical world was now extended to the spiritual world. Thinking men began to argue that the doctrines of Christianity should not be accepted on the authority either of the Church or of the Bible, but must be submitted to free inquiry. These champions of reason — the rationalists — especially flourished in Great Britain, where thought was less fettered than on the Continent.

Some of the rationalists, including John Locke, defended Christianity as being the most reasonable of all religions. Nevertheless, in his famous Letters on Tolerance, John Locke, 1632–1704 made a plea for individual liberty of conscience. To persecute unbelievers, he argued, only transformed them into hypocrites. Religious belief is a state of mind, and the mind cannot be compelled to believe. If infidels were to be converted by force, it would be easier for God to do it "with armies" of heavenly legions than for any son of the Church, how potent soever, with all his dragoons."

Other rationalists went beyond Locke and questioned the special claims of Christianity. They declared that the questions over which Christian sects had disputed for centuries were really of minor importance; the essential thing was the doctrine common to all mankind. Thus they arrived at the conception of "natural religion," which included simply the belief in a personal God and in
man’s immortal soul. These thinkers received the name of Deists.¹

By casting doubt on the efficacy of particular religions, the Deists gave an impetus to the demand for toleration of all. Their speculations found a warm welcome in France, where they helped to undermine reverence for the Church among the more intelligent classes. Deism in this way acted as a revolutionary ferment.

Rationalism also invaded politics. British thinkers, of whom Locke in his *Two Treatises on Government* was again the most prominent representative, developed a theory of politics utterly opposed to the old doctrine of the divine right of kings. According to Locke, all men possess certain natural rights to life, liberty, and the ownership of property. To preserve these rights they have entered into a contract with one another, agreeing that the majority shall have power to make and execute all necessary laws. If the government, thus created, breaks the contract by violating man’s natural rights, it has no longer any claim to the allegiance of its subjects and may be legitimately overthrown.

To say that all government exists, or should exist, by the consent of the governed is to set up the doctrine of popular sovereignty. How influential it was may be seen from passages in the Declaration of Independence which reproduce the very words of Locke and other British writers. But their ideas found the heartiest reception in France. Enlightened members of the nobility and *bourgeoisie*, weary of royal despotism, took them up, expounded them, and spread them among the people.

44. The French Philosophers

France during the eighteenth century had not been able to maintain the high position among European states to which she had been raised by Louis XIV, and in the struggle for colonial empire she had been defeated by Great Britain. Her intellectual leadership compen-

¹ Latin *Deus*, “God.”
sated for all that she had lost. Throughout this century France
gave birth to a succession of philosophers, whose ideas fell like
fertilizing rain upon the arid soil of the Old Régime. Some of
them had lived for a time in Great Britain as refugees from the
persecution which too bold thinking involved at home. Their
life there made them acquainted with the British system of
constitutional monarchy — so unlike the absolutism of French
kings — with the political theories of Locke, and with the ideas
of the Deists, from whom they learned to submit time-honored
beliefs to searching examination.

A nobleman, lawyer, and judge, Montesquieu, spent twenty
years in composing a single book on the *Spirit of Laws*. It is
a classic in political science. There was nothing Montesquieu,
revolutionary in Montesquieu’s conclusions. He
examined each form of government in order to determine its
excellencies and defects. The Brit-
ish constitution seemed to him most
admirable, as combining the vir-
tues of monarchy, aristocracy, and
democracy. Montesquieu especially
insisted upon the necessity of sepa-
rating the executive, legislative, and
judicial functions of government,
instead of combining them in the
person of a single ruler. This idea
influenced the French revolutionists
and also had great weight with the
framers of the Constitution of the
United States.

The foremost figure among the
philosophers was Voltaire, who sprang from the *bourgeoisie.*
He was not a deep thinker like Montesquieu, but was rather a brilliant and somewhat super-
ficial man of letters. For more than half a century he
poured forth a succession of poems, dramas, essays, biogra-
phies, histories, and other works, so clearly written, so witty,
and so satirical as to win the applause of his contemporaries.
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Voltaire devoted a long life to the preaching of enlightenment. He was in no sense a revolutionist, and favored reform by royal decree as being the simplest and most expeditious method. He made it his particular work to bring discredit on ecclesiastical authority. The Church he regarded as an invention of self-seeking priests. A typical "Deist, Voltaire insisted on the need of toleration. "Since we are all steeped in error and folly," he said, "we must forgive each other our follies." His exposure of bigotry and fanaticism was needed in the eighteenth century. It has helped to create the freer atmosphere in which religious thought moves to-day.

If Voltaire was the destroyer of the old, Rousseau was the prophet of the new. This son of a Geneva watchmaker, who wandered from one European capital to another, made a failure of everything he undertook and died poverty-stricken and demented. The discouragements and miseries of his career found expression in what he wrote. Rousseau felt only contempt for the boasted civilization of the age. He loved to picture what he supposed was once the "state of nature," before governments had arisen, before the strong had begun to oppress the weak, when nobody owned the land, and when there were no taxes and no wars. "Back to nature" was Rousseau's cry.

Such fancies Rousseau applied to politics in what was his most important book, the Social Contract. Starting with the as-
assertion that "man was born free and everywhere he is in chains," he went on to describe a purely ideal state of society in which the citizens are ruled neither by kings nor parliaments, but themselves make the laws directly. The only way to reform the world, according to Rousseau, was to restore the sovereignty of the people, with "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" for all. As we have just learned, the idea that governments and laws arise by voluntary agreements among men, who may overthrow them for just cause, was not new; but Rousseau first gave it wide currency. Frenchmen of every class read the Social Contract with avidity, and during the Revolution they proceeded to put its democratic teachings into effect.

Rousseau, Voltaire, and Montesquieu were among the contributors to the famous Encyclopedia, a work in seventeen volumes which appeared after the middle of the eighteenth century. As the name indicates, it formed a repository of all the scientific and historical knowledge of the age. The Encyclopedists, as its editors are known, sought to guide opinion, as well as to give information. They were radical thinkers, who combined in a great effort to throw the light of reason on the dark places of the social order. Among the abuses attacked by them were religious intolerance, the slave trade, the cruel criminal law, and the inequitable system of taxation. The Encyclopedists even ventured to criticize absolutism in government. Their work thus set in motion a current of revolt which did much to undermine both Church and State in France.
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45. The Enlightened Despots

The ideas of the philosophers spread throughout those parts of Europe where French models were followed. Even kings and statesmen began to be affected by the spirit of reform. European rulers did not intend to surrender the least fraction of absolute power; they were still autocrats who believed in government by one strong man rather than by the democratic many; but with their despotism they combined a paternal solicitude for the welfare of their subjects. They took measures to secure religious toleration, to relieve poverty, to codify the laws, to provide elementary education, and to encourage scientific research. These activities have won for them the name of the "enlightened despots."

In Russia Catherine the Great posed as an enlightened despot. Catherine was a learned woman, at least for an empress. She wrote flattering letters to Voltaire and the other Encyclopedists and conferred on them gifts and pensions. Montesquieu she especially admired, saying that were she the pope she would canonize him. But Catherine paid little more than lip-service to the ideas of the French philosophers. If she abolished torture, she did not do away with the knout; for capital punishment she only substituted the living death of exile in Siberia. Her toleration of dissenters from the Orthodox Church stopped short of allowing them to build chapels for public worship, and her passion for legislative reform grew cold when she found that she must begin by freeing the serfs. Catherine's real attitude is exhibited in a letter to the governor of Moscow: "My dear prince, do not complain that the Russians have no desire for instruction; if I institute schools it is not for us, it is for Europe, where we must keep our position in public opinion. But the day when our peasants shall wish to become educated both you and I will lose our places."

Catherine's contemporary, Frederick the Great, was a despot more sincere and more enlightened. He worked harder and had fewer pleasures than any other king of his day. "Monarchs," he once wrote, "are not
invested with authority that they may riot in voluptuousness." Although Frederick's resources had been so completely drained by the Seven Years' War that it was necessary for him to melt the silver in the royal palaces and debase the currency, his vigorous measures soon restored the national prosperity. He labored in a hundred ways to make Prussia the best-governed state in Europe. Thus, he founded elementary schools so that his subjects could learn at least to read and write, and reformed the courts so that everybody from high to low might be assured of impartial justice. A Deist in religion, the correspondent and friend of Voltaire, Frederick declared that every one should be allowed to get to heaven in his own way, and backed up his declaration by putting Roman Catholics on an equality with Protestants throughout the Prussian dominions. No less than thirty volumes, all in French, contain the poems, letters, and treatises on history, politics, and military matters which Frederick managed to compose in the spare moments of a busy life. This philosopher on the throne held the attention of his generation in the world of ideas as well as in that of diplomacy and war.

In Austria, Joseph II, the eldest son of Maria Theresa, presented a less successful type of the enlightened despot. Joseph regarded Frederick the Great as the ideal of a modern ruler. He wished to transform the various peoples in the Hapsburg realm, with all their differences of race, speech,
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1 Holy Roman Emperor, 1765–1780, and sole ruler of the Hapsburg realm, 1780–1790.
religion, and aspirations, into a single unified nation. German officials sent out from Vienna were to administer the affairs of each province. The army was to be built up by compulsory service after the Prussian model. German was to be used everywhere as the official language. Most unwise, however, Joseph tried to do in a short lifetime what all the Hapsburg rulers after him could not accomplish. The result was that his measures to Germanize Hungarians, Bohemians, Italians, and Netherlanders only aroused hostility and did not survive his death. The sentence that the king himself proposed as his epitaph was a truthful summary of his reign: "Here lies the man who, with the best intentions, never succeeded in anything."

Paternal government had two serious weaknesses. First, the despots could not determine the policy of their successors. An able and liberal-minded ruler might be followed by a ruler who was indolent, extravagant, and unprogressive. In Prussia, for instance, the weak reign of Frederick the Great's successor undid much of his work. The same thing happened in Spain and Portugal. Second, the despots, however enlightened, treated their subjects as children and enacted reforms without first discovering whether reformation was popularly desired. Because of these weaknesses, the eighteenth-century conception of absolute monarchs ruling for their people's good was certain to be superseded by the modern idea of the people ruling themselves. But to bring this about, a revolution was necessary.

Studies

1. Do monarchy and autocracy necessarily mean the same thing? 2. Compare the European estates or privileged classes with the castes of ancient and modern India. 3. Contrast the leading ideas of Mercantilism and Physiocracy. 4. Look up in an encyclopedia some account of the life and writings of Adam Smith. 5. What do you understand by laws of nature? Give some examples of such laws. 6. What was the origin of the names Quaker and Methodist? 7. Distinguish between deism (or theism) and atheism. 8. How did Locke's theory of the social contract provide the intellectual justification for the "Glorious Revolution"? 9. Is there any reason to suppose that Rousseau's "state of nature" ever existed anywhere? 10. Why has Rousseau's Social Contract been called "the Bible of the French Revolution" and "the gospel of modern democracy"? 11. Show that Rousseau's
ideas of government were far more radical than the ideas of Montesquieu.

12. Why did not the reforms of the enlightened despots make a revolution unnecessary?

13. "No reform can produce real good unless it is the work of public opinion, and unless the people themselves take the initiative." Discuss the justice of this statement.

14. Describe those features of the Old Régime which led to the demand for "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity."

15. "The evils of European society were rooted in feudalism and entrenched in privilege." Comment on this statement.

16. How do the facts presented in this chapter support the statement that "Great thinkers control the affairs of men, and by their discoveries regulate the march of nations"?
CHAPTER VII

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION, 1789–1799

46. Preparation for the French Revolution

What we call the French Revolution refers to a series of events in France, between 1789 and 1799, by which divine-right monarchy gave way to a republic and class distinctions and privileges disappeared in favor of social equality. This revolution started in France, not because the misery of the people had become more intolerable there than in other parts of the Continent, but because France was then the most advanced of Continental countries. French peasants and artisans were free enough and intelligent enough to be critical of their government. Next to Great Britain, France contained the most numerous, prosperous, and influential bourgeoisie. Members of this class furnished the Revolution with its principal leaders. Even the nobility and clergy included many men who realized the abuses of the Old Régime and wished to abolish them. In short, the revolutionary impulse stirred all ranks of French society.

That impulse came in part from across the Channel. The spectacle of the Puritan Revolution and the “Glorious Revolution” in the seventeenth century affected Frenchmen in the eighteenth century. The English had put one king to death and had expelled another; they had established the supremacy of Parliament in the state. It was the example of parliamentary England which Montesquieu held up to the emulation of his country-

men. It was the political philosophy of the Englishman, John Locke, upon which Rousseau founded his doctrine of the sovereignty of the people.

A second impulse came from across the Atlantic. After the close of the War of American Independence, the French common soldiers, together with Lafayette and other officers, returned home to spread republican doctrines. It is significant that in 1783 a French nobleman translated and published all thirteen of the constitutions of the American states. Very important was the work of Benjamin Franklin, who for nearly a decade represented the American government at Paris. His engaging manners, practical wisdom, and high principles won general admiration. The portrait of the Philadelphia printer hung in every house, and at republican festivals his bust figured side by side with that of Rousseau. "Homage to Franklin," cried an enthusiastic Frenchman, "he gave us our first lessons in liberty."

To understand the outbreak of the French Revolution it is necessary to go back to the long reign of Louis XV. France had never had so unkingly a sovereign as this successor of the "Grand Monarch." All his life he was an idler. He hunted, he danced, he gambled, he sank deep in the frivolities and immoralities of Versailles, he did everything but rule. The government fell more and more into the hands of courtiers and adventurers, whose main concern was to line their own pockets at the expense of the public treasury.

The foolish alliances and fatal wars upon which Louis XV was persuaded to enter reduced France to the position of a second-rate power. In the Seven Years' War French armies were repeatedly vanquished on Continental battle-fields, and French fleets were swept from the high seas. When the Peace of Paris was signed in 1763, the French flag ceased to fly in North America, and it flew in India only by permission of England. The annexation of Lorraine (1766) and Corsica (1768) did not compensate for the loss of

1 Great-grandson of Louis XIV. See page 47, note 1.
a colonial empire.\textsuperscript{1} The military failures of the king's reign humiliated his subjects and undermined their loyalty to him.

The wars and extravagance of Louis XV added to the legacy of debt with which his predecessor on the throne had saddled France. The treasury every year faced a chronic deficit. It could only be met by the dangerous expedient of fresh loans, involving still larger outlays for interest charges. As long as the government refused to take proper measures of economy and continued to exempt the clergy and nobility from their share of taxation, little improvement of the financial situation was possible. France, the richest country in Europe, with a population greater than that of any rival state, became virtually bankrupt.

The French monarchy, so despised abroad, had to face a growing volume of complaints at home. Louis XV did his best to stifle them. A rigid censorship muzzled the press. Postoffice officials opened letters passing through the mails and revealed their contents to the king. Books and pamphlets, obnoxious to the government, were burned by the common hangman, and their authors were imprisoned. No man's personal liberty was safe, for the police, if provided with an order of arrest signed by the king (a lettre de cachet), could send any one to jail. Suspected persons sometimes remained prisoners for years without trial. Yet in spite of all measures of repression, opposition to the monarchy steadily increased.

Louis XV was able to read the signs of the times. He knew that the Old Régime could not last much longer; but he felt sure that it would last his lifetime. "After me, the deluge," he said. The deluge soon came.

47. Eve of the French Revolution

Louis XVI, the grandson of Louis XV, mounted the throne when only twenty years old. Virtuous, pious, and well-meaning, he was the sort of ruler who in quiet times might have won the esteem of the French people. He was, however, weak, indolent, slow

\textsuperscript{1} See the map on page 42.
Eve of the French Revolution

of thought, and very slow of decision. It has been well said that Louis XVI "could love, forgive, suffer, and die," but that he did not know how to reign.

At his side, presiding over the gay court of Versailles, stood Marie Antoinette of Austria, daughter of Maria Theresa. This beautiful and lovable, though frivolous and light-minded, woman exerted a most unfortunate influence on Louis XVI, whom she surpassed in ability. She constantly interfered in matters of state to support some mistaken policy or an incompetent minister. The queen had many enemies in France because of her nationality, and she increased them by lavish expenditures on herself and on her favorites. The chief charge later to be hurled against "Madame Deficit" was that she had wasted the resources of France.

The youthful king began his reign auspiciously by appointing a new ministry, in which Turgot held the most responsible position. He was a friend of Voltaire, a contributor to the *Encyclopédia*, an economist of the Physiocratic school,
and a successful administrator. Turgot drew up a comprehensive program of reforms. He would allow complete freedom of the press, establish a national system of education, recall the Huguenots, and admit the bourgeoisie to all public offices.

Turgot summed up his financial policy in the three maxims, "No bankruptcy, no increase of taxation, no loans." Expenses were to be reduced by cutting off the pensions to courtiers, whose only merit was, in the words of a contemporary writer, "to have taken the trouble to be born." The taxes bearing most heavily on the Third Estate were to be replaced by a general tax on all landowners. Peasants were to be no longer forced to work without pay on public highways and bridges. The old guilds, which hampered industry, were to be abolished. The vexatious tolls and duties on the passage of grain from one province to another were to be swept away. Could such reforms have been carried out, France would have had a bloodless and orderly revolution.

But they were not carried out. The privileged classes would not surrender their privileges, nor favorites their pensions, nor monopolists their unjust gains, without a struggle. The weak king, who once declared that "the only persons who truly love the people are Monsieur Turgot and myself," failed to support him against the intrigues of Marie Antoinette and the court party. Turgot's dismissal from office after two years of power removed the one man who could have saved absolutism in France.
The Estates-General

The finances of the government went from bad to worse after the fall of Turgot. His successors in the ministry relied mainly on fresh loans to cover the deficits of the treasury and avert bankruptcy. From the standpoint of French interests, Louis XVI committed a fatal error in allowing himself to be persuaded to intervene in the War of American Independence. America was freed; Great Britain was humbled; but the war forced up the public debt of France by leaps and bounds. When at last it became impossible to borrow more money, the king yielded reluctantly to the popular demand for the convocation of the Estates-General. He appealed to the nation for aid, thereby confessing the failure of absolutism.

48. The Estates-General, 1789

The Estates-General, the old feudal assembly of France, had not met for one hundred and seventy-five years. Suddenly awakened from their long slumber, the representatives of the clergy, the nobles, and the Third Estate appeared at Versailles to take counsel with the king. The written instructions (cahiers),

1 See page 40.
drawn up in every part of the country for the guidance of each representative, though not revolutionary in wording, set forth a long list of abuses to be removed. While Louis XVI would have been satisfied with measures to increase the revenues, most Frenchmen wanted thoroughgoing reforms.

Not quite half of the twelve hundred-odd members of the Estates-General belonged to the two privileged orders. About two-thirds of the delegates of the Third Estate were members of the legal profession. A few were liberal nobles. Less than a dozen came from the lower classes. As a whole, the Estates-General represented the most prosperous and intelligent people of France.

The Third Estate possessed two very competent leaders in Count Mirabeau and the Abbé Sieyès. The former belonged by birth and office to the privileged classes, but both gladly accepted election as representatives of the Third Estate. Mirabeau, a born statesman and orator, had a sincere belief in constitutional government. He wished to set up in France a strong monarchy, limited by a constitution after the English model. Sieyès, a cleric more devoted to politics than to theology, had recently stirred all Frenchmen by a remarkable pamphlet entitled *What is the Third Estate?* He answered, “Everything.” “What has it been hitherto?” “Nothing.” “What does it ask?” “To be something.”

The three estates in former days sat as separate chambers and voted by orders. If this usage were now followed, the
clergy and the nobility would have two votes to one for the Third Estate. The commoners insisted, however, that the new Estates-General no longer represented feudal France, but the united nation. They wished, therefore, that it should organize as a single body, in which the members voted as individuals. Since the Third Estate had been permitted to send twice as many delegates as either the clergy or the nobility, this arrangement would enable it to outvote the privileged orders and carry any reforming measures desired.

The debate over the organization of the Estates-General continued for several weeks and resulted in a deadlock. At last, on the motion of Sieyès, the Third Estate cut the Gordian knot by boldly declaring itself the National Assembly. Then and there it asserted its right to act for the nation as a whole. Representatives of the clergy and nobility might come in if they pleased, but the National Assembly could do without them.

Louis XVI, left to himself, might have been too inert for resistance, but his wife, his two brothers, and the court party persuaded him to make a stand. Troops were now posted before the doors of the hall which had been set apart in the palace of Versailles for the Third Estate. Finding their entrance barred, the undaunted commoners adjourned to a building nearby, which had been used as a tennis court. Here they took a solemn oath never to separate, but to continue to meet, under all circumstances, until they had drawn up a constitution for France. This action brought to their side the representatives
of the lower clergy (curés), who were inclined to the popular cause.

But the king persisted in his opposition. Summoning the three estates before him, he made known the royal will that they should deliberate apart. The higher clergy and nobility immediately withdrew to their separate chambers. The Third Estate, with its clerical supporters, did not stir. When the master of ceremonies repeated the king's command, Mirabeau retorted, "We are assembled by the national will; force alone shall disperse us." Louis XVI did not dare to use force, especially after many of the nobles, headed by Lafayette, joined the commoners. The king now gave way and requested the rest of the clerical and noble representatives to unite with the Third Estate in the National Assembly.

49. Outbreak of the French Revolution

Thus far we have been following a constitutional movement confined to the upper and middle classes of French society. Now, however, the lower classes began to make their influence felt upon the course of events, first in Paris and later in the provinces. Paris was a manufacturing center, with a large population of artisans, very poor, often idle, and inclined to be turbulent. Their ranks were swelled at this time by crowds of peasants, whom the bad harvests and severe winter of the preceding year had driven into the city. Here, in fact, were all the elements of a dangerous mob, on whose ignorance and passion reformers, agitators, and demagogues could play what tunes they willed.

Soon came ominous news. Louis XVI had hardly accepted the National Assembly before he changed his mind and determined to dissolve that body. A large number of troops, mainly German and Swiss regiments in the service of France, were massed near Paris, obviously with intent of awing, perhaps seizing, the representatives of the people. It was then that the Parisians made the cause of the National Assembly their own.
After the painting by J.-L. David, Versailles Gallery.

"THE TENNIS COURT OATH"
Rioting broke out in the capital, and for several days anarchy prevailed. Reinforced by deserters from the army, the mob attacked and captured the Bastille, a fortress where political offenders had been often confined through *lettres de cachet*.

![The Storming of the Bastille](image)

**The Storming of the Bastille**

A picture by a contemporary artist. Lafayette sent the key of the Bastille to Washington at Mount Vernon, with these words: "It is a tribute which I owe as a son to my adopted father, as an aide-de-camp to my general, as a missionary of liberty to its patriarch."

The Bastille at this time contained only seven prisoners, all there for just cause, but it symbolized the tyranny of the Old Régime, and its fall created an immense sensation throughout France and in other countries. Louis XVI, on hearing the news, exclaimed, "Why this is a revolt!" "No, Sire," replied a courtier, "this is a revolution."

Now that Paris was practically independent of royal control,
The more prominent and well-to-do citizens took steps to secure an orderly government. They formed a municipal council, or Commune, made up of representatives elected from the different wards of the city. A militia force, called the National Guard, was also organized, and the popular Lafayette was selected as commander. Meanwhile, Louis XVI had seen the necessity of submission. He withdrew the troops, got rid of his reactionary ministers, and paid a visit of reconciliation to the Parisians. In token of his good intentions, the king put on a red, white, and blue cockade, red and blue being the colors of Paris and white that of the Bourbons. This was to be the new tricolor of France.

The example set by Paris was quickly copied by the provinces. Many cities and towns set up communes and formed national guards. In the country districts the peasants sacked and burned those local bastilles, the châteaux, taking particular pains to destroy the legal documents by which the nobles exercised their manorial rights. Monasteries, also, were often pillaged. The government showed itself unable to maintain order or to protect life and property. Troops in the garrison towns refused to obey their officers and fraternized with the populace. Royal officials quitted their posts. Courts of justice ceased to act. Public works stopped, and the collection of taxes became almost impossible. From end to end of France the Old Régime collapsed amid universal confusion.

The revolution in the provinces led directly to one of the
most striking scenes of French history. On the night of August 4–5, while the National Assembly had under consideration measures for stilling the unrest in France, one of the nobles — a relative of Lafayette — urged that it remove the feudal burdens still resting on the peasantry. Then, amid hysterical enthusiasm, noble after noble and cleric after cleric arose in his place to propose equality of taxation,

**The Destruction of Feudalism**

A contemporary cartoon representing the French people hammering to pieces with their flails all the emblems of the feudal system, including the knight's armor and sword and the bishop's crosier and miter.

the repeal of the game laws, the freeing of such serfs as were still to be found in France, the abolition of tithes, tolls, and pensions, and the extinction of all other long-established privileges. A decree “abolishing the feudal system” was passed by the National Assembly within the next few days and was signed by the king. The reforms which Turgot labored in vain to secure thus became accomplished facts. It is well to remember, however, that the Old Régime had already fallen in France; the decree of the National Assembly did little more than outlaw it.

Times were hard in Paris. Employment was scarce, and
THE LOUVRE AND THE TUILERIES

After an old print. The palace of the Louvre was begun by Francis I in the sixteenth century and continued by his successors, especially Louis XIV. Important additions were made during the nineteenth century. The Tuileries palace, so named from the tile kilns (tuileries) which once occupied the site, was burned in 1871. Nothing remains of the structure except two wings connected with the Louvre.
food was dear. The discontent grew in proportion, especially among the women, who had to stand in line many hours at a time waiting to purchase a few loaves of bread at the bakeries. Rumor accused the court and the aristocrats of deliberately causing famine, nay, of plotting to overturn the revolution by force. A newspaper published the statement—quite unfounded—that during a banquet of army officers at Versailles the national cockade had been insulted and trampled under foot. Here was the spark which caused the explosion. On October 5 a mob of hungry women, armed with every sort of weapon, even scythes and pitchforks, set out for Versailles to demand bread of the king. It was a strange procession that straggled along the twelve miles of highway from Paris to Versailles; an eyewitness declares that it reminded him of an army of crusaders. Early in the morning of October 6, some of the women made their way into the palace, killed the sentinels, and entered the apartments of Marie Antoinette, who escaped with difficulty. Only the arrival of Lafayette at the head of the National Guard prevented further rioting and bloodshed. The women were finally quieted by the king's promise to remove to Paris with his wife and children. That afternoon the royal family set out on their sorrowful journey to the capital, accompanied by a mob which yelled, "We are bringing the baker, the baker's wife, and the baker's little boy." Henceforth Louis XVI lodged in the palace of the Tuileries, where he found himself, in effect, a prisoner of the Parisians.

50. The National Assembly, 1789–1791

The National Assembly declared itself inseparable from the king's person and followed him to Paris. It remained in session there for the next two years. One of its most important undertakings was the reform of local government. During the eight centuries between Hugh Capet and Louis XVI, France had been built up by the gradual welding together of a number of provinces varying greatly in size, and each with its own privileges, customs, and laws.
Eighteenth-century France, in consequence, did not form a compact, well-organized state. The old provinces were now replaced by eighty-three artificial districts (départements), approximately uniform in size and population and named after some river, mountain, or other natural feature. A map of contemporary France still shows the départements.

The National Assembly next undertook a reorganization of the Church. It ordered that all Church lands should be declared national property, broken up into small lots, and sold to the peasants at a low price. By way of partial indemnity, the government agreed to pay fixed salaries to the clergy. All appointments to ecclesiastical positions were taken from the hands of king and pope and placed in the hands of the people. The electors of a départment chose their bishop, and those of a district their curé.

The National Assembly also suppressed the monasteries, but undertook to pension the monks and nuns.

The desperate condition of the finances led to the adoption of a desperate remedy. The National Assembly passed a decree authorizing the issue of notes to the value of four hundred million francs on the security of the former Church lands. To emphasize this security the title of assignats was given to the notes. If the issue of assignats could have been restricted, as Mirabeau desired, to less than the value of the property pledged to pay for them, they might have been a safe means of raising a revenue; but the continued needs of the treasury led to their multiplication in enormous quantities. Then followed the inevitable consequences of
paper money inflation. Gold and silver disappeared from circulation, while prices rose so high that the time came when it needed a basket of assignats to buy a pair of boots. The assignats in the end became practically worthless. The finances of the government, instead of being bettered by this resort to paper money, were left in a worse state than before.

The National Assembly gave to France in 1791 the written constitution which had been promised in the "Tennis-Court Oath." The constitution established a legislative assembly of a single chamber, with wide powers over every branch of the government. The hereditary monarchy was retained, but it was a monarchy in little more than name. The king could not dissolve the legislature, and he had only a "suspensive veto" of its measures. A bill passed by three successive legislatures became a law even without his consent. Mirabeau wished to accord the king greater authority, but the National Assembly distrusted Louis XVI as a possible traitor to the Revolution and took every precaution to render him harmless. The distrust which the bourgeois framers of the constitution felt toward the lower classes was shown by the clause limiting the privilege of voting to those who paid taxes equivalent to at least three days' wages. Almost one-half of the citizens, some of them peasants but most of them artisans, were thus excluded from the franchise.

The National Assembly prefixed to the constitution a Declaration of the Rights of Man. This memorable document, which shows Rousseau's influence in almost every line, formed a comprehensive statement of the principles underlying the Revolution. "Men," it affirmed, "are born free and remain free and equal in rights. Social distinctions may be founded only upon the general good. The aim of all political association is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man. These rights are liberty, property, security, and resistance to oppression. The

---

1 Hence the National Assembly is also called the Constituent Assembly.
2 See page 149.
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principle of all sovereignty resides essentially in the nation. No body or individual may exercise any authority which does not proceed directly from the nation. Liberty consists in the freedom to do everything which injures no one else; hence the exercise of the natural rights of each man has no limits except those which assure to the other members of the society the enjoyment of the same rights. These limits can be determined only by law. Law can prohibit only such actions as are hurtful to society. Nothing may be prevented which is not forbidden by law, and no one may be forced to do anything not provided for by law. Law is the expression of the public will. Every citizen has a right to participate personally, or through his representative, in its formation. It must be the same for all, whether it protects or punishes."

From these general principles the framers of the Declaration went on to enumerate the rights of man, rights which for the most part had been ignored or violated under the Old Régime. All persons, it was said, shall be equally eligible to all dignities, public positions, and occupations, according to their abilities. No person shall be arrested or imprisoned except according to law. Any one accused of wrongdoing shall be presumed innocent until he is adjudged guilty. Every citizen may freely speak, write, and print his opinions, including his religious views, subject only to responsibility for the abuse of this freedom. All the citizens have the right to decide what taxes shall be paid and how they are to be used. No one shall be deprived of his property, except for public purposes, and then only after indemnification. These clauses of the Declaration reappeared in the constitutions framed in France and other Continental countries during the nineteenth century. The document, as a whole, should be compared with the English Bill of Rights and the first ten amendments to the American Constitution.

51. The First French Republic, 1792

The first phase of the French Revolution was now ended. Up to this point it has appeared rather as a reformation, which
abolished the Old Régime and substituted a limited monarchy for absolutism and divine right. Many men believed that under the new constitution France would henceforth enjoy the blessings of peace and prosperity. They were quickly undeceived. The French people, unfortunately, lacked all training in the difficult art of self-government. Between their political incapacity and the opposition of the reactionaries and the radicals, the revolutionary movement drifted into its second and more violent phase, which was marked by the establishment of a republic.

The reactionaries consisted, in part, of nobles who had hastily quitted the country upon the outbreak of the Revolution. Their emigration continued for several years, until thousands of voluntary exiles (émigrés) had gathered along the northern and eastern frontier of France. Headed by the king's two brothers, the count of Provence and the count of Artois, they kept up an unceasing intrigue against the Revolution and even organized a little army to recover by force their titles, privileges, and property.

Had the reactionaries included only the émigrés beyond the borders, they might not have proved very troublesome. But they found support in France. The Constitution of 1791 had made the clergy state officials, elected by the people and paid by the government. Such an arrangement could not be acceptable to sincere Roman Catholics, because it separated the Church from papal control. The pope, who had already protested against the confiscation of Church property and the dissolution of the monasteries, forbade the clergy to take the oath of fidelity to the new constitution. Nearly all the bishops and perhaps two-thirds of the curés obeyed him; these were called the non-juring clergy. Until this time the parish priests had generally supported the revolutionary movement. They now turned against it, carrying with them their peasant flocks. The Roman Catholic Church,
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with all its spiritual influence, was henceforth arrayed against the French Revolution.

To Louis XVI, practically a prisoner in the Tuileries, the new order of things was most distasteful. The constitution, soon to be put into effect, seemed to him a violation of his rights as a monarch, while the treatment of the clergy deeply offended him as a Christian. As long as Mirabeau lived, that statesman had always been able to dissuade the king from seeking foreign help, but Mirabeau’s premature death deprived him of his only wise adviser. Louis’s opposition to the revolutionists was strengthened by Marie Antoinette, who keenly felt the degradation of her position.

The king and queen finally resolved to escape by flight. Disguising themselves, Marie Antoinette as a Russian lady and Louis as her valet, they drove away in the evening from the Tuileries and made straight for the eastern frontier. But Louis exposed himself needlessly on the way; recognition followed; and at Varennes, near the border, excited crowds stopped the royal fugitives and turned them back to Paris. This ill-starred adventure greatly weakened the loyalty of the French people for Louis XVI, while Marie Antoinette, the “Austrian woman,” became more detested than ever.

Besides the reactionaries who opposed the Revolution, there were the radicals who thought that it had not gone far enough. The radicals secured their chief fol-
lowing among the poverty-stricken workingmen of the cities, those without property and with no steady employment. Of all classes in France, the urban proletariat \(^1\) seemed to have gained the least by the Revolution. No chance of future betterment lay before them, for the bourgeois Constitution of 1791 expressly provided that only tax-payers could vote or hold public office. The proletariat might well believe that, in spite of all high-sounding phrases about the “rights of man,” they had merely exchanged one set of masters for another, the rule of the privileged classes for that of the bourgeoisie.

The radical movement naturally centered in Paris, the brain and nerve center of France. It was fostered by inflammatory newspapers such as Marat’s The Friend of the People;\(^2\) which agitated for a popular uprising against the government, by the bitter speeches of popular orators, and especially by numerous political clubs. The control of these clubs lay largely in the hands of young lawyers, who embraced the cause of the masses and soon became as hostile to the bourgeoisie as to the aristocracy. The famous Jacobin Club, so named from a former monastery of the Jacobin monks where its meetings were held, had hundreds of branches throughout France, all engaged in radical propaganda.

The leaders of the Jacobin Club included two men who were destined to influence profoundly the subsequent course of the Revolution. One was Danton, who sprang from the middle class. Highly cultivated, a successful advocate at the bar, Danton with his loud voice and forcible

---

\(^1\) See page 139 and note 1.  
\(^2\) L’Ami du Peuple.
gestures could arouse his audience to wild enthusiasm. The other was Robespierre, also a middle-class lawyer with democratic sympathies. This austere, precise little man, whose youth had been passed in poverty, early became a disciple of Rousseau and the oracle of the Jacobins. Mirabeau once prophesied of Robespierre that he would “go far; he believes all that he says.” We shall soon see how far he went.

**The Lion of Lucerne**

This celebrated work at Lucerne in Switzerland was designed by the Danish sculptor Bertel Thorwaldsen and was dedicated in 1831. It represents a dying lion, which, pierced by a lance, still guards with its paw the Bourbon lilies. The figure is hewn out of the natural sandstone. The monument commemorates the officers and men of the Swiss Guard who were slain in 1792, while defending the Tuileries against the Parisian mob.

A new influence began at this point to affect the course of the French Revolution. Continental monarchs, however “enlightened,” felt no sympathy for a popular movement which threatened the stability of their own thrones. If absolutism and divine right were overthrown in France, they might before long be overthrown in Austria and Prussia. The Austrian emperor, a brother of Marie Antoinette, now joined with the Prussian king in a statement to the effect that the restoration of the old monarchy in France formed an object of “common interest to all sovereigns of Europe.” The two rulers also
agreed to prepare their armies for active service abroad. Their announced intention to suppress the Revolution by force provoked the French people into a declaration of war. Though directed only at the Austrian emperor, it also brought his Prussian ally into the field against France.

The French began the contest with immense enthusiasm. They regarded themselves as armed apostles to spread the gospel of freedom throughout Europe. But their troops, poorly organized and disciplined, suffered severe reverses, one result of which was further to exasperate public opinion against the monarchy. Suspicion pointed to Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette as the traitors who were secretly revealing the French plan of campaign to the enemies of France. Suspicion passed into hatred, when the allied commander-in-chief, as he led his army across the frontier, issued a proclamation threatening Paris with destruction if the slightest harm befell the royal family. At this juncture the Jacobins under Danton organized an uprising of the Parisian proletariat. The mob stormed the Tuileries, massacred the Swiss Guard, and compelled the National Assembly to suspend the king from office. A new assembly, to be called the National Convention, was summoned to prepare another constitution for France.

Then followed the next scene in the bloody drama. The Commune of Paris, now controlled by the Jacobins, emptied the prisons of suspected royalists and butchered them without mercy. More than one thousand persons perished in the "September massacres." Shortly afterwards the National Convention held its first meetings and by a unanimous vote decreed the abolition of the monarchy. All public documents were henceforth to be dated from September 22, 1792, the beginning of "the first year of the French Republic."

52. The National Convention, 1792–1795

The National Convention contained nearly eight hundred members, all republicans, but republicans of diverse shades of
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opinion. One group was that of the Girondists, so-called because its leaders came from the département of the Gironde. The Girondists represented largely the bourgeoisie; they desired a speedy return to law and order. Opposite them sat the far more radical and far more resolute group of Jacobins, who leaned for support upon the turbulent populace of Paris. The majority of the delegates belonged to neither party and voted now on one side and now on the other. Eventually, however, they fell under Jacobin domination.

The feud between the two parties broke out in the first days of the National Convention. The Jacobins clamored for the death of Louis XVI as a traitor; most of the Girondists, less convinced of the king’s guilt, would have spared his life. Mob influence carried through the assembly, by a small majority, the vote which sent “Citizen Louis Capet” to the guillotine. The king’s accusers did not have the evidence, which we now possess, proving that he had been in constant commu-
nication with the foreign invaders. His execution was a political measure. Louis must die,” urged Robespierre, “that the country may “live.” Danton, railing against the enemies of France, could now declare, “We have thrown them as gage of battle the head of a king.”

Meanwhile, the tide of foreign invasion receded rapidly. Two days before the inauguration of the republic the French stayed the advance of the allies at Valmy, scarcely a hundred miles from Paris. The battle of Valmy was a small affair, but it first gave confidence to the revolutionary armies and nerved them for further re-

**Execution of Louis XVI**

*After a contemporary print.*

...istance. The French now took the offensive and invaded the Austrian Netherlands. Fired by these successes, the National Convention offered the aid of France to all nations which were striving after freedom; in other words, it proposed to propagate the Revolution by force of arms throughout Europe. This was a blow in the face to autocratic rulers and privileged classes everywhere. After the execution of Louis XVI Austria, Prussia, Great Britain, Holland, Spain, and
Sardinia leagued together in the First Coalition to overthrow republican France.

The republic at the same time was threatened by domestic insurrection. The peasants of La Vendée, a district to the south of the lower Loire, were royalists in feeling and deeply devoted to Roman Catholicism. When an attempt was made to draft them as soldiers, they refused to serve and broke out in open rebellion. The important naval station of Toulon, a royalist center, surrendered to the British. A tremor of revolt also ran through the great cities of Lyons, Marseilles, and Bordeaux, whose bourgeoisie resented the radicalism of the Parisian proletariat.

The peril to the republic, without and within, showed the need of a strong central government. The National Convention met this need by selecting twelve of its members to serve as a Committee of Public Safety, in which at first Danton, and later Robespierre, was the leading figure. The committee received almost unlimited authority over the life and property of every one in France. It proceeded to enforce a general levy or conscription, which placed all males of military age at the service of the armies. This earliest of draft laws ran as follows: "The young men shall go to fight; married men shall forge weapons and transport supplies; the women shall make tents and uniforms or serve in the hospitals; the children shall make lint; the old men shall be carried to the public squares to excite the courage

---

1 Read Victor Hugo's novel, *Ninety-Three*, which deals with the insurrection in La Vendée.
of soldiers, hatred of kings, and enthusiasm for the unity of the republic.” Carnot, another member of the committee, the “organizer of victory” as he came to be called, drilled and disciplined the new national forces and sent them forth, singing the *Marseillaise*¹ to battle.

The mercenary troops of old Europe could not resist these citizen-soldiers. Filled with enthusiasm and in overwhelming numbers, they soon carried the war into enemy territory. The First Coalition dissolved under the shock. By the Treaty of Basel in 1795 Prussia ceded her provinces on the west bank of the Rhine to France, which thus secured the “natural boundary” so ardently desired by Louis XIV. During this year Spain and Holland also made peace with France. Holland became the Batavian Republic under French protection.

The Committee of Public Safety likewise dealt effectively with domestic insurrection. It resorted to a policy of terrorism as a means of suppressing the anti-revolutionary elements. A law was passed which declared “suspect” every noble, every office-holder before the Revolution, every person who had had any dealings with an *émigré*, and every person who could not produce a certificate of citizenship. No one could feel safe under this law. As a wit afterward remarked, all France in those days went about conjugating, “I am suspect, thou art suspect, he is suspect,” etc. Special courts were set up in Paris and the provincial cities to try the “suspects” and usually to order them to the guillotine.

France endured the Reign of Terror for over a year.² During this time seventeen thousand persons, it has been estimated, were executed under form of law, while many more were massacred without the pretense of a trial. The carnage spread beyond the non-juring clergy and the aristocracy to include the *bourgeoisie* and even many artisans and peasants. Among the distinguished victims

---

¹ A patriotic song, the words and music of which were composed in 1792 by Rouget de Lisle.

² Read Dickens’s novel, *The Tale of Two Cities*, the scenes of which are laid in London and Paris during the revolutionary era.
at Paris were Marie Antoinette, the sister of Louis XVI, the
duke of Orléans (a member of the royal house who had intrigued
to get himself raised to the throne), and the principal Girondist
leaders. Then the Terror began to consume its own authors.
Danton, who had wearied of the bloodshed and counseled
moderation, suffered death. "Show my head to the people," he said to the executioner, "they do not see the like every day."
The fanatical Robespierre now became the virtual dictator
of France. He continued the slaughter for a few months until
his enemies in the National Convention secured the upper
hand, and hurried him without trial to the death to which he
had sent so many of his fellow-citizens.

Robespierre's execution ended the Reign of Terror. The
policy of terrorism, however effective in crushing the enemies
of the republic, had long since been perverted to
party and personal ends. The inevitable reaction
against Jacobin tyranny followed. The *bourgeoisie*
gained control of the National Convention, which now resumed
its task of preparing a constitution for republican France.
The new instrument of government provided for a legislature
of two chambers and vested the executive authority in a Di-
rectory of five members, with most of the powers of the former
Committee of Public Safety.

Before the constitution went into effect, Paris became the
scene of another mob outburst. Royalists and radicals joined
forces and advanced to the attack of the Tuileries,
where the National Convention was sitting. Here the rioters met such a cannonade of grape
shot that they fled precipitately, leaving many of
their number dead in the streets. The man who most dis-
tinguished himself as the defender of law and order was the
young artillery general, Napoleon Bonaparte.

53. The Directory, 1795–1799

Napoleon Bonaparte was born at Ajaccio, Corsica, in 1769,
only a year after that island became a French possession. He was the second son of an Italian lawyer of noble birth
but decayed fortunes. Napoleon attended a preparatory school in France and went through the ordinary curriculum with credit, showed proficiency in mathematics, and devoted much of his leisure to reading history. After a brief military training in Paris, he entered an artillery regiment, thus realizing his boyish desire to be a soldier. He was then a youth of sixteen years, poor, friendless, and without family influence.

Napoleon took a keen interest in the reform movement then stirring France. A devoted admirer of Rousseau’s philosophy, he hated all privileges, all aristocracy, and for a time, at least, he became a Jacobin. The Revolution gave him his first opportunities. He commanded the artillery which compelled the British to evacuate Toulon in 1794 and two years later he helped defend the National Convention against the Parisian mob. Shortly afterwards Carnot, who divined Napoleon’s genius, persuaded his colleagues on the Directory to intrust the young man with the command of the French army in Italy.

When the Directory assumed office, France still numbered Great Britain, Sardinia, and Austria among her foes. Great Britain could not be assailed, because of the weakness of the French navy, but the other two countries offered fronts open to attack through northern Italy. Napoleon’s army, small and shabbily equipped, seemed a weak instrument for so formidable a task. But to the “Little Corporal,” as his men nicknamed him, all things were possible.
“Soldiers,” he cried, “I desire to lead you into the most fertile plains in the world. Rich provinces and great cities will be in your power; you will find there honor, glory, and wealth. Soldiers of Italy, will you be wanting in courage and constancy?” Napoleon did not find them wanting in anything. His brilliant strategy first separated the Sardinians from their Austrian allies. The king of Sardinia then purchased peace by the cession of Savoy and Nice to France. After another year of fighting, which turned the Austrians out of northern Italy and brought the French to within eighty miles of Vienna, the Hapsburg emperor also stooped to make terms with this ever-victorious republican general.

Austria ceded to France the Austrian Netherlands, which had already been occupied by the republican armies, and agreed to the annexation by France of the Germanic lands west of the Rhine. She also recognized the independence of the Cisalpine Republic, one of Napoleon’s creations in northern Italy. In return for these concessions, Austria received most of the Venetian territories conquered by Napoleon, including a valuable sea-coast along the Adriatic. France likewise profited by this Italian settlement, for both the Cisalpine Republic and the tiny Ligurian Republic (Genoa and the adjacent district) were under French influence.

Great Britain now remained the only country to contest
French supremacy in Europe. Napoleon determined to strike at her through her Oriental possessions. It was necessary, first of all, to wrest Egypt from the Ottoman Turks, for, as Napoleon never tired of asserting, "the power that is master of Egypt is master of India." Napoleon easily persuaded the Directory to give him the command of a strong expedition, which set sail from Toulon and reached Alexandria in safety. The French marched across the blazing sands to Cairo and defeated the Turkish troops in a battle near the pyramids. "Soldiers," proclaimed Napoleon, "from the summit of these pyramids forty centuries look down upon you." The Egyptian campaign had hardly begun before Lord Nelson, the British admiral, destroyed most of the French fleet in Abukir Bay, thus severing Napoleon’s communications with Europe. The French soon overran Egypt, but met a severe check when they carried the war into Syria. Faced by the collapse of his Oriental dreams, Napoleon left his army to its fate and escaped to France. Here his highly colored reports of victories caused him to be greeted as the conqueror of the East.

Affairs had gone badly for France during Napoleon’s absence in Egypt. Great Britain, Austria, and Russia formed the Second Coalition against the republic, put large armies in the field, and drove the French from Italy. This misfortune sapped the authority of the Directory and turned the eyes of most Frenchmen to Napoleon as the one man who could guarantee victory
abroad and order at home. He took advantage of the situation to plan with Sieyès and other politicians a coup d’État. Three of the five directors were induced to resign; the other two were placed under military guard; and the bayonets of Napoleon’s devoted soldiers forced the assemblies to dissolve. Napoleon now became virtually master of France. “I found the crown of France lying on the ground,” he once remarked, “and I picked it up with the sword.” Thus, within little more than ten years from the meeting of the Estates-General at Versailles, popular government gave way to the rule of one man. Autocracy supplanted democracy.

54. The Revolutionary Era

The French Revolution differed sharply from previous revolutionary movements. The Puritan Revolution and the “Glorious Revolution” in England were carried out by men of the upper and middle classes, who wished to limit the royal power and establish the supremacy of Parliament. Even the American Revolution was guided by conservative statesmen, at least as solicitous for the rights of property as for the rights of man. The French Revolution also began as mainly a middle-class movement, but it soon reached the lower classes. Their principles found expression in the famous motto, “Liberty, Equality, Fraternity.”

“Liberty” meant the recognition of popular sovereignty. Government was to be no longer the privilege of a divine-right ruler, however benevolent or “enlightened”; henceforth, it was to be conducted constitutionally in accordance with the will of the people. Since the first constitution (that of 1791) the French have often changed their form of government, but they have always had a written constitution. The revolutionists also proclaimed with enthusiasm the natural “rights of man” to freedom of thought, of speech, of publication, of worship, and of the ownership of property.

1 French for a “stroke of state.”
"Equality" meant the abolition of privilege. The Revolution made all citizens equal before the law. It opened to every one the positions in the civil service, the Church, and the army. It abolished serfdom and manorial dues, thus destroying the last vestiges of feudalism. It suppressed the guilds, thus releasing industry from medieval shackles. It canceled all exemptions from taxation and substituted a new fiscal system which taxed men according to their means. As we shall learn, Napoleon retained and extended these achievements of the Revolution.

"Fraternity" meant a new consciousness of human brotherhood. The revolutionists set out to make France a better place for every one to live in. This fraternal feeling inspired all ranks and classes of the people. It led to a great outburst of patriotic and national sentiment, which enabled the French, singlehanded, to withstand Europe in arms.

The principles of 1789 were not confined to France. The revolutionary soldiers passed from land to land bringing in their train the overthrow of the Old Régime. The spirit of 1789 has been the service of France as a liberator.

Seal of the French Republic, 1792-1804
Studies

1. "The principal cause of the ruin of royalty in France was the lack of a King." What does this statement mean?
2. Why is July 14 observed by the French as the "birthday of the nation"?
3. Compare the assignats with the paper money issued by the Confederacy during the Civil War.
4. How did the Austrians and Prussians justify their invasion of France in 1792?
5. Read a translation of the Marseillaise and compare the sentiments expressed in it with those of Hail Columbia and The Star Spangled Banner.
6. In your opinion was there greater or less justification for the execution of Louis XVI than of Charles I?
7. In what sense is the word Jacobin now frequently used?
8. What excuse can be offered for the policy of terrorism adopted by the Jacobins in 1793?
9. Prepare a class-room report dealing with the story of Charlotte Corday.
10. Mention four conspicuous instances of mob action during the French Revolution. Why are mobs so often cruel and bloodthirsty?
11. Why may Napoleon's coup d'état in 1799 be regarded as the final scene of the French Revolution?
12. "England is the mother of liberty, France the mother of equality." Explain this statement.
13. "The two most striking and important events in the history of the eighteenth century are the establishment of the United States of America and the outbreak of the French Revolution." Justify this statement.
CHAPTER VIII

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE, 1799–1815

55. The Consulate, 1799–1804

The history of France, from the overthrow of the Directory to the battle of Waterloo, forms the biography of Napoleon Bonaparte. At the time of the coup d'état of 1799 he was not quite thirty years old. A foreign observer has left the following pen picture of the youthful Napoleon: "He is about five feet seven inches tall, delicately and gracefully made; his hair a dark brown crop, thin and lank; his complexion smooth, pale, and sallow; his eyes gray but very animated; his eyebrows light brown, thin and projecting. All his features, particularly his mouth and nose, are fine, sharply defined, and expressive beyond description. The true expression of his countenance is a pleasing melancholy, which, when he speaks, relaxes into the most agreeable and gracious smile you can imagine. He speaks deliberately but very fluently, with particular emphasis, and in rather a low tone of voice."

Napoleon's extraordinary abilities enabled him to take full advantage of the chances which the revolutionary era offered to men of talent and ambition. Endowed with a splendid constitution, he could toil eighteen hours a day and go without sleep for long periods. His mind kept its keenness after the most exhausting activities on the battle-field or in the council room. Sober in his habits, with little taste for art, letters, or the refinements of life, he lived only for work—the work of a warrior and a statesman. His military genius is admitted; he has no superiors, perhaps no equals, among the great captains of modern times. His ca-

1 Webster, Readings in Medieval and Modern History, chapter xxxii, "Letters and Proclamations of Napoleon"; chapter xxxiii, "Napoleon."
pacity as a civil ruler seems even more remarkable, considering how completely he reconstructed western and central Europe in sixteen years. Nor did his character lack an attractive side: he made devoted friends and could talk good-humoredly and frankly with all sorts of people. Yet no one can follow Napoleon's career, especially in its later phases, without being impressed with the man's selfishness, untruthfulness, and unscrupulousness. An insatiable appetite for war and the belief in the necessity of dazzling France by brilliant victories drove him into constant acts of aggression and rendered him callous to human suffering. He could call a Russian battle-field, heaped with bodies of friend and foe, the "finest" he had ever seen, a remark which contrasts with Wellington's words after Waterloo that "next to a battle lost the greatest misery is a battle gained."

Throughout Napoleon's career, he appears as essentially an adventurer, skirting uneasily the edge of ruin and destined to fall at last a victim to the enemies he himself had made.

After the coup d'état Napoleon proceeded to frame a constitution. It placed the executive power in the hands of three consuls, appointed for ten years. The First Consul (Napoleon himself) was really supreme. To him belonged the command of the army and navy, the right of naming and dismissing all the chief state officials, and the proposal of all new laws. Napoleon then submitted the constitution to the people for ratification. The popular vote, known as a plebiscite, showed an overwhelming majority in favor of the new government.

1 From the Latin plebiscitum, referring to a vote or decree of the common people (plebs).
NAPOLEON AS FIRST CONSUL

After the painting by J.-B. Isabey.

Versailles Gallery.
The French accepted Napoleon's rule the more readily because of the threatening war-clouds in Italy and on the Rhine. Though Russia soon withdrew from the Second Coalition, Austria and Great Britain remained in arms against France. Napoleon now led his troops across the Alps by the pass of the Great St. Bernard, a feat rivaling Hannibal's performance, descended unexpectedly into Italy in the rear of the Austrian forces, and won a new triumph at Marengo. A few months later the French general Moreau inflicted a crushing defeat on the Austrians at Hohenlinden in Bavaria. These reverses brought the Hapsburg emperor to his knees, and he agreed to a peace which reaffirmed the provisions of the Treaty of Campo Formio.

Great Britain and France now took steps to end the long war between them. The one country was all-powerful on the sea, the other on the land; but neither could strike a vital blow at the other. The Peace of Amiens, which they concluded, proved to be a truce rather than a peace. However, it enabled the First Consul to drop the sword for a time and take up the less spectacular but more enduring work of administration. He soon showed himself as great in statecraft as in war.

One of Napoleon's most important measures put the local government of all France directly under his control. He placed a prefect over every département and a subprefect over every subdivision of a département. Even the mayors of the larger towns and cities owed their positions to the First Consul. This arrangement enabled Napoleon to make his will felt promptly throughout the length and breadth of France. It survived Napoleon's downfall and still continues to be the French system of local government.

The same desire for unity and precision led Napoleon to complete the codification of French law. Before the Revolution nearly three hundred different local codes had existed in France, giving force to Voltaire's remark that a traveler there changed his laws as often as he

1 Read Campbell's poem, Hohenlinden.  
2 Treaty of Lunéville (1801).
changed his post-horses. The National Convention began the work of replacing this multiplicity of laws — Frankish, Roman, feudal, and royal — by a single uniform code. Napoleon and the commission of legal experts over whose deliberations he presided finished the task after about four years' labor. The *Code Napoléon* embodied many revolutionary principles, such as civil equality, religious toleration, and jury trial, and carried these principles into the foreign lands conquered by the French. It is still the prevailing law of both France and Belgium, while the codes of modern Holland, Italy, and Portugal have taken it as a model.

Napoleon also healed the religious schism which had divided France since the Revolution. Though not himself an adherent of any form of Christianity, he felt the necessity of conciliating the many French Catholics who remained faithful to Rome. An agreement, called the Concordat, was now drawn up, providing for the restoration of Catholicism as the state religion. Napoleon reserved to himself the appointment of bishops and archbishops, and the pope gave up all claims to the confiscated property of the Church. The Concordat formed a singularly politic measure, for by confirming the peasantry in their possession of the ecclesiastical lands it bound up their interests with those of Napoleon. It continued to regulate the relations between France and the Papacy for more than a century.¹

Nor did Napoleon forget the *émigrés*. A law was soon passed extending amnesty to the nobles who had fled from France. More than forty thousand families now returned to their native land.

A long list might be drawn up of the other measures which exhibit Napoleon’s qualities as a statesman. Thus he founded the Bank of France, still one of the leading financial institutions of the world. He established a system of higher education to take the place of the colleges and universities which had been abolished by a decree of the National Convention. He planned and partly carried out

¹ *From 1802 to 1905.*
The structure now serves as a church. The structure was the House of a Roman temple, with a colonnade of Corinthian pillars.

Begin in 1802 by Napoleon. Not completed until 1862. The Emperor planned to be a "Hall of Fame" to commemorate his victories, but it never was.
a vast network of canals and inland waterways, thus improving
the means of communication and trade throughout France.
Like the Roman emperors, he constructed a system of military
highways radiating from the capital city to the remotest dé-
partements, in addition to two wonderful Alpine roads con-
necting France with Italy. Like the Romans, also, he had a
taste for building, and many of the monuments which make
Paris so splendid a city belong to the Napoleonic era.

56. The First French Empire, 1804

Napoleon’s victories in war and his policies in peace gained
for him the support of all Frenchmen except the Jacobins,
who would not admit that the Revolution had
ended, and the royalists, who wished to restore
the Bourbon monarchy. When in 1802 the
people were asked to vote on the question, “Shall Napoleon
Bonaparte be consul for life?” the answering “ayes” numbered
over three and a half millions, the “noes” only a few thousands.
Another plebiscite in 1804 decided, by an equally large majority,
that the First Consul should become emperor. Before the
high altar of Notre Dame Cathedral at Paris and in the presence
of the pope, the modern Charlemagne placed a golden laurel
wreath upon his own head and assumed the title of Napoleon I,
emperor of the French.

Napoleon also proceeded to erect a monarchy on Italian soil.

At Milan he crowned himself king, as Charle-
magne had done, with the “Iron Crown” of the
Lombards. North Italy thus became practically
an annex of France.

The emperor-king set up again at the Tuileries the etiquette
and ceremonial of the Old Régime. Already he had estab-
lished the Legion of Honor to reward those who
most industriously served him. Now he created
a nobility. His relatives and ministers became kings, princes,
dukes, and counts; his ablest generals became marshals of
France. “My titles,” Napoleon declared, “are a sort of civic
crown; one can win them through one’s own efforts.”
France, intoxicated with the imperial glory, forgot that she had come under the rule of one man. What hostile criticism Frenchmen might have leveled against Napoleon was stifled by the secret police, who arrested and imprisoned hundreds of persons obnoxious to the emperor. The censorship of books and newspapers prevented any expression of public opinion. Many journals were suppressed; the remainder were allowed to publish only articles approved by the government. Even the schools and churches were made pillars of the new order, and Napoleon went so far as to prepare a catechism setting forth the duty of good Christians to love, respect, and obey their emperor. In all these ways he established a despotism as unqualified as that of Louis XIV.

57. Napoleon at War with Europe, 1805–1807

The wars of the French Revolution, beginning in a conflict between democracy and monarchy, gradually became a means of gratifying the French lust for territorial expansion. With the advent of Napoleon they appeared still more clearly as wars of conquest. The “successor of Charlemagne,” who carried the Roman eagles on his military standards, dreamed of universal sovereignty. Supreme in France, he would also be supreme in Europe. No lasting peace was possible with such a man, unless the European nations submitted tamely to his will. They would not submit, and as a result the Continent for ten years was drenched with blood.

Instituted by Napoléon in 1803; given to both soldiers and civilians for distinguished services to the state. In the present order of the French Republic the symbolical head of the republic appears in the center, and a laurel wreath replaces the imperial crown.
Austria in the revolutionary wars had been the chief opponent of France; in the wars of Napoleon Great Britain became his most persistent and relentless enemy. That island-kingdom, which had defeated the grandiose schemes of Philip II and Louis XIV, could never consent to the creation of a French empire restricting her trade in the profitable markets of the Continent and dominating western Europe. To preserve the European balance of power Great Britain formed coalition after coalition, using her money, her ships, and her soldiers unsparingly, and at length successfully, in the effort.

The prime minister of Great Britain during this period was William Pitt, the Younger, son of the earl of Chatham. He became head of the state when only twenty-four, shortly after the downfall of Lord North’s ministry.\(^1\) As an orator few have rivaled him; as a parliamentary leader he has no rival. Disdaining the bribery which had been employed since the days of Walpole, Pitt ruled by the sheer power of his intellect and the fascination of his personality. His life was pure and honest in an age when immorality and intrigue were all too common; and he loved his country with a devotion to which he sacrificed health and fortune.

The Peace of Amiens lasted little over a year. The war between Great Britain and France being then renewed, Napoleon made every preparation to overthrow “perfidious Albion.” He collected an army and a flotilla

\(^1\) See page 82.
THE BATTLE OF TRAFALGAR

After the painting by W. C. Staniland.
WILLIAM PITT, THE YOUNGER
After the painting by John Hoppner.
of flat-bottomed boats near Boulogne, apparently intending to "jump the ditch," as he called the Channel, and lead his soldiers to London. If this was ever his intention, it became impossible of accomplishment after Lord Nelson’s victory off Cape Trafalgar, over the combined French and Spanish fleets. Nelson received a mortal wound in the action, but he died with the knowledge that his country would henceforth remain in undisputed control of the seas. "England," said Pitt, "has saved herself by her own energy, and will, I trust, save Europe by her example."

Meanwhile, Pitt had succeeded in forming the Third Coalition against France and Napoleon. Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Sweden were the four allied powers. Before they could strike a blow, Napoleon suddenly broke up his camp at Boulogne, moved swiftly into Germany, captured an entire Austrian army at Ulm, and entered Vienna. These successes were followed by the celebrated battle of Austerlitz, a masterpiece of strategy, at which Napoleon with inferior numbers shattered the Austro-Russian forces. With his capital lost, his territory occupied, his armies destroyed, the Hapsburg emperor once more consented to an ignominious peace. The Venetian lands, which Austria
acquired by the Treaty of Campo Formio, were now added to Napoleon's kingdom of Italy.¹

Prussia was next to feel the mailed fist of Napoleon. Relying upon the help of Saxony and Russia, she attempted to stay his victorious progress, only to suffer the loss of two armies in the double battle of Jena. Napoleon soon entered Berlin in triumph. Russia still remained formidable, until a bad defeat at Friedland induced the tsar, Alexander I, to make overtures for peace.

The two emperors met at Tilsit on the river Niemen, near the frontier between Prussia and Russia, and concluded a bargain for the partition of Europe. The tsar agreed to throw over his allies and allow Napoleon a free hand in the West. Napoleon permitted the tsar to seize Finland from Sweden and promised French aid in expelling the Turks from Europe. When, however, the tsar asked for the Turkish capital, Napoleon exclaimed, "Constantinople! Never! That would be the mastery of the world."

No sovereign in modern times was ever so powerful as Napoleon after Tilsit. If he had failed on the sea, he had won complete success on the land, and the triumphs of Ulm, of Austerlitz, of Jena, and of Friedland hid from view the disaster of Trafalgar. Napoleon's victories are explained only in part by his mastery of the art of war. The emperor inherited the splendid citizen-soldiery of the revolutionary era, a whole nation under arms and filled with the idea of carrying "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" throughout Europe. The hired troops of the absolute monarchies, on the contrary, had little enthusiasm for their cause. Slight wonder that in conflict with them Napoleon's legions always gained the day.

58. Napoleon's Reorganization of Europe

Napoleon at the zenith of his power ruled directly over a large part of western Europe. Even before the Peace of Tilsit he had added Genoa (the Ligurian Republic) and Piedmont

¹ Treaty of Pressburg (1805).
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to France and had converted Holland (the former Batavian Republic) into a dependent kingdom. Holland subsequently became a part of the Napoleonic Empire. After Tilsit he annexed the German coast as far as Denmark, what remained of the States of the Church, including Rome, and the Illyrian provinces east of Italy. Imperial France touched the Baltic on the north, and on the south faced the Adriatic.

Beyond the empire stood a belt of dependencies. Northern Italy, including the former Cisalpine Republic and the ancient possessions of Venice, formed a separate kingdom, held by Napoleon himself and administered by his stepson, Eugène Beauharnais.¹ His brother Joseph governed the kingdom of Naples in central and southern Italy. Switzerland, enlarged by six new cantons added to the thirteen original cantons, became a vassal republic which Napoleon ruled with the title of Mediator. The sections of Polish territory seized by Prussia and Austria in the second and third partitions, went to form the Grand Duchy of Warsaw; not, however, under a Polish ruler, but under Napoleon’s new ally, the king of Saxony. “Roll up the map of Europe,” William Pitt had cried, when he heard the news of Austerlitz, “it will not be wanted these ten years.”

Napoleon’s power in central Europe rested upon the Confederation of the Rhine. This organization included Bavaria, Baden, and Württemberg, and in its final form all the German states except Austria and Prussia. As sovereign of the league, under the title of Protector, Napoleon disposed of its military forces and conducted its foreign relations.

The formation of the Confederation of the Rhine gave the death-blow to the Holy Roman Empire. That venerable institution, which went back to Otto the Great and Charlemagne, had by this time become little more than a name, an empty form, a shadow without substance. When Napoleon declared that

¹ Son of Napoleon’s wife, Joséphine, by her first husband.
he would recognize it no longer, the Hapsburg ruler laid down the crown and contented himself with the title of emperor of Austria.

Many other European states not actually dependent on Napoleon were allied with him. They included Spain, which subsequently became a dependency, Denmark, Norway, the kingdom of Prussia, now reduced to about a half of its former size, and the weakened Austrian Empire. But Great Britain, mistress of the seas, still held out against the master of the Continent.

§9. The Continental System

The failure of Napoleon's Egyptian expedition prevented him from striking at Great Britain through her possessions in the East. His hope of invading her vanished at Trafalgar. His efforts to destroy her commerce by sending out innumerable privateers to prey upon it were foiled when British merchantmen sailed in convoys under the protection of ships of war. One alternative remained. If British manufacturers could be deprived of their Continental markets and British ship-owners and sailors of their carrying trade, it might be possible to compel the "nation of shop-keepers"\(^1\) to make peace with him on his own terms.

Napoleon's successes on land enabled him to devise a scheme for the strangulation of Great Britain. By two decrees issued at Berlin and Milan he placed that country under a commercial interdict. British ships and goods were to be excluded from France and her dependencies, while neutral vessels sailing from any British port were to be seized by French warships or privateers.

Napoleon endeavored to enforce these decrees in the French Empire, the Italian kingdom, the Confederation of the Rhine, and the Grand Duchy of Warsaw. Russia and Prussia agreed to enforce them by the terms of the Peace of Tilsit. At one time or another all the

\(^1\) A Napoleonic phrase.
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states of Europe, except Great Britain and Turkey, came into the Continental System.

The British government replied to the Berlin and Milan decrees by various Orders in Council, which forbade neutral ships from trading with France, her dependencies, or her allies under penalty of capture. As Napoleon sought to exclude Great Britain from Continental markets, so that country sought to shut out Napoleon from maritime commerce. The sea-power of Great Britain made it possible for her to blockade the Continent with some degree of effectiveness.

Napoleon, on the other hand, could not make the Continental System really effective. British merchants always managed to smuggle large quantities of goods into the European countries. Some goods which the French absolutely required, such as woolens, had to be admitted into France under special license. Napoleon clad his own armies in British cloth, and his soldiers marched in British shoes. Though Great Britain suffered acutely from the emperor's interference with her trade, the Continental nations, deprived of needed manufactures and colonial wares, suffered still more. The result was to excite great bitterness against Napoleon. Nevertheless, he persisted in the attempt to humble his only rival by this economic warfare; as we shall now see, he staked his empire on the success of the Continental System.

60. Revolt of the Nations, 1808–1814

Napoleon hitherto had been fighting kings, not nations; and he had been uniformly victorious. A change came after Tilsit. The emperor's treatment of the conquered peoples aroused the utmost hatred for him. They saw their sons dragged away by the conscription to fight and die in his armies; they paid excessive war taxes; above all, they had to endure the high prices resulting from the Continental System. The time was near at hand when these burdens could no longer be borne. Hence-
forth our chief interest is with the various nations which one after another rose against their common oppressor. France in arms made Napoleon; Europe in arms overthrew him.

The little kingdom of Portugal had been linked to Great Britain by close commercial ties for more than a century. When the Portuguese refused to close their ports to British ships, as Napoleon demanded, he sent an army into the country, seized Lisbon, and drove the royal family to Brazil. Napoleon then proceeded to deprive his friend and ally, Ferdinand VII, of the Spanish crown and gave it to his brother Joseph. These high-handed acts enabled the emperor to extend the Continental System over the Iberian peninsula. What he gained there was more than offset elsewhere. As soon as the Portuguese government removed to Brazil, it opened that country to British trade, and after the Spanish monarchy fell, its colonies revolted from the mother country and admitted British goods. Napoleon thus unwittingly created lucrative markets in Latin America for his rival.

Furthermore, Napoleon found that he had stirred up a veritable hornet's nest in the peninsula. The Portuguese and Spanish declined to accept their French overlords and everywhere rose in revolt. Great Britain took a lively interest in the situation and sent an army commanded by Sir Arthur Wellesley, better known by his subsequent title of duke of Wellington, to help the insurgents. The French were soon driven out of Portugal, nor could they maintain themselves securely in Spain. The Peninsular War,
as it is called, dragged on for years, consuming men and money which Napoleon might have employed much more profitably elsewhere.

Encouraged by the Spanish resistance, Austria tried to throw off the Napoleonic yoke. The effort proved to be premature, though Austria fighting this time alone gave Napoleon far more trouble than when previously she had the help of allies. The French again occupied Vienna and won the hard battle of Wagram. The peace which followed cost the Hapsburg ruler additional territory and a heavy indemnity. It also cost him his daughter Maria Louisa, whose hand Napoleon demanded in marriage after divorcing Joséphine. When Maria Louisa presented the emperor with a son and heir, the so-called "king of Rome," it must have seemed to him that his dynasty was at length firmly fixed on the French throne.¹

Europe, except in Spain and on the seas, now enjoyed peace for two years. It was a brief breathing-spell, while Napoleon made ready for a new and much more terrible contest. Until

¹ The Bonapartes

Charles Bonaparte m. Letitia Ramolino

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joseph</th>
<th>Napoleon I</th>
<th>Louis</th>
<th>Caroline</th>
<th>Jerome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>king of Naples, 1806–1808; king of Spain, 1808–1813</td>
<td>king of Holland, 1806–1810</td>
<td>m. Murat, 1807–1813</td>
<td>king of Westphalia, 1808–1815</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Napoleon II, &quot;king of Rome,&quot; d. 1832</td>
<td>Napoleon III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
now he had induced Tsar Alexander to adhere to the Continental System, which pressed with special severity upon Russia, an agricultural country needing large imports of British manufactures. The tsar at length decided to break his shackles and renew trade relations between Russia and Great Britain. This decision left Napoleon no choice but go to war with him, if the Continental System was to be preserved. Rather than give up the hope of humbling Great Britain, the emperor, against the advice of his wisest counselors, threw down the gage of battle.

More than half a million men formed the Grand Army with which Napoleon began the invasion of Russia. About one-third of the soldiers were French; the rest were Germans, Italians, Poles, and other subjects of the empire. All western Europe had banded together under the leadership of one man to overthrow the only great state remaining unconquered on the Continent. The Russians offered at first little resistance, and the Grand Army reached the river Borodino before they turned at bay. A murderous conflict followed; the French won; and eight days later Napoleon entered the ancient capital of Moscow.

But to occupy Moscow was not to conquer Russia. The French did not dare to follow their enemy farther into the wilderness, nor could they remain for the winter in Moscow,
owing to the scarcity of food for men and horses. The Russian peasants burned their grain and fodder rather than supply the French. Moreover, a great fire, perhaps kindled by the Russians themselves, had destroyed much of the city just as the French entered it. Napoleon lingered for a month among the ruins of Moscow in the belief that Alexander would open negotiations for peace. But no message came from the tsar, and at last the emperor gave orders for the retreat. A southerly route, which the army attempted to follow, was blocked, and the troops had to return by the way they had come, through a country eaten bare of supplies. Famine, cold, desertions, and the incessant raids of the Cossacks thinned their ranks; and at last only twenty thousand broken fugitives recrossed the Niemen to safety. The Grand Army had ceased to exist.¹

This disaster, unparalleled in military annals, thrilled Prussia with hopes of freedom. Thanks to the labors of Baron vom Stein, Chancellor Hardenberg, and other statesmen, it was a new Prussia which confronted Napoleon. Serfdom had been declared illegal, all occupations and professions had been opened to noble, commoner, and peasant alike, a state system of both elementary and secondary education had been established, and the army had been reorganized on the basis of military service for all classes. These reforms gave to Prussia many of the advantages of the French Revolution and aroused a patriotic spirit which united the entire nation in a common love of country.

¹ Tolstoy’s War and Peace deals with Napoleon’s campaigns in Russia.
Prussia now joined forces with Russia and began the War of Liberation.

Yet so vast were Napoleon's resources that he was soon able to recruit a new army and take the offensive in Germany. He gained fresh victories, but could not follow them up because of the lack of cavalry. Austria then threw in her lot with the allies. Outnumbered and outmaneuvered, Napoleon fell back on Leipzig, and there in a three days' "Battle of the Nations" — a battle in which every European people except the Turks was represented — suffered a sanguinary defeat. All Germany now turned against him, and he withdrew his shattered troops across the Rhine.

The allies would have made peace with Napoleon, had he been willing to give up his claims to the overlordship of Europe. They offered him the Rhine, the Alps, the Pyrenees, and the Atlantic as the French boundaries, but he refused to accept the territorial limits that would have satisfied the ambitions of Louis XIV. Napoleon's campaigns during the early months of 1814 against three armies, each one larger than his own, are justly celebrated; they postponed but did not prevent his overthrow. After Paris surrendered, the emperor gave up the useless struggle and signed an act of abdication renouncing for himself and for his heirs the thrones of France and Italy.\(^1\)

\(^1\) Read Byron's *Ode to Napoleon Buonaparte*, written in 1814, after the emperor's abdication.
61. Downfall of Napoleon, 1814–1815

The allies treated Napoleon with marked consideration. They allowed him to retain the title of emperor and assigned him the island of Elba as a possession. He spent ten months in this tiny principality and ruled it with all his accustomed energy, meanwhile keeping a watchful eye upon the course of events in France.

Suddenly Europe heard with amazement that Napoleon had returned to France and that Louis XVIII,¹ his Bourbon successor on the throne, was once more an exile. The enthusiastic welcome which greeted the emperor, as he advanced to Paris with only a small bodyguard, bore witness at once to the magnetism of his personality and to the unpopularity of the Bourbons. In a manifesto to the French people he declared that henceforth he would renounce war and conquest and would govern as a constitutional sovereign. The allies, however, refused to accept the restoration of one whom they very properly described as the "enemy and destroyer of the world's peace." The four great powers, Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, proclaimed Napoleon an outlaw and set their armies in motion toward France.

The allied armies lay in two groups behind the Sambre River. A mixed force of British, Belgians, Dutch, and Germans, under the duke of Wellington, covered Brussels, and the Prussians, under Blücher, held a position farther east. Napoleon hoped to overcome them separately before they could concentrate their overwhelming numbers. He did beat Blücher at Ligny, compelling the Prussian general to retreat northward to Wavre. Blücher's defeat made it necessary for Wellington to fall back on a strong defensive position near Waterloo, twelve miles south of Brussels. Here, all through a hot Sunday in June, Napoleon hurled his infantry and cavalry in fierce

¹ See page 171 and note 1. The young son of Louis XVI ("Louis XVII") is supposed to have died in a revolutionary prison in 1795.
but ineffectual attacks against the "Iron Duke's" lines. The timely arrival of the Prussians from Wavre — Napoleon supposed that they had retreated toward Namur — compelled the French to fight a double battle; their situation soon became desperate; and even a last charge of the Old Guard failed to restore the day. Repulse soon turned into a rout, and Napoleon's splendid army broke up into a mob of fugitives. The emperor himself escaped with difficulty to Paris.¹

Napoleon again abdicated and to avoid the Prussians (who had orders to take him dead or alive) threw himself upon the generosity of the British government. Then followed exile to the desolate rock of St. Helena, where the fallen emperor lived for six years, without wife or child, but surrounded by a few intimate friends to whom he dictated his memoirs. After his death, at the early age of fifty-two, France forgot the sufferings he had caused her and remembered only his glory. Poets, painters, and singers created out of the "Little Corporal" a purely legendary figure. The world-despot appeared as the heir of the Revolution, a crusader for liberty, a foe of tyrants; and in this guise he found his way irresistibly to the hearts of the French people.

¹ Victor Hugo has a famous though inaccurate description of the battle in Les Misérables (part ii, book i). See also Byron's lines, "The Eve of Waterloo," in Childe Harold (canto iii, stanzas 21–28).
NAPOLÉON ON BOARD THE "BELETRON"
A picture by Meissonier of the battle of Friedland. Napoleon is shown seated on his famous white charger and surrounded by his staff. As the cuirassiers advance to the attack, each horseman rises in the saddle and salutes the emperor. Soldiers of the “Old Guard,” wearing grenadier caps and white breeches, are seen drawn up in the rear. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
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After Napoleon's first abdication in 1814 the victorious allies concluded with France a peace which stripped her of all her conquests. After the emperor's second abdication in 1815 the allied powers deemed it necessary to impose still more humiliating conditions of peace. Though France was not dismembered, that country was reduced to substantially her old boundaries before the Revolution. Furthermore, she had to restore all the works of art which Napoleon had pilfered from other countries, to pay an indemnity of seven hundred million francs, and for five years to support a foreign army in her chief fortresses. It is noteworthy, however, that the desire of Prussia for the French provinces of Alsace and Lorraine was not at this time gratified.

62. The Napoleonic Era

It remains to sum up the work of Napoleon. In general, he continued the work of the Revolution. If he destroyed the republic, he did not restore the Old Régime. His empire rested upon the Revolutionary principles of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity."

Despot though Napoleon was, his plebiscites show that he paid at least lip homage to the new idea of popular sovereignty, of government resting upon the consent of the governed. It is certain that during both the consulate and the empire he enjoyed the support of the great majority of Frenchmen. On the other hand, he did not respect all the "rights of man" which the revolutionists had proclaimed with such enthusiasm. Freedom of thought and freedom of worship prevailed under Napoleon, but the emperor allowed neither free speech nor a free press.

Equality before the law and equality of opportunity Napoleon fully recognized. The "career open to talents" formed for him the heart and core of democracy. Citizens of all ranks might freely compete for offices, honors, wealth, and other distinctions. Under such a system there would still be rich and poor, learned and ignorant,

1 See the map facing page 180.  2 See pages 188 and 192.
industrious and shiftless, but each one would enjoy the fullest opportunity for self-development and advancement. Most Frenchmen were content to accept Napoleon’s rule largely because he insisted upon equal rights for all men.

The patriotic and national sentiments "Fraternity" under evoked Napoleon during the Revolution only became stronger when the republic passed into the empire. Those tremendous campaigns which carried the Napoleonic armies from Paris to Moscow and from Berlin and Warsaw to Naples and Madrid dazzled the eyes of most Frenchmen. They willingly exchanged the tricolor for the imperial eagles and, as we have just seen, they supported Napoleon to the last. After Waterloo there lingered many memories of victorious battles in foreign lands, of conquered countries, plundered cities, subjected peoples. The French, in consequence, developed a spirit of overweening pride and a belief in their natural superi-
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ority which only disappeared after the Franco-German War, several generations later. Such was the fruit of militarism.

Napoleon was an agent of the Revolution, not only in France, but in all the lands subject to French influence. Wherever the Code Napoléon went, the forms of feudalism and serfdom, class privileges, and social inequalities vanished. The trained officials sent out by the emperor reformed finances, made roads, built bridges, improved harbors, encouraged trade, fostered education. For the first time the inhabitants of the Netherlands, most of the German states, Switzerland, Italy, and Spain discovered what it meant to have an efficient government. Could Napoleon’s activity have ended here, he would have earned the unmixed gratitude of mankind. As it was, even the blessings of his rule could not reconcile the subject nations to his despotism. They rose against it, and their successful struggle for independence ushered in a new period of European history.

Studies

1. Locate on the map all the Napoleonic battle-fields mentioned in this chapter.
2. Write a character sketch (400 words) of Napoleon Bonaparte, based partly on the statements in the text and partly on your outside reading. 3. How did the First Consul, to use his own words, “close” the French Revolution and “consolidate” its results? 4. Why was Napoleon styled by the lawyers a new Justinian and by the clergy a new Constantine? 5. Is it correct to call Napoleon an “enlightened” despot? Is it incorrect to call him a “usurper”? 6. Compare as to results the battle of Trafalgar with the destruction of the Spanish Armada. 7. Show that the political weakness of central Europe in Napoleon’s day contributed to his success as a conqueror. 8. How did the Continental System help to bring about the downfall of Napoleon? 9. How did the physical features of Spain facilitate the Spanish resistance to Napoleon? 10. Why is Waterloo included among the world’s “decisive battles”? Would it have been equally decisive if Napoleon, and not Wellington, had won? 11. It has been said of Napoleon that “he was as great as a man can be without virtue.” Does this seem to be a fair judgment? 12. Account for the comparatively mild treatment of France by the allies, after Napoleon’s downfall.
CHAPTER IX

RECONSTRUCTION AND REACTION, 1815–1830

63. The Congress of Vienna

The close of the revolutionary and Napoleonic era found Europe in confusion. The French Revolution had destroyed the Old Régime in France, and Napoleon Bonaparte had given new rulers or new boundaries to almost every Continental state. While the fallen emperor was still at Elba, a great international congress met at Vienna in September, 1814, to restore the old dynasties and remake the European map. The powers represented were Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, Russia, Sweden, Portugal, Spain, and France.

The congress formed a brilliant assemblage of emperors, kings, princes of every rank, and titled diplomats. A single drawing room sometimes held Alexander I, tsar of Russia; Francis I, emperor of Austria; Frederick William III, king of Prussia; the duke of Wellington, the German patriot Stein, the Austrian minister Metternich, and the French representative Talleyrand. The final decision as to all questions obviously lay with the four powers whose alliance had overthrown Napoleon, until Talleyrand’s skilful management secured the admission of France to their councils as a fifth great power. When the wheels of diplomacy had been well oiled by banquets, balls, and other festivities, the monarchs and their advisers undertook the reconstruction of Europe.

Only by courtesy could the meeting at Vienna be called a congress. As a matter of fact, it never held open sessions with general debates. All the work was done privately by committees of plenipotentiaries, who signed treaties between the various states. These treaties
were then brought together in a single document called the Final Act of the Congress of Vienna (June, 1815).

64. Restoration of the Dynasties

The aristocrats who assembled at Vienna were opposed, naturally enough, to all the democratic or liberal sentiments which had been awakened in Europe since 1789. The French Revolution appeared to them as merely a revolt against authority, a revolt which had overturned the social order, destroyed property, sacrificed countless human lives, and introduced confusion everywhere. Blind to the true significance of the demand for liberty and equality, they sought to bring back the Old Régime of absolutism, privilege, and divine right. Their ideal was Europe before 1789.

The first business at Vienna was therefore the restoration of "Legitimacy." The congress asserted the right of European monarchs to govern their former subjects, irrespective of the latter's wishes or of the claims of the rulers whom Napoleon had established. Talleyrand dignified this principle under the name of "legitimacy."

Louis XVIII, who now went back to France, was an old gentleman of sixty, and so fat and gouty that he could not sit a horse. This cool, cautious Bourbon wanted to enjoy his power in peace; like Charles II of England, he had no desire to set out on his travels again. He

1 See page 205 and note 1.
realized that to most Frenchmen absolutism had become intolerable and that the main results of the revolutionary and Napoleonic era must be preserved. Accordingly, Louis XVIII retained such institutions as the Code, the Concordat, the Bank of France, and the imperial nobility, and renewed a charter or constitution, which he had granted in 1814. It guaranteed freedom of the press, religious toleration, and the inviolability of sales of land made during the Revolution. The restoration of the Bourbon monarchy did not mean the restoration of the Old Régime in France.

Ferdinand VII, another king whom Napoleon had de-throned, went back to Spain. This Spanish Bourbon had no sooner recovered his crown than he began to sweep away all traces of revolutionary ideas and institutions introduced by the French. A constitution, modeled upon that of France, which the Spaniards had framed in 1812, was suppressed, because it denied divine right and asserted the sovereignty of the people. The old privileges of the clergy and nobility were reaffirmed. The censorship of books and newspapers, the prohibition of public meetings, and the imprisonment or banishment of all those suspected of liberal opinions showed clearly the reactionary character of the new government.

Still other dispossessed monarchs profited by the principle of "legitimacy." The king of Sardinia regained Nice, Savoy, and Piedmont on the mainland, together with the former republic of Genoa as an additional protection against France. "Republics are no longer fashionable," said the tsar to a Genoese deputation which had objected to this arbitrary arrangement. Sicily and Naples were again combined to form the kingdom of the Two Sicilies under a Bourbon ruler. The pope, whom Napoleon had deprived of temporal sovereignty, recovered the States of the Church. All these restored princes governed without constitutions or parliaments. They used their absolute power to get rid of every trace of the revolutionary era, even uprooting French
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plants in the botanical gardens and abolishing vaccination and gas street lamps as nefarious French innovations. The restorations in Italy, as in Spain, spelled reaction.

65. Territorial Readjustments

As we have already learned, the fraternal or patriotic feelings so deeply stirred during the revolutionary and Napoleonic era put renewed emphasis on the rights of nationalities. Patriots in one country after another boldly declared that no nation, however small or weak, should be governed by foreigners. Every nation, on the contrary, ought to be free to choose its own form of government and manage its own affairs. To such “submerged nationalities” as the Belgians, Bohemians, Poles, and Magyars this principle held out the hope of independence; to the Italians and the Germans it held out the hope of unification. Like the “enlightened despots,” however, the rulers and diplomats at Vienna willfully disregarded all national aspirations. They treated the European peoples as so many pawns in the game of diplomacy.

In general, the territorial readjustments made by the congress were intended to compensate the great powers for their exertions against Napoleon. Land hunger thus influenced the Vienna settlement, as it had influenced the earlier treaties of Utrecht and Westphalia. The principle of “compensations,” however, had to be modified by the assumed necessity of strengthening the neighbors of France against future aggression on the part of that country. The total result was a new map of Europe.

The oldest and most successful of Napoleon’s enemies, Great Britain, did not desire Continental territories. She received colonial possessions as payment, including Helgoland in the North Sea and Malta and the Ionian Islands in the Mediterranean. Great Britain also retained the former Dutch colonies of Ceylon, Cape Colony, and Guiana, which had been appropriated during the Napoleonic wars.¹

¹ A part of Guiana (Surinam) was kept by the Dutch.
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A new state arose across the Channel. In order to compensate the Dutch for the loss of their possessions overseas and at the same time to set up a strong bulwark against France, the congress united the Austrian Netherlands—modern Belgium—with Holland. The kingdom of the Netherlands, as thus established, was under the rule of the house of Orange. This arbitrary union of Belgians and Dutch soon led to acute friction between the two peoples.

As compensation for the cession of the Austrian Netherlands, Austria secured Lombardy and Venetia, the two richest provinces in Italy. She also received the Illyrian lands along the Adriatic coast, part of Poland (Galicia), and all the other territory taken from her by Napoleon. Austria was now a state geographically compact, centering round the middle Danube and controlling North Italy and the northern Adriatic.

The Prussian kingdom, whose limits had been so reduced by Napoleon, recovered part of Poland (Posen), took over from Sweden what remained of western Pomerania, and absorbed about half of Saxony, a state which had been one of Napoleon’s allies. Prussia also annexed much additional territory on the lower Rhine. The inhabitants of the Rhine provinces had little enough affinity with the Prussians, and after twenty years’ union with France did not willingly change their nationality. In spite of these territorial acquisitions, Prussia remained almost as unformed as in the eighteenth century, with her dominions scattered throughout Germany.

Another great power widened its boundaries at this time. Russia kept Finland, taken from Sweden in 1809, and Bessarabia, wrested from Turkey in 1812. In addition, Russia obtained the lion’s share of Napoleon’s Grand Duchy of Warsaw. Tsar Alexander proceeded to set up a kingdom of Poland, with himself as king.

For the cession of western Pomerania to Prussia and of Finland to Russia, Sweden found compensation in taking
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Norway from Denmark. The only excuse for this action was the former alliance of the Danes with Napoleon, Sweden an alliance which had been practically forced upon them. The Norwegians themselves resented the new arrangement, preferring a Danish to a Swedish ruler. Though compelled to submit, they succeeded in keeping their own government, constitution, and laws. Their union with the Swedes lasted just ninety years.

The Swiss Confederation, or Switzerland, whose independence had been recognized at the Peace of Westphalia, received its final form at the Congress of Vienna. Three Switzerland new cantons were added to the nineteen in existence before 1815. The great powers also signed a treaty promising never to declare war against Switzerland or to send troops across the Swiss borders. The little Alpine republic became in this way a neutral buffer state in the heart of Europe.

The settlement of Vienna left Italy a mosaic of nine states. Of these, Sardinia formed an independent kingdom. Lombardy and Venetia were Austrian provinces. Parma, Modena, Tuscany, and Lucca were duchies, all but the last under rulers belonging to the Hapsburg family. Austrian influence also prevailed in the States of the Church and in the Two Sicilies. Thus Austria, a foreign power, fixed its grip upon the Italian peninsula. Italy, in Metternich's contemptuous phrase, was only "a geographical expression."

Germany after the settlement of Vienna included thirty-nine states and free cities, of which the most extensive were the Austrian Empire and the five kingdoms of Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Württemberg, and Hanover. Stein and his fellow-patriots wished to bring them all into a strongly knit union. This proposal encountered the opposition of Metternich, who feared that a united Germany would not serve Austrian interests. Metternich found support among the German rulers themselves, not one of whom would surrender any particle of his authority. The outcome was the creation of the Germanic Confederation,

1 Eleven, if Monaco and San Marino be included. See the map on page 260.
a loose association of sovereign princes with a Diet or assembly presided over by a representative of the Austrian emperor.\footnote{Both the kingdom of Prussia and the Austrian Empire contained territories not included in the confederation. See the map facing page 264.}

The Congress of Vienna may properly be charged with grave shortcomings. It rode rough-shod over popular rights and disappointed the hopes of Germans, Italians, Norwegians, Poles, and Belgians for freedom. Its failure to satisfy either the democratic or national aspirations of Europe has left a heritage of trouble even to our own day. The political history of the last hundred years is very largely concerned with the triumph of both democracy and nationalism, and the consequent changes of territory and government. What the Viennese map makers constructed was not a lasting settlement of the difficult problems before them, but rather a new balance of power, cunningly contrived yet nevertheless unstable. There now remained, as in the eighteenth century, five great states: Great Britain and France in the west; Austria and Prussia competing in the center; and in the east Russia. No one of them was strong enough to dominate the others. Together they managed to preserve peace in Europe for the next forty years.

66. "Metternichismus"

Austria, now the leading Continental state, consisted of more than a score of territories inhabited by ungenial Germans, Magyars, Slavs, Rumanians, and Austrians. To keep them united under a single scepter, the Hapsburgs deliberately repressed all agitation for independence or self-government. The Hapsburgs felt it equally necessary to discourage every popular movement, which, starting in Italy or Germany, might spread like an infection to their own dominions. "My realm," confessed the emperor Francis I, "is like a worm-eaten house; if a part of it is removed, one cannot tell how much will fall." Force of circumstances thus placed Austria at the forefront of the reaction against democracy.
The spirit of reactionary Austria seemed incarnate in Prince Clemens Metternich. He belonged to an old and distinguished family from the Rhinelands, entered the diplomatic service of Austria, and during the Napoleonic era rose to be the chief representative of the Hapsburg emperor at Paris. An aristocrat to his finger-tips, polished, courtly, tactful, clever, this man soon became the real head of the Austrian government and the most influential diplomat in Europe. To the rule of Napoleon succeeded the rule of Metternich. The German word *Metternichismus* has been coined to express the ideas which he championed and the measures which he enforced.

Metternich regarded absolutism and divine right as the pillars of stable government. Democracy, he declared, could only "change daylight into darkest night." All The Metternich system demands for constitutions, parliaments, and representative institutions must consequently be opposed to the uttermost. In order to stamp out the "disease of liberalism," let spies and secret police be multiplied, press and pulpit kept under gag-laws, the universities sharply watched for dangerous teachings, and all agitators exiled, imprisoned, or executed. Such measures of repression seemed quite feasible at a time when the majority of European peoples were ignorant peasants, far removed from public life. Democratic ideas could only find followers among the workingmen of the cities and in the educated bourgeoisie, both very small and defenseless when confronted by the powerful forces at the disposal of governments. Metternich, in fact, found little difficulty in establishing his system in Austria. He then proceeded to establish it in the other states of the Germanic Confederation.

It had seemed for a time that the successful struggle against Napoleon would be followed by the setting up of free political institutions throughout Germany. Frederick William III, the Prussian king, promised his loyal and patriotic subjects a charter, something like that accorded by Louis XVIII to the French. The grand duke of Saxe-Weimar actually granted a written constitution, establishing
a representative assembly and guaranteeing the equality of all classes before the law. That the liberal movement did not proceed further was largely due to Metternich, who exerted the same reactionary influence over Frederick William III and the other German princes as over his imperial master, Francis I.

German liberalism at this time centered in the universities, where students and teachers had together formed numerous secret societies — Burschenschaften. The members adopted a flag of black, red, and gold, the colors of the volunteers during the War of Liberation. Their motto was "Honor, Liberty, Fatherland"; their purpose, agitation for German unity and freedom.

In 1817, the fourth anniversary of the battle of Leipzig and the three-hundredth anniversary of the publication of Luther's theses against indulgences, a celebration by the Burschenschaften took place in Saxe-Weimar. The place chosen was the castle of the Wartburg, so memorable in Reformation history. On the evening of the festival some of the more radical spirits gathered around a bonfire and, in imitation of Luther's burning of the papal bull, threw into the flames certain reactionary books, together with such symbols of military tyranny as an officer's baton and a private soldier's pigtail. Metternich regarded these harmless proceedings as the beginning of a revolution. His fears seemed justified when a German spy in the secret pay of Russia was assassinated by a student patriot, and an attempt was made on the life of a government official in Nassau.

Such outbreaks gave Metternich his cue. Having persuaded the Austrian and Prussian monarchs to summon a conference of the rulers at Carlsbad, he secured their approval of a series of measures intended to quell the spirit of revolt. The Carlsbad Decrees, as afterwards ratified by the Diet of the confederation, dissolved the Burschenschaften and prohibited the display of its colors, even in the popular combination of black coats, red waistcoats, and yellow straw hats. Both professors and students were to be expelled.
from the universities for unseemly political activity. A rigid press censorship was set up to examine every newspaper, pamphlet, or book before publication and thus to stifle the free expression of opinion. The frightened princes also established a permanent commission for the purpose of keeping track of "revolutionary plots and demagogic associations."

The Carlsbad Decrees signalized the triumph of Metternichism in Germany. Outside of Bavaria, Baden, Württemberg, and a few other German states, whose rulers conceded constitutions, reaction had full swing. This was notably the case in Prussia, where the weak and timorous Frederick William III docilely followed Austrian leadership. He never kept his promise of a constitution, but began instead a persecution of all liberal thinkers, even of the heroes of the War of Liberation. Prussia thus early appeared as a stronghold of conservatism.

67. The Concert of Europe

The states whose coalitions overthrew Napoleon became in 1815 the arbiters of Europe. Great Britain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia renewed their alliance, in order to preserve the dynastic and territorial arrangements made by the Congress of Vienna. In 1818 France under Louis XVIII was admitted into the sacred circle of the alliance. The French, during three years' probation, had fulfilled the obligations imposed upon them by the allies after Waterloo and, as far as appearances went, had extinguished forever their revolutionary fires. These five great powers, as long as they worked in harmony, could enforce their will on all the smaller states. They formed, in effect, a European Concert.

The agreements establishing the Concert pledged its members to the maintenance of "public peace, the tranquillity of states, the inviolability of possessions, and the faith of treaties." High sounding words! Europe in 1815 was not ready for a genuine international league to safeguard the rights of each country, whether big or little. The defects of the Concert were obvious. First, it did not extend to Tur-
key in Europe, whose Christian inhabitants languished under the tyranny of the Sultan. Second, it was dynastic rather than popular in character—a union of sovereigns instead of peoples. Of the five leading states, all but Great Britain were divine-right monarchies. Third, it lacked effective machinery for reconciling the contrary interests, ambitions, and jealousies of the members. The Concert, in short, formed only a distant approach to the ideal of a confederated Europe, of a commonwealth of nations.

Metternich, the leading spirit in the formation of the Concert of Europe, found in it the means of extending his system from the German states to the rest of the Continent. One of the clauses of the treaty of alliance between the powers had provided that they should hold congresses from time to time for the consideration of the measures "most salutary for the repose and prosperity of nations and for the peace of Europe." Four such congresses\(^1\) were convoked by Metternich, whose diplomatic genius turned them into agencies of reaction.

How soon the Concert degenerated from a high court of justice for all peoples into a mere league for the protection of princes against revolution was seen at the Congress of Troppau. Here the sovereigns of Austria, Prussia, and Russia took it upon themselves to act as the policemen of Europe. The protocol, or declaration, signed by them at this time ran as follows: "States which have undergone a change of government due to revolution, the results of which threaten other states, ipso facto cease to be members of the European alliance, and remain excluded from it until their situation gives guarantees for legal order and stability. If, owing to such alterations, immediate danger threatens other states, the powers bind themselves, by peaceful means, or if need be by arms, to bring back the guilty state into the bosom of the Great Alliance."

The Protocol of Troppau announced a doctrine new to international law. The European autocrats now boldly asserted

\(^1\) Aix-la-Chapelle (1818), Troppau (1820), Laibach (1821), and Verona (1822).
their right, and even their duty, to intervene in the affairs of any country for the suppression of democratic or national movements. France did not sign this outrageous document. Neither did Great Britain. Her statesmen, members of a government which dated from the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688, had now begun to comprehend the real character of the Concert as directed by Metternich, and to see in it a deadly menace to the liberties of Europe. Undaunted by British protests, however, the three eastern powers prepared for armed intervention.

1820 was a year of revolutions. A widespread uprising in Spain against Ferdinand VII forced that tyrannical monarch to restore the constitution of 1812 and to convene a liberal parliament. An insurrection in Portugal overthrew the regency which had governed there since the removal of the royal family to Brazil during the Napoleonic era.\(^1\) John VI, then reigning in Brazil, returned to Portugal and promised to rule as a constitutional sovereign. Encouraged by these successes, the people of Naples (a part of the kingdom of the Two Sicilies) compelled their Bourbon prince to grant a constitution.

Metternichismus did not long remain on the defensive. An Austrian army quickly occupied Naples and restored "order" and absolutism. In the reaction which followed the liberal leaders were hurried to the dungeon and the scaffold. Almost at the same time a revolt in the Sardinian kingdom (Piedmont) collapsed under the pressure of eighty thousand Austrian bayonets. Metternich felt well satisfied with his work. "I see the dawn of a better day," he wrote. "Heaven seems to will it that the world shall not be lost."

Armed intervention soon registered another triumph. The three eastern powers commissioned France to act as their agent to subdue the turbulent Spaniards. Great Britain protested vigorously against this action and asserted the right of every people to determine

---

\(^1\) See page 200.
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its own form of government. Her protests were unheeded. French troops crossed the Pyrenees and put Ferdinand once more on his autocratic throne. The king then proceeded to inaugurate a reign of terror, exiling, imprisoning, and executing liberals by the thousands. It is a sorry chapter in Spanish history.

The sovereigns were now ready to crusade against freedom in Spain’s American colonies, which had revolted against the mother land. Both Great Breaches in Britain and the United States felt thoroughly alarmed at the prospect of European interference in the affairs of the New World. George Canning, the British foreign minister, made it clear to the governments of France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia that as long as Great Britain controlled the seas no country other than Spain should acquire the colonies either by cession or by conquest. Canning’s policy received the emphatic support of President Monroe in his message to Congress (1823), in which he said: “We owe it, therefore, to candor, and to the amicable relations existing between the United States and those powers, to declare that we should consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety.” ¹ Shortly afterwards both the United States and Great Britain recognized the independence of the Spanish-American republics. A second breach in the European Concert opened when Russia, absolutist but orthodox, supported a rebellion of the Greeks against their Turkish

¹ The so-called Monroe Doctrine.
oppressors. It remained, however, for another democratic revolution in France to deal the most effective blow against Metternich and all his works.

Studies

1. "The nineteenth century is precisely the history of the work which the French Revolution left." Comment on this statement. 2. Mention some instances of the disregard of nationalism by the Congress of Vienna. 3. Why was the neutrality of Switzerland guaranteed by the great powers in 1815? Has Swiss neutrality been violated since this time? 4. May any excuses be offered for the "shortcomings" of the Congress of Vienna? 5. "The name of Metternich has become a synonym for reaction and conservatism." Explain this statement. 6. What justification can be given for Metternichism? 7. To what extent was the Concert of Europe, as established in 1815–1818, a League for Peace? 8. Why has the Concert been called a "mutual insurance society of sovereigns"? 9. Why may the period between 1815 and 1822 be called the era of the congresses? 10. What is the meaning of Canning's remark, "I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old"?
CHAPTER X

THE DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT IN EUROPE,
1830–1848

68. Modern Democracy

The idea of democracy, so emphasized by the American and French revolutions, has been a potent influence in molding modern history. What is democracy? The word comes from the Greek and means popular rule—"government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Democracy is thus distinguished from autocracy, the rule of one, and from aristocracy or oligarchy, the rule of a few.

Ancient democracy was exclusive. All the people did not rule, even in the most democratic of Greek cities. Slaves, a very considerable element of the population, enjoyed no political rights, while freedmen and foreigners were seldom allowed to take part in public affairs. A democratic state at the present time does not recognize any slave class, freely admits foreigners to citizenship, and grants the suffrage to all native-born and naturalized men, irrespective of birth, property, or social condition. The recent extension of the suffrage to women in several progressive countries marks the final step in broadening the conception of "the people" to include practically all adult citizens.

As a working system of government, democracy implies the sway of majorities. It is usually impossible to wait until all the people are of one mind regarding proposed measures or policies. A unanimous or nearly unanimous decision is best, of course; failing that, we must "count heads" and see which side has the more adherents. A democratic government which did not enforce the will of the majority would be a contradiction in terms. How far should the sway of a majority go? If it goes so far
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as to suppress free opinion, free speech, and free discussion in a public press, then there is little to choose between the absolutism of a democracy and the absolutism of an autocracy. A majority can be as tyrannical as any divine-right monarch. The danger of abusing majority rule makes it necessary to safeguard the rights of minorities, whether great or small. After a decision has been reached upon any question, the minority should still be entitled to convert (if it can) the majority to its views by free and open debate. In this way democratic government comes to rest upon common consent, upon the willing cooperation of all the citizens.

Democracy in antiquity was direct, while that of to-day is representative. Every citizen of Athens or Rome had a right to appear and vote in the popular assembly. With the growth of modern states this form of government became impossible. The population was too large, the distances were too great, for all the citizens to meet in public gatherings. Voters now simply choose some one to represent them in a parliament or congress.

The representative system, though not unknown to the Greeks and Romans, was little used by them. It developed during the Middle Ages, when such countries as Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, France, and England established legislative bodies representing the three "estates" of clergy, nobility, and commoners. Most of these medieval legislatures afterwards disappeared or sank into insignificance, but the English Parliament continued to lead a vigorous existence. It thus furnished a model for imitation, first by the American colonies, then by revolutionary France, and during the past hundred years by nearly all Europe.

We have already learned how the builders of the United States set up what may be called the presidential system of government.¹ They provided for a president, gave him executive authority, and sharply separated his functions from those of the legislature. In Great Britain a cabinet system of government arose during

¹ See page 129.
the eighteenth century, by which both executive and legislative functions were centered in Parliament, and specifically in the House of Commons. The Continental states have generally favored the British arrangement. Instead of a popularly elected president, we find in Europe, therefore, a cabinet or body of ministers, who execute the laws subject to the constant oversight and control of the legislature. Both systems of government are democratic. The differences between them relate simply to the machinery by which the people rule.

Democracy does not necessarily imply a republican form of government. The establishment of the United States did, indeed, lead almost immediately to the formation of the first French Republic, and the examples thus set were soon followed by the Spanish-American colonies after their separation from the mother country. On the other hand, Great Britain, Italy, and certain other European states have succeeded in developing governments which, though monarchical in form, are democratic in substance. The king still reigns by hereditary succession, but he does not rule. The popularly elected president of a republic often has more power than one of these democratic monarchs.

Modern democracy is constitutional in form. There is generally a written constitution, of a more or less liberal type, to guarantee the rights of the people. The first document of this sort for any country was the Union of Utrecht (1579), by which the northern provinces of the Netherlands bound themselves together, "as if they were one province," to maintain their liberties "with life, blood and goods" against Spain. The second was the Cromwellian Instrument of Government (1653). The third was the Constitution of the United States, framed in 1787. The fourth was the French constitution which went into effect in 1791. All these documents, it should be noticed, were of revolutionary origin: they testified to the success of armed rebellion against the legal government. The same thing will

¹ See page 79.
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be found true of many other constitutions secured by European peoples during the nineteenth century.

69. France and the "July Revolution," 1830

Though Louis XVIII called himself king "by the grace of God" and kept the white flag of the Bourbon family, he ruled in fact as a constitutional monarch. The Charter of 1814 established a legislature of two houses, the upper a Chamber of Peers appointed for life, the lower a Chamber of Deputies chosen for a term of years. A high property qualification for the suffrage restricted the right of voting for deputies to less than one hundred thousand persons out of a population of twenty-nine million. The mass of the citizens — bourgeoisie, workingmen, and peasants — could neither elect nor be elected to office. The French government thus remained far removed from democracy.

As long as Louis XVIII lived, he kept some check upon the royalists, who wished to get back all their old wealth and privileged position. The accession of his brother, the count of Artois, under the title of Charles X, firmly seated the reactionary elements in the saddle. It was well said of Charles X that after long years of exile he had "learned nothing and forgotten nothing." A thorough believer in absolutism and divine right, the king tried to rule as though the Revolution had never taken place. A law was passed compensating the nobles for the losses which they had sustained by the confiscation of their estates during the revolutionary era. The government found the money for this purpose by scaling down the interest on the national debt. The bondholders, who saw their income suddenly reduced for the benefit of the aristocrats, became at once bitter enemies of the Bourbon monarchy. The peasants were aroused by the proposal to restore primogeniture, in place of the equal division among all the sons of lands bequeathed by the father. Other measures admitting the Jesuits into

1 See page 212.  
2 See page 171 and note 2.
France and giving the Church control of higher education seemed to indicate an open alliance between "the altar and the throne." The apprehensions of the nation were increased when the king's minister, Prince de Polignac, boldly announced his determination "to reorganize society, to restore to the clergy their weight in state affairs, to create a powerful aristocracy, and to surround it with privileges."

The unpopular ministry of Polignac could not command a majority in the liberal Chamber of Deputies. Charles X thereupon dissolved that body, but the new elections returned a chamber still more hostile to reaction. The king replied by issuing the infamous July Ordinances, which suspended the liberty of the press, dissolved the newly elected Chamber of Deputies even before it had met, and disfranchised three-fourths of the voters. Like James II of England, Charles X showed clearly that he held himself above the constitution. His arbitrary conduct at once provoked an uprising.

Paris in July, 1830, as in July, 1789, was the storm-center of the revolutionary movement. Workingmen and students, few in numbers but organized and armed, hastily constructed barricades in the narrow streets and defied the government. After three days of fighting against none-too-loyal troops, the revolutionists gained control of the capital. Charles X fled to England, and the tricolor once more flew to the breeze in France.

Those who carried through the uprising in Paris wanted a republic, but they found little support among the liberal bour-
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Men of this class feared that a republican France would soon be at war with monarchical Europe. Largely influenced by the aged Lafayette, the Republicans agreed to accept another king, in the person of Louis Philippe, duke of Orléans. He took the crown now offered to him by the Chamber of Deputies, at the same time promising to respect the constitution and the liberties of Frenchmen.

The new sovereign belonged to the younger, or Orléans, branch of the Bourbon family.1 He had participated in the events of 1789, had joined the Jacobin Club, had fought in revolutionary battles, and during a visit to the United States had become acquainted with democratic ideals and principles. To this "Citizen King," who reigned "by the grace of God and by the will of the people," France now gave her allegiance.

70. The "July Revolution" in Europe

The events in France created a sensation throughout Europe. The reactionaries were horrified at the sudden outburst of a revolutionary spirit which for fifteen years they had endeavored to suppress; the liberals were encouraged to renewed
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agitation for self-government and national rights. Widespread disturbances in the Netherlands, Poland, Italy, and Germany compelled Metternich to abandon all thought of intervening to restore "legitimacy" in France.

The union between the former Austrian Netherlands and Holland, made by the Congress of Vienna, proved to be very unfortunate. Differences of language, religion, and culture kept the two countries apart. Though about one-half of the Belgians were Flemings and hence closely akin to the Dutch in blood and speech, the other half were French-speaking Walloons. Both Flemings and Walloons felt a religious antipathy to the Protestant Dutch. Both alike had French sympathies and looked toward Paris for inspiration rather than toward The Hague. The antagonism between the two peoples might have lessened in time, had not the government of Holland incensed Belgian patriots by imposing
upon them Dutch law, Dutch as the official language, and Dutch control of the army, the civil service, and the schools. Just a month after the uprising in Paris, Brussels responded
to the revolutionary signal. The insurrection soon spread to the provinces and led to a demand for complete separation from Holland. The French government under Louis Philippe naturally favored this course, and Great Britain, a champion of small nationalities, also gave it her approval. The three eastern powers would gladly have intervened to prevent such a breach of the Vienna settlement, but Austria and Russia had disorders of their own to quell, and Prussia did not dare, single-handed, to take action which might bring her into collision with France.

Under these circumstances an international conference met at London in 1831. It decided that Belgium should be "a state independent and perpetually neutral," with Leopold of Saxe-Coburg as the first ruler. The British had to blockade the Dutch coast and the French to occupy Antwerp before the king of Holland would consent to this arrangement. He did not recognize the independence of Belgium until 1839. In that year Belgian neutrality was further guaranteed by a treaty to which Great Britain, France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia pledged their faith. Thus a new state, under a new dynasty, was added to the European family of nations.

The disposition of the grand duchy of Luxemburg (originally a part of the Holy Roman Empire) formed a troublesome problem for the powers. The Congress of Vienna had made it a member of the Germanic Confederation, intrusting its sovereignty and vote in the confederation to the king of the Netherlands. The decision reached in 1831 was to give eastern Luxemburg, together with Limburg, to Holland, while the Walloon or western part of Luxemburg remained under Belgium. The Dutch king accepted this partition eight years later.¹

Like the Belgians, the Poles were one of the "submerged

¹ Upon the dissolution of the Germanic Confederation in 1866, Limburg was incorporated with Holland. Dutch Luxemburg became an independent state in 1867, with its neutrality guaranteed by the European powers, including Prussia. Until 1890, however, the grand duchy was ruled by the kings of Holland.
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nationalities" of the nineteenth century. The Congress of Vienna, it will be remembered, had maintained the results of the former partitions, giving the greater part of Poland to Russia, but allowing Prussia and Austria to keep, respectively, Posen and Galicia. Russian Poland became a self-governing, constitutional state, with the

tsar, Alexander I, as its king. This experiment in liberalism did not last long. Alexander I, who fell more and more under Metternich's reactionary influence, proceeded to curtail Polish rights and privileges, and the accession in 1825 of his brother, Nicholas I, placed on the throne an inflexible opponent of all free institutions. Such was the situation when news of the revolution in Paris reached Warsaw.
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The insurrection which now broke out in the capital soon became general throughout the country. It found no support with the Austrian and Prussian governments, while France and Great Britain were too far away to lend effective aid. Having crushed the revolt, Tsar Nicholas determined to uproot all sense of nationality among the Poles. He revoked their constitution, abolished their Diet, suppressed their flag, and exiled or executed thousands of Polish patriots. Poland was flooded with Russian agents, the Russian tongue was made the official language, and the Polish army was incorporated with the imperial troops. Poland became, as far as force could make her, simply another province of Russia.¹

Revolution in Italy proved to be likewise abortive. This time not the Sicilian and Sardinian kingdoms, but the States of the Church and Parma and Modena formed the centers of disturbance. The revolutionists raised a new tricolor of red, white, and green (which subsequently became the Italian flag), declared the pope deposed from temporal power, and drove out the sovereigns of the two duchies. No help reached the patriots from Louis Philippe, as they had expected, nor did the people of the other Italian states rally to their support. The result might have been foreseen. Metternich's Austrian soldiers quickly extinguished the insurrectionary fires and restored the exiled rulers. Italy remained a Hapsburg province.

The discontent which had been smoldering in Germany since 1815 also flamed forth into revolution. Popular outbreaks led in Saxony to the grant of a constitution, and in Hanover and Brunswick, which already enjoyed constitutional government, to further liberal measures. But the movement made no more progress, for the great states, Austria and Prussia, remained quiet. The Diet of the confeder-

¹ Another revolt of the Poles was put down in 1863–1864. Their national spirit survived even this blow, and in 1914, upon the outbreak of the World War, Nicholas II issued a proclamation promising them self-government. The restoration of Poland to her place among the nations formed, however, the work of the Peace Conference.
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ation, upon Metternich's motion, passed a decree declaring all concessions wrung from a sovereign by violent means to be null and void; while another decree announced that a parliament which refused taxes to the head of a state might be coerced by the confederation's troops. These repressive measures had their effect in reducing Germany to its former condition of political stagnation.

Notwithstanding the setbacks to the cause of democracy and nationalism in Poland, Italy, and Germany, the year 1830 marks an important stage in the decline of Metternich’s Significance of 1830 and the system of armed intervention. Both the overthrow of the restored Bourbon monarchy in France and the disruption of the kingdom of the Netherlands threatened the stability of the treaties made in 1815. In the one case, the powers had to abandon, as far as France was concerned, the precious doctrine of "legitimacy" and to acquiesce in the right of the French nation to determine its own form of government. In the other case, they had to submit to a radical modification of the territorial settlement of Vienna.

The next eighteen years of European history witnessed no conspicuous triumphs for either democracy or nationalism on the Continent. The period was one of apparent stagnation in politics. Italy and Germany remained as disunited as ever. Bohemia and Hungary continued to be subject to the Hapsburgs, and Poland to the Romanovs. Metternich, though growing old and weary, still kept his power at Vienna. The new rulers who came to the throne at this time — Ferdinand I in Austria and Frederick William IV in Prussia — were no less autocratic than their predecessors. But beneath the surface discontent and unrest intensified, becoming all the stronger because so sternly repressed by the governments. Journalists, lawyers, professors, and other liberal-minded men, who might have been mere reformers, adopted radical and even revolutionary views and sought with increasing success to impress them upon the working classes of the cities, the hungry proletariat who wanted freedom and who wanted

1 Son of Francis I (1792–1835). 2 Son of Frederick William III (1797–1840).
bread. From time to time mutterings of the coming storm were heard; it burst in France.

71. The "February Revolution" and the Second French Republic, 1848

Louis Philippe posed as a thorough democrat. He liked to be called the "Citizen King," walked the streets of Paris unattended, sent his sons to the public schools, and opened the royal palace to all who wished to come and shake hands with the head of the state. It soon became clear, however, that under an exterior of republican simplicity Louis Philippe had all the Bourbon itching for personal power. A semblance of parliamentary government was indeed preserved, but by skillful bestowal of the numerous public offices and by open bribery the king managed to keep a subservient majority in the Chamber of Deputies. This system, not unlike that which existed in England under George III, could prevail in France because the government still remained undemocratic. In spite of franchise reforms which raised the number of voters from about 100,000 to 200,000, the majority of citizens continued to be excluded from political life. The French people found that they had only exchanged the rule of clergy and nobles for that of the upper bourgeoisie. Bankers, manufacturers, merchants—the wealthy middle class—now had a monopoly of office and law-making.

Few Frenchmen, outside of the bourgeoisie, supported their sovereign. Both the Legitimists, as the adherents of Charles X were called, and the Bonapartists, who wished to restore the Napoleonic dynasty, cordially hated him. The Republicans, who had brought about the "July Revolution" and felt themselves cheated by its outcome, held him in even greater detestation. No less than six attempts to assassinate the "Citizen King" were made in the course of his reign.

The growing discontent produced a succession of plots and insurrections, which Louis Philippe met with the time-honored policy of repression. All societies were required to submit
their constitutions to the government for approval. Editors of outspoken newspapers were jailed, fined, or banished. Criticism or caricature of the king in any form was forbidden. Adolphe Thiers, the liberal prime minister, was displaced by Guizot, a famous historian but a thorough reactionary. Louis Philippe, like his predecessor, seemed quite determined that his throne should not be "an empty armchair."

![Caricature of Louis Philippe]

Affairs did not become critical in Paris until 1848. On Washington's birthday of that year vast crowds assembled on the Place de la Concorde and clamored for Guizot's resignation. He did resign the next day, and the frightened king promised concessions; but it was too late. Workmen armed themselves, threw up barricades, and raised the ominous cry, "Long live the republic!" Louis Philippe, losing heart and fearing to lose head as well, at once abdicated the throne and as plain "Mr. Smith" sought an asylum in England.

His abdication and departure did not save the Orléans monarchy. The revolutionists in Paris proclaimed a republic and summoned a national assembly, to be elected by the votes of all Frenchmen above the age of twenty-one, to draw up a constitution. Their action found favor in the départements, which as on previous occasions followed the lead of the capital city.

The constitution of this second French Republic formed a thoroughly liberal document. It guaranteed complete freedom of speech and of assembly, prohibited capital punishment for political offenses, and abolished
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all titles of nobility. There was to be a parliament of a single chamber, a responsible ministry, and a president chosen by universal manhood suffrage. This extension of the suffrage to include the masses marks an epoch in the history of democracy. The revolutions of 1789 and 1830 destroyed absolute monarchy and privileged aristocracy in France; the revolution of 1848 overthrew middle-class government and established political equality.

The voters elected to the presidency Louis Napoleon, a nephew of the great emperor and the eldest representative of his family. During the reactionary rule of the Bourbons and the dull, bourgeois monarchy of Louis Philippe, the legend of a Napoleon who was at once a democrat, a soldier, and a revolutionary hero had grown apace. The stories of every peasant's fireside, the pictures on every cottage wall, kept his memory green. To the mass of the French people the name Napoleon stood for prosperity at home and glory abroad; and their votes now swept his nephew into office.

72. The "February Revolution" in Austria and Italy

France had once more lighted the revolutionary torch, and this time eager hands took it up and carried it throughout the Continent. Within a few months half of the monarchs of Europe were either deposed or forced to concede liberal reforms. No less than fifteen separate revolts marked the year 1848. Those in the Austrian Empire, Italy, and the German states assumed most importance.

Vienna, the citadel of reaction, was one of the first scenes of a popular uprising. Mobs, which the civic guard refused to suppress, fired Metternich's palace and compelled the white-haired old minister to resign office. Quitting the capital in disguise and with a price set upon his head, he made his way to England, there to compare experiences

1 See page 206.
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with that other exile, Louis Philippe. Thus disappeared from view the man who for nearly forty years had guided the destinies of Austria, one whose name has been handed down as a synonym for illiberal and oppressive government.

Metternich's fall left the radical elements in control at Vienna. The city was ruled for a time by a revolutionary committee of students and citizens. The Hapsburg emperor, Democratic Vienna Ferdinand I, who so hated the very word "constitution" that he is said to have forbidden its use in his presence, had to grant a constitutional charter for all his dominions, except Hungary and Lombardy-Venetia. A parliament, universal suffrage, free speech, and a free press were also promised by the emperor—promises which he conveniently ignored at the first opportunity.

What had begun as a democratic movement among the Germans of Vienna speedily became a national movement in other parts of the Hapsburg realm. The Czechs, Nationalism in Bohemia as the Slavic inhabitants of Bohemia are called, believed that the hour had struck to regain their liberties, suppressed by Austria since the Thirty Years' War. They demanded that a parliament, representing all Bohemia, should be convoked, and that Bohemian as well as German should become an official language of the country. At the same time an effort was made to unite the Slavic peoples of the Austrian Empire by means of a congress held at Prague. Had this idea been carried out, Bohemia, Moravia, and Austrian Silesia would have formed a separate Slavic kingdom.

The national movement in Bohemia encountered opposition on the part of the Germans there, who feared that they themselves would be oppressed by the triumphant Czechs. The government of Austria naturally supported the Germans. Street riots which broke out in Prague gave the Austrian commander, Prince Windischgrätz, an excuse for bombarding the city and crushing the revolt (June, 1848). This success showed that the army remained loyal to the Hapsburgs and that a mere mob could not stand up against disciplined soldiers. Prince Windisch-
grätz felt encouraged to attempt the recovery of Vienna for his royal master. After sharp fighting the imperial troops occupied the city. Martial law was then proclaimed, and the revolutionary leaders were executed (November, 1848).

The national movement in Hungary centered about the patriot Kossuth. He first became known as the editor of a liberal newspaper which attracted the unfavorable attention of Metternich's government. As a result, Kossuth spent three years in prison. After his release he entered politics and by his eloquence and energy soon took a prominent place among Hungarian liberals. Kossuth was ready for a breach with Austria. "From the charnel-house of the cabinet of Vienna," he said, "a pestilent wind sweeps over us, benumbing our senses and paralyzing our national spirit."

Kossuth's influence transformed Hungary, almost overnight, from a semi-feudal to a modern state. The "March Laws" of 1848 set up a Diet freely elected by the people, abolished the privileges of the nobles, and swept away the dues and services owed by the peasants. Henceforth Austria and Hungary were to remain united only through their common Hapsburg ruler. Even this slender tie disappeared after Ferdinand I abdicated in favor of his nephew. Francis Joseph I, the new emperor, immediately abrogated the "March Laws," declaring that Ferdinand's oath to uphold them did not bind his successor. Aroused to fury by this perfidious act, Kossuth carried through the Diet a declaration that the house of Hapsburg, "perjured in the
sight of God and man,” henceforth had ceased to rule and that Hungary formed an independent nation.

Unfortunately, the new state did not command the allegiance of all its peoples. The Magyars refused to share their newly won liberties with their fellow citizens, the Serbo-Croats of southern Hungary and the Rumanians of Transylvania. This ungenerous attitude, kindling racial animosities and jealousies, gave the Austrian government an opportunity to recover Hungary by force of arms. Despite the odds against them, the Magyars resisted so sternly that Francis Joseph I had to call in the aid of his brother-monarch and brother-reactionary, the tsar. Nicholas I, fearing lest an independent Hungary should be followed by an independent Poland, joined his troops to those of the Austrians, and together they overwhelmed the Magyar armies. Kossuth escaped to Turkey. The other leaders of revolution perished on the gallows or before a firing squad.

The revolutionary flood also spread over the Italian peninsula. Milan, the capital of Lombardy, expelled an Austrian garrison. Venice did the same and set up once more the old Venetian Republic which Napoleon had suppressed.¹ Charles Albert, king of Sardinia, declared war on hated Austria. To his aid came troops from the duchies of Parma, Modena, and Tuscany, from the States of the Church, and from the Two Sicilies. Charles Albert’s proud boast, _Italia farà da sé (“Italy will do it herself”),_ seemed likely to be justified.

The splendid dream of a free, united Italy quickly faded before the realities of war. The patriotic parties would not act together and failed to give the king of Sardinia hearty support. The pope, Pius IX, fearing a schism in the Church, decided that he could not afford to attack Catholic Austria. The Bourbon ruler of the Two Sicilies also withdrew his troops. Sardinia, fighting alone, was no match for Austria. Marshal Radetzky, the able Austrian commander, won the battles of Custozza (1848) and Novara (1849). Charles

---

¹ See pages 182 and 195–196.
Albert then abdicated and went into voluntary exile. His son and successor, Victor Emmanuel II, made peace with Austria.

A republic set up in Rome by the revolutionary leader Mazzini, likewise came to grief. Pius IX, who had been deprived of his temporal possessions, called in the assistance of Catholic France. To the pope's appeal Louis Napoleon lent a willing ear, especially since he did not wish to allow all Italy to be subjugated by the Austrians. A French army soon expelled the republican leaders and restored the pope to the States of the Church. The revolution in Italy thus brought only disappointment to patriotic hearts.

73. The "February Revolution" in Germany

Almost all the German states experienced revolutionary disturbances during 1848. The cry rose everywhere for constitutions, parliaments, responsible ministries, a free press, and trial by jury. Berlin followed the example of Vienna and threw up barricades. Frederick William IV bowed before the storm. He promised a constitutional government for Prussia and even consented to ride in state through the streets of the pacified capital, wearing the black, red, and gold colors of the triumphant revolution.

The German people at this time also took an important step toward unification. A national assembly, chosen by popular vote, with one representative for every fifty thousand inhabitants, met at Frankfort to devise a form of government for the united Fatherland. The learned members of the assembly had all the scholarship necessary for the solution of constitutional questions. Unfortunately, they lacked power. The revolutionary movements had not affected the armies, which, under their aristocratic officers, remained faithful to the princes of Germany. As long as the princes kept this weapon, the assembly could wield only a moral authority. It might pass decrees, but it possessed no means of executing them.
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The Frankfort Assembly began well by drawing up a liberal constitution. Rights which few German citizens then possessed, such as freedom of speech, of press, of petition, were expressly guaranteed to all. There was to be a parliament of two houses, representing the states and the people, respectively, and a ministry responsible to parliament. The assembly also decided to replace the old Germanic Confederation with a new union, including Prussia but excluding the non-Germanic territories of Austria. The Hapsburg emperor, quite naturally, would have nothing to do with such an arrangement. The Assembly met his refusal by the formal exclusion of Austria from the proposed federation. Though some of the members of the Frankfort Assembly wanted to set up a republic, the majority favored a federal empire with a hereditary sovereign. The imperial title was offered to Frederick William IV. He declined it. That Prussian ruler had no desire to exchange his monarchy by divine right for a sovereignty resting on the votes of the people; he would not accept a “crown of shame” from the hands of a popular assembly. Moreover, he knew that the house of Hapsburg would never consent willingly to the assumption of the imperial dignity by a Hohenzollern. Prussia thus made “the great refusal” which destroyed the hope of creating by peaceful means a democratic German empire.

Rebuffed by Prussia and faced with the opposition of Austria, the Frankfort Assembly began to dwindle out of existence. Many of the larger states withdrew their representatives. Others resigned in disgust. Those who remained decided to disregard the princes altogether and to call for an uprising of the German people. But this German “Rump Parliament” was soon broken up by soldiers with drawn swords.

The collapse of the Frankfort Assembly drove the more radical Germans in Saxony, Baden, and the Rhenish Palatinate to attempt to set up a republic by force of arms. Some of the noblest men in Germany — among them Carl Schurz and Franz Sigel, who after-
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wards emigrated to America and fought in the Union army during the Civil War — took part in this desperate adventure for freedom. Their efforts were in vain. Prussian troops bloodily suppressed the revolution and sealed the doom of the first German Republic.

The "February Revolution" died down in Europe, seemingly having accomplished little. Almost everywhere the old autocracies remained in the saddle. The Austrian constitution was revoked when Francis Joseph I, an apt pupil of Metternich, came to the throne. The constitution which Frederick William IV granted to Prussia in 1850 did, indeed, provide for representative government, but otherwise turned out to be a very illiberal document. In France, also, the new republic soon drifted upon the rocks of reaction. Discouraged by these failures, the European peoples now gave over to some extent the agitation for democratic reforms. They turned, instead, to the task of nation building.

Studies

1. Why is it better for a nation to make mistakes in the course of self-government than to be ruled, however wisely, by an irresponsible monarch? 2. Mention some of the essentially democratic monarchies in contemporary Europe. 3. Who was the last divine-right ruler of France? 4. Why did Paris and not the provinces play the chief part in the French revolutionary outbreaks from 1789 to 1848? 5. Why has France been styled the "magnetic pole of Europe"? 6. Compare the "July Revolution" in France with the "Glorious Revolution" in England, and Charles X with James II. 7. What precedent existed for the action of the powers in neutralizing Belgium? 8. Compare the advantages received by France from the revolution of 1848 with those received from the revolutions of 1830 and 1789. 9. Give reasons for the preservation of the Austrian Empire from dissolution in 1848-1849. 10. Look up in an encyclopedia some account of Kossuth's visit to the United States in 1851-1852. 11. How was Austria the "fire department" of Italy in 1821, 1830, and 1848-1849? 12. Enumerate the non-Germanic territories of the Hapsburgs at the middle of the nineteenth century. 13. Why did the Frankfort Assembly wish to exclude these territories from the new imperial federation to be formed? 14. Look up in an encyclopedia some account of the careers of Carl Schurz and Franz Sigel in the United States.
CHAPTER XI

THE NATIONAL MOVEMENT IN EUROPE, 1848-1871

74. Modern Nationalism

Since the close of the eighteenth century, the idea of nationalism has been at least as potent as that of democracy in molding modern history. What is a nation? The word should not be confused with "state," which means the entire political community, nor with "government," which refers to the legislative, executive, and judicial organization of the state. A "nation" may be defined as a people or group of peoples united by common ideals and common purposes.

National feeling does not depend on identity of race, for that can be found nowhere. The inhabitants of every European country are greatly mixed in blood. It does depend, in part, on sameness of speech. There is always difficulty in uniting populations with different languages. The examples of bilingual Belgium and trilingual Switzerland show, however, that nations may exist without unity of language. Sameness of religion also acts as a unifying force; nevertheless most modern nations include representatives of diverse faiths. National feeling, in fact, is essentially a historic product. That which makes a nation is a common heritage of memories of the past and hopes for the future. Ireland has long been joined to England, but Irish nationality has not disappeared. Bohemia, long subject to the Hapsburgs, never lost her national spirit. The Polish nation still lived, though after the partitions Poland disappeared from the map of Europe. The Jews have been scattered

1 Webster, Readings in Medieval and Modern History, chapter xxxiv, "Bismarck and the Unification of Germany."
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throughout the world for many centuries, yet they continue to look forward to their reunion in the Holy Land. While national feeling endures, a nation cannot perish.

Nationalism scarcely existed among the ancient Greeks, who made the town or the city their typical social unit. It was equally unfamiliar to the Romans, who created a world-wide state. It lay dormant throughout most of the Middle Ages, when feudalism was local and the Church and the Empire were alike international. Only toward the close of the medieval period did a sense of nationality arise in England, France, Spain, and some other countries. This was due to various reasons: the development of the king's power as opposed to that of the feudal nobles; the growth of the Third Estate, or bourgeoisie, always far more national in their attitude than either nobility or clergy; the rise of vernacular languages and literatures, replacing Latin in common use; finally, the danger of conquest by foreigners, which greatly stimulated patriotic sentiments. The spread of education and of facilities for trade, travel, and intercourse during modern times made it possible for ideas of nationalism to permeate the masses of the people in each land. They began to feel themselves closely bound together and to call themselves a nation.

The French Revolution did most to develop this national sentiment. The revolutionists created the "fatherland," as we understand that term to-day. They substituted the French nation for the French kingdom; for loyalty to a monarch they substituted love of country. When an attempt was made to crush the Revolution, they rose as one man, and to the inspiring strains of the Marseillaise drove the invaders from the "sacred soil" of France.

But not satisfied with defending the Revolution at home, the French started to spread it abroad, and in doing so became aggressive. They posed as liberators; very speedily they proved to be subjugators. A republican general, Napoleon Bonaparte, transformed their citizen levies into professional soldiers devoted to his fortunes and led them
to victory on a score of battle-fields. Napoleon, himself a man without a country, felt no sympathy for nationalism. Out of a Europe composed of many independent and often hostile states, he wished to create a unified Europe after the model supplied by Charlemagne's empire. He even intended, had he been successful in the Russian campaign, to move the capital of his dominions, and by the banks of the Tiber to revive the glories of imperial Rome.

Napoleon carried all before him until he came into conflict with nations instead of sovereigns. The sentiment of nationalism, which had saved republican France, now inspired the British in their long contest with the French emperor, spurred the Portuguese and Spaniards to revolt against him, and strengthened the will of Austrians, Prussians, and Russians never to accept a foreign despotism. What the Hapsburgs, Hohenzollerns, and Romanovs failed to do, their subjects accomplished. The national resistance to Napoleon, aroused throughout the Continent, destroyed his empire.

The reaction which followed the Congress of Vienna checked, but could not destroy, the national aspirations of European peoples. As we have learned in the two preceding chapters, nationalism combined with all the liberal or democratic sentiments aroused by the French Revolution to provoke the revolutionary upheavals between 1815 and 1848. These met only partial success, but during the next twenty-three years nationalism won its most conspicuous triumphs in the unification of Italy and of Germany.

75. Napoleon III and the Second French Empire, 1852

European history from 1848 to 1871 is dominated by the personality of the second French emperor, Louis Napoleon, who influenced the fortunes of France, Italy, Germany, Austria, and Russia almost as profoundly as did Napoleon Bonaparte half a century earlier. He was the son of Napoleon's brother Louis, at one time king of Hol-
land, and after the death of "Napoleon II" became the recognized head of the house of Bonaparte.¹ His early life had been a succession of adventures. Exiled from France at the time of the Bourbon restoration, he found his way to many lands, and in Italy even became a member of a revolutionary secret society. Twice he tried to provoke an uprising in France against the Orléans monarchy and in favor of his dynasty. On the first occasion he appeared at Strassburg, wearing his uncle's hat, boots, and sword, but these talismans did not prevent his capture and deportation to the United States. A second imitation of the "return from Elba" led to his imprisonment for six years in a French fortress. He then escaped to England and waited there, full of faith in his destiny, until the events of 1848 recalled him home. His election to the presidency of the French Republic soon followed.

The new president inherited the Napoleonic tradition, but his long body, short legs, pointed mustache, and pointed beard made a sharp contrast to the first Napoleon's face and figure. Nor did he possess the military and administrative genius of Napoleon I. He did have sufficient astuteness to realize that the eyes of his countrymen might be dazzled by a successful adventurer trading on the magic name Napoleon, complete unscrupulousness in the choice of men and means to be employed in the rise to power, and an overweening ambition to revive the glories of his house. From the start Louis Napoleon set to work deliberately to deceive the French people, and indeed all Europe, regarding his real intentions. Posing as a sincere republican, as a devoted champion of liberty, he succeeded in establishing perhaps the most despotic régime that had ever existed in France.

Louis Napoleon, upon becoming president of France, swore to remain faithful to the republic and "to regard as enemies of the nation all those who may attempt by illegal means to change the form of the established government." Events soon showed how well the oath was kept. His uncle had progressed by rapid steps from the consulate to

¹ See the genealogical table, page 201, note 1.
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the empire; he himself determined to use the presidency as a stepping-stone to the imperial crown. The recent adoption of universal manhood suffrage by the French made it necessary for him to enlist the support of all classes of the population. The army, of course, welcomed a Bonaparte at its head. The peasantry and bourgeoisie felt reassured when Louis Napoleon, far from being a radical, disclosed himself as a guardian of landed property and business interests. The workingmen, who had largely carried through the "February Revolution," were conciliated by the promise of special laws for their benefit. So skilfully did the prince-president curry favor with these different groups of opinion in France that it was not long before he attained his goal.

The republican constitution had limited the president's term to four years, without the privilege of reëlection. Louis Napoleon did not intend to retire to private life, and determined to carry through a coup d'état. On the anniversary of the battle of Austerlitz, loyal troops occupied Paris, dissolved the legislature, and arrested the president's chief opponents. An insurrection in the streets of the capital was ruthlessly suppressed by the soldiers, and throughout France thousands of Republicans were imprisoned, exiled, or transported to penal colonies across the seas. The French people, when called upon by a,
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plebiscite to express an opinion as to these proceedings, ratified them by a large majority. Louis Napoleon then made over the government in such a way as to give himself well-nigh absolute power.

It needed only a change of name to transform the republic into an empire. An almost unanimous popular vote in 1852 authorized the president to accept the title of Napoleon III, hereditary emperor of the French.

76. France under Napoleon III, 1852–1870

France under Napoleon III had a constitution, universal manhood suffrage, and a legislature—all the machinery of popular rule. But France was free in appearance only. The right of suffrage meant very little when candidates for office were nominated and elected under the direct supervision of the government. As for the legislature, it could neither propose a measure nor question ministers nor determine the expenditure of public money nor make public its deliberations. The emperor kept control of law-making, diplomacy, the army and navy, and the entire administrative system.

What opposition to this "veiled despotism" existed among liberty-loving Frenchmen was stifled by a resort to the usual agencies of repression. An infamous General Security Act permitted the imprisonment or exile without trial of political suspects. Newspapers which criticized the emperor were, after two warnings, suspended or suppressed. The universities also felt the heavy hand of the government: instruction in modern history and philosophy was discouraged as revolutionary, and liberal-minded professors lost their positions. Political stagnation descended upon France. The country became a sickroom where no one might speak aloud.

France the more readily acquiesced in the loss of freedom because under the Second Empire she enjoyed material prosperity. Napoleon III felt a sincere interest in the welfare of all classes, including the hitherto neglected proletariat. By charitable gifts, endow-
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ments, and subsidies he tried to show that the idea of improving the lot of those who are "the most numerous and the most poor" lay ever present in his mind. His was a government of cheap food, vast public works to furnish employment, and many holidays. "Emperor of the workmen" his admirers called him. On the other hand, business men profited by the remarkable development during this period of banks, factories, railways, canals, and steamship lines. The progress made was strikingly shown at the first Paris Exposition in 1855, when all the world flocked to the beautiful capital to see the products of French industry and art.

Having failed to marry into the royal families The imperial court who looked askance at an adventurer; Napoleon III wedded for love a Spanish lady, Eugénie de Montijo. Her beauty and elegance helped to make the court at the Tuileries such a center of European fashion as it had been under the Old Régime. The birth of an heir, the ill-fated Prince-Imperial,¹ seemed to make certain the perpetuation of the Napoleonic dynasty. Fortune had indeed smiled upon the emperor.

"The empire means peace," Napoleon III had announced shortly before assuming the imperial title. Nevertheless, he proceeded to make war. Like his uncle, he believed that all that the French people wanted to satisfy them was military glory. The emperor

¹ Killed in 1879, while fighting with the British against the Zulus in South Africa. The former Empress Eugénie still lives in England at an advanced age.
had not been two years on the throne before he embarked
upon the Crimean War against Russia. It terminated vic-
toriously for him in the Treaty of Paris, the most important
diplomatic arrangement in Europe since that of Vienna. A few
years later success still more spectacular attended his interven-
tion in the Austro-Sardinian War for the liberation of Italy.

77. Disunited Italy

It might seem from a glance at the map as if Italy, with the
Mediterranean on three sides and the Alps on the fourth, was
specially intended by nature to be the seat of a
unified nation. But the map is deceptive. The
number, position, and comparative lowness of the
Alpine passes combine to make Italy fairly accessible from the
north and northwest; from before the dawn of history these
passes, together with the river valleys which approach them,
have facilitated the entrance of invading peoples. The extreme
length of the peninsula in proportion to its breadth, its division
into two unequal parts by the Apennines, and the separateness
of the Po basin from the rest of the country are also unfavor-
able to Italian unity.

Historical circumstances have been even more unfavorable.
The Lombards, Franks, Normans, and Germans — to say noth-
ing of the Moslems and Byzantines — who estab-
lished themselves in Italy during the Middle Ages, divided the peninsula into small, weak, and mutually jealous
states. In later times Spaniards, French, and Austrians an-
nexed part of the country and governed much of the remainder
through its petty princes. The popes also worked throughout
the medieval and modern period to keep Italy fragmentary.
They realized that unification meant the extinction of the States
of the Church, or at least papal dependence on the secular
power, and they felt that this would interfere with the im-
partiality which the head of the Church ought to exercise
toward Roman Catholics in all lands. Furthermore, the Italians
themselves lacked national ideals, and preserved from antiquity
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the tradition of separate city-communities, ruled, it may be, by despots or else self-governing, but in any case independent. Such were medieval Genoa, Pisa, Milan, Florence, and Venice.

Italian history, for the century and a half between the Peace of Westphalia and the outbreak of the French Revolution, is almost a blank. The glories of Renaissance art, literature, scholarship, and science were now but a memory. Centuries of misrule and internecine strife crushed the creative energies of the people, while their material welfare steadily declined after the discovery of America and the Cape route to the Indies shifted trade centers from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic. Divided, dependent, impoverished, Italy had indeed fallen on evil days.

The Italians describe their national movement as a *Risorgimento*, a "resurrection" of a people once the most civilized and prosperous in Europe. It dates from the shock of the French Revolution. The armies of revolutionary France drove out the Austrians, set up republics in the northern part of the peninsula, and swept away the abuses of the Old Régime. Italy began to rouse herself from her long torpor and to hope for unity and freedom.

Napoleon Bonaparte, himself an Italian by birth, continued the work of the French Revolution. "Italy," he wrote, "is one sole nation; the unity of customs, of language and literature, will, in some future more or less remote, unite all its inhabitants under one government." Under Napoleon the country was, in fact, practically unified. Northwestern Italy, including Savoy and Piedmont, Genoa, Parma, Tuscany, and the papal territory about Rome, was annexed to France. Lombardy, Venetia, Modena, and the remainder of the papal territory were erected into the kingdom of Italy with Napoleon at its head. Southern Italy became the dependent kingdom of Naples. The islands of Sicily and Sardinia alone remained under their former rulers.¹ Throughout the peninsula the French emperor introduced personal freedom,

¹ See the map facing page 106.
religious toleration, equality before the law, and the even justice of the Code Napoléon.

The year 1815 was one of cruel disappointment to patriotic Italians, who saw their country again dismembered, subject to Austria, and under reactionary princes.\(^1\) Men who had once experienced Napoleon’s enlightened rule would not acquiesce in this restoration of the Old Régime. The great mass of the bourgeoisie, many of the nobles, and some of the better educated artisans now began to work for the expulsion of Austria from the peninsula and for the formation of a constitutional government in the various states. Unable to agitate publicly, these Italians of necessity resorted to underground methods. A secret society, the Carbonari ("charcoal burners"), sprang out of the Freemasons, spread throughout Italy, and incited the first unsuccessful revolutions (those of 1820-1821, 1830) against Austria. After their failure the society ceased to have much importance and made way for another revolutionary organization, Mazzini’s "Young Italy."

Mazzini, the prophet of modern Italy, was born at Genoa of a middle-class and well-to-do family. Endowed with all a prophet’s enthusiasm and moral fervor, Mazzini from early manhood gave himself to the regeneration of his country. He hated the Austrians, and he hated the princes and princelings who served Austria rather than Italy. At a time when the obstacles in the way seemed insuperable, he believed that twenty millions of Italians could

\(^1\) See pages 212 and 215.
free themselves if only they would sink local interests and jealousies in a common patriotism. It was Mazzini's great service that he inspired multitudes of others with this belief, thus converting what had seemed a utopia to his contemporaries into a realizable ideal.

In 1831 Mazzini founded the secret society called "Young Italy." It included only men under forty, ardent, self-sacrificing men who pledged themselves to serve as missionaries of liberty throughout Italy. The oath imposed upon initiates reveals the purpose of the organization: "By the blush that rises to my brow when I stand before the citizens of other lands, to know that I have no rights of citizenship, no country, and no national flag; by the memory of our former greatness and the sense of our present degradation; by the tears of Italian mothers for their sons dead on the scaffold, in prison, or in exile; by the sufferings of the millions—I swear to dedicate myself wholly and forever to strive to constitute Italy one free, independent, republican nation."

As far as practical results were concerned, "Young Italy" proved to be as ineffective as the Carbonari had been. Nevertheless, it kept alive the enthusiasm for Italian nationalism during more than a decade. Meanwhile other political parties began to take shape. Many patriotic men who did not favor republican principles hoped to
form a federation of the Italian states under the presidency of the pope. Many more pinned their faith to a constitutional monarchy under the Sardinian king.

78. Victor Emmanuel II and Cavour

The kingdom of Sardinia, the student will remember, included not only the island of that name but also Savoy and Piedmont on the mainland. At the middle of the nineteenth century Sardinia ranked as the leading state in Italy. It was, moreover, the only Italian state not controlled by Austria since 1815, and in 1848–1849 it had warred bravely, though unsuccessfully, against that foreign power. After Pope Pius IX had shown himself unwilling to head the national movement, and after Mazzini had failed in his attempt to create a Roman Republic, Italian eyes turned more and more to Victor Emmanuel II as the most promising leader in the struggle for independence.

Victor Emmanuel II in 1849 mounted the throne of a country crushed by defeat, burdened with a heavy war indemnity, and without a place in the councils of Europe. The outlook was dark, but the new ruler faced it with resolution. Though not a man of brilliant mind, he possessed much common sense and had personal qualities which soon won him wide popularity. He was a devoted Churchman. He was also a thorough liberal. His father in 1848 had granted a

1 Piedmont ("Foot of the Mount") extended from the Alps to the plains of Lombardy. In 1815 Genoa had been added to Piedmont. See page 212.
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constitution to the Sardinians; he maintained it in spite of Austrian protests, when all the other Italian princes relapsed into absolutism. Patriots of every type, Roman Catholics, republicans, and constitutionalists, could rally about this Re galantuomo, this Honest King, who kept his pledged word.

Fortunately for Italy, Victor Emmanuel II had a great minister in the Piedmontese noble, Count Cavour. His plain, square face, fringed with a ragged beard, his half-closed eyes that blinked through steel-bowed spectacles, and his short, burly figure did not suggest the statesman. Cavour, however, was finely educated and widely traveled. He knew England well, admired the English system of parliamentary government, and felt a corresponding hatred of absolutist principles. Unlike the poetical and speculative Mazzini, Cavour had all the patience, caution, and mastery of details essential for successful leadership. It must be added, also, that his devotion to the cause of unification made him sometimes unscrupulous about the methods to be employed: upon occasion he could stoop to all the tricks of the diplomatic game. As the sequel will show, his “fine Italian hand” never lost its cunning.

Cavour became the Sardinian premier in 1852, a position which he continued to fill, with but one brief interruption, until his death nine years later. Faithfully supported by Victor Emmanuel II, Cavour bent every effort to develop the economic resources of the kingdom, foster education, and reorganize the army. He made Sardinia a strong and liberal state; strong enough to cope with Austria, liberal enough to attract to herself all the other states of Italy.

Not less successful was Cavour’s management of foreign affairs. Upon assuming office he had declared that Sardinia must re-establish in Europe “a position and prestige equal to her ambition.” The Crimean War gave an opportunity to do so. Though Sardinia had only a remote interest in the Eastern Question, nevertheless she sent twenty thousand soldiers to fight with the British and
French against the Russians. For her reward she secured admittance, as one of the belligerents, to the Congress of Paris, which ended the war. Sardinia now had an honorable place at the European council-table, and two powerful friends in Great Britain and France.

Always practical and clear-headed, Cavour began to seek a military ally in the coming struggle with Austria. Public opinion in Great Britain sided with the Italian patriots, but her statesmen considered themselves still bound by the Vienna settlement and could not be relied upon for material assistance. On the other hand, France, under the ambitious and adventurous Napoleon III, held out the prospect of an alliance. The emperor seems to have had a genuine sympathy for Italy; he liked to consider himself the champion of oppressed nationalities; and he felt no hesitation about tearing up the treaties of 1815, treaties humiliating to his dynasty and to France. In return for the duchy of Savoy and the port of Nice, he now promised an army to help expel the Austrians from Italy.

The bargain once struck, Cavour had next to provoke the Austrian government into a declaration of war. It was essential that Austria be made to appear the aggressor in the eyes of Europe. Cavour’s agents secretly fomented disturbances in Lombardy and Venetia. Francis Joseph I, the Hapsburg emperor, in an outburst of reckless fury, finally sent an ultimatum to Sardinia, offering the choice between disarmament or instant war. Cavour joyfully accepted the latter. “The die is cast,” he exclaimed, “and we have made history.”

79. United Italy, 1859–1870

The fighting which ensued lasted only a few months. Sardinia and France carried everything before them. The allied victory of Magenta compelled the Austrians to evacuate Milan; that of Solferino to abandon Lombardy. They now fell back upon Venetia, where,
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sheltered by the great fortresses known as the Quadrilateral, they stood at bay.

To the amazement of European onlookers, who deemed the conflict only begun, Napoleon III suddenly stayed his hand. The French emperor, in truth, found himself in a difficult position. He had never contemplated the unification of all Italy, but only the annexation of Lombardy and Venetia to the Sardinian kingdom. The outburst of national feeling which accompanied the war promised, however, to unite the entire peninsula, thus creating a strong national state as a near neighbor of France. Furthermore, Prussia, fearful lest the victories of the French in Italy should be followed by their advance into Germany, had begun to mobilize on the Rhine. For these and other reasons Napoleon III decided to make an end of his Italian venture. He sought a personal interview with Francis Joseph I and privately concluded the armistice of Villafranca.¹

The armistice terms, as finally incorporated in the peace treaty, ceded Lombardy to Sardinia. Venetia, however, remained Austrian. Victor Emmanuel II and Cavour, thus left in the lurch by their ally, had to accept an arrangement which dashed their hopes just on the point of realization. Losing for once his habitual caution, Cavour urged that Sardinia should continue the war alone. The king more wisely refused to imperil what had been already won. He would bide his time and wait. He did not have to wait long.

The people of central Italy, unaided, took the next step in unification. Parma, Modena, Tuscany,² and Romagna³ expelled their rulers and declared for annexation to Sardinia. This action met the hearty support of the British government. Even Napoleon III acquiesced, after Cavour handed over to him both Savoy and

¹ Read Lowell’s poem, Villafranca.
² Lucca had been incorporated in Tuscany since 1847.
³ The northern part of the States of the Church. Umbria and The Marches—also papal territories—joined Sardinia later in the year 1860.
Nice, just as if the French emperor had carried out the original agreement and had freed Italy "from the Alps to the Adriatic." An ironical diplomat described the transaction as Napoleon's pourboire (waiter's tip).

The third step in unification was taken by Garibaldi, a sailor from Nice, a soldier of liberty, and a picturesque, heroic figure. At the age of twenty-four Garibaldi joined "Young Italy," participated in an insurrection, for which he was condemned to death, escaped to South America, and fought there many years for the freedom
of the Portuguese and Spanish colonies. Returning to Italy during the uprising of 1848, he won renown in the defense of Mazzini's Roman Republic. The collapse of the revolutionary movement made him once more a fugitive; he lived for some time in New York; later became the skipper of a Peruvian ship; and finally settled down as a farmer on the little Italian island of Caprera. The events of 1859 called him from retirement, and he took part effectively in the campaign against Austria.

But this man, who had passed through the fire of many battlefields, who had been shipwrecked, wounded, imprisoned, and exiled, could not rest until all Italy was one and free. When the Sicilians threw off Bourbon rule in 1860, Garibaldi went to their aid with one thousand red-shirted volunteers. It seemed — it was — a foolhardy expedition, but to Garibaldi and his "Red Shirts" all things were possible. Within a month they had conquered the entire island of Sicily. Thence they crossed to the mainland and soon entered Naples in triumph. The Two Sicilies voted for annexation to Sardinia. Garibaldi then handed over his conquests to Victor Emmanuel II, and the two liberators rode through the streets of Naples side by side, amid the plaudits of the people.

The diplomacy of Cavour, the intervention of Napoleon III,
Garibaldi's sword, and the popular will thus united the larger part of Italy within two years. A national parliament met at Turin in 1861 and conferred the Italian crown upon Victor Emmanuel II. Cavour passed away soon afterwards. "Let me say a prayer for you, my son," said a priest to the dying statesman. "Yes, father," was the reply, "but let us pray, too, for Italy."

The new kingdom was not quite complete. Venice and the adjoining region were held by Austria. Rome and a fragment of the States of the Church were held by the pope. Two great European conflicts gave Victor Emmanuel II both of these territories. Venetia fell to Italy in 1866, as her reward for an alliance with Prussia in the Austro-Prussian War. A plebiscite of the Venetians, with only sixty-nine votes registered in the negative, approved this action.

Four years later the Franco-German War broke out, compelling Napoleon III to withdraw the French garrison from Rome. An Italian army promptly occupied the city. The inhabitants, by an immense majority, voted for annexation to the monarchy. In 1871 the City of the Seven Hills, once the capital of imperial Rome, became the capital of the kingdom of Italy.

Even these acquisitions did not quite round out the Italian kingdom. There was still an Italia Irredenta, an "Unredeemed Italy." The district about Trent in the Alps (the Trentino) and the district about Trieste at the head of the Adriatic, though largely peopled by Italians, remained under Austrian rule. The desire to recover her lost provinces was one of the reasons which led Italy in 1915 to espouse the cause of the Allies in the World War.

80. Disunited Germany

The political unification of Germany formed another striking triumph for nationalism, even though it did not involve, as in the case of Italy, the removal of a foreign yoke. National unity

1 See page 270.  2 See page 272.
could not be won as long as a motley crowd of kingdoms, duchies, principalities, and free cities encumbered German soil. These states—the heritage of feudalism—had been the German states practically independent since the close of the Thirty Years’ War. Each made its own laws, held its own court, conducted its own diplomacy, and had its own army, tariff, and coinage. Only a map or a series of maps on a large scale can do justice to the German “crazy-quilt.” Here was a country, large, populous, and wealthy, which lacked a national government, such as had existed in England, France, Spain, and even Russia for centuries.

The Holy Roman Empire furnished no real bond of union for Germany. Within the Empire were princes who also held territories outside. The Hohenzollerns ruled over the Empire East Prussia and part of Poland; the Hapsburgs, over Hungary and other non-German lands. At the same time the kings of Great Britain, Denmark, and Sweden, by virtue of their possessions in Hanover, Holstein, and western Pomerania, respectively, ranked among the imperial princes. Here was an empire which lacked a common center or capital, such as London, Paris, Madrid, and St. Petersburg were for their respective states.

It is one of the ironies of history that Germany owes to Napoleon Bonaparte the first measures which made possible her later unification. By the Treaty of Campo Formio and subsequent treaties Napoleon secured for France the Germanic lands west of the Rhine, thus dispossessing nearly a hundred princes of their territories. He subsequently reorganized much of Germany east of the Rhine, with the idea of setting up a few large states as a barrier between France on the one side and Austria and Prussia on the other. This work survived the emperor’s downfall. Germany in 1815 included only thirty-nine independent states, as com-
pared with more than three hundred in 1789. The destruction of the Holy Roman Empire by Napoleon involved another breach with the past; henceforth one could conceive of a new and genuine empire, thoroughly German, in which Austria had no place.

The impulse to German nationalism also came from Napoleon. By sweeping away so many small states he not only simplified the political map, but also forced Germans to abate somewhat their jealousies and hatreds and to regard one another as countrymen. The War of Liberation against Napoleon banded them together, at least for the moment, in behalf of a common cause. Prussians, Saxons, and Bavarians rose in arms, not to seek world conquests, but to free themselves from an intolerable tyranny. "I have only one fatherland," wrote Stein in 1812, "that is called Germany." Arndt's famous war song, What is the German Fatherland? expressed the same patriotic spirit.¹

The hopes of German nationalists were dashed by the Congress of Vienna. The Germanic Confederation,² which now replaced the Holy Roman Empire, was not, properly speaking, a union of states, but rather of sovereigns: six kings, seven grand dukes, nine dukes, eleven princes, and four free cities, together with the King of the Netherlands (for Luxemburg) and the King of Denmark (for Holstein). Each member of the confederation continued to be independent, except in foreign affairs, which a Diet, meeting at Frankfort-on-Main, controlled. The delegates to the Diet were all appointed by the sovereigns and were subject to their instructions. What little authority the delegates had was limited by the rule requiring a unanimous vote for the passage of any important measure. It is easy to see how under such circumstances the Diet became a synonym for feebleness and futility.

German democracy likewise met a setback at Vienna. The

¹ Die Wacht am Rhein, Germany's national anthem, was not written until 1840. The song, Deutschland, Deutschland über alles, appeared a year later.

² See page 215.
successful issue of the War of Liberation had seemed to offer a favorable opportunity for modernizing the governments of the different states along constitutional and parliamentary lines. Little was done, however. Most of the rulers remained absolute monarchs after 1815, as they had been before 1789. Absolutist sentiments were too firmly entrenched among the noble and official classes; the political education of the common people was still so little advanced; and the French Revolution and Napoleon together had inspired such general distrust of modern ideas that it was easy to repress any agitation for popular rights and representative institutions. The rulers of Germany thus forgot or ignored the sacrifices which their subjects had made in the cause of freedom. The War of Liberation turned out to be a victory, not for liberalism, but for reaction.\(^1\)

\(^1\) See pages 217–219.
Germany, while still politically divided, became economically one. The tariff duties levied by each member of the confederation against the goods of every other member greatly hampered commerce and industry. To meet this difficulty Prussia formed a Zollverein (Customs Union), which by 1834 included eighteen states. All the others, except Austria, afterwards joined it. Complete free trade prevailed between the members of the Zollverein, while protective duties shut out foreign competition. The Zollverein thus showed the German people some of the advantages of union and encouraged them to look to Prussia for its attainment.

81. William I and Bismarck

The Prussian kingdom seemed to be, indeed, the natural center of unity. Her population, except the Poles, was entirely German; she had led Germany in the heroic struggle against Napoleon; and since 1850 she had possessed a constitution, which, if not democratic, at least established some measure of parliamentary government. The interests of Austria, on the contrary, were divided between her German and numerous non-German peoples, and the Austrian government was the apotheosis of reaction. Neither nationalists nor democrats could expect help from the Hapsburgs. As for the central and southern states — Saxony, Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, Hanover, and the rest — none of them was large enough or strong enough to attempt the arduous task of unification. But if the Hohenzollerns undertook it, how would they carry it through? Would they serve Germany by merging
Prussia in a German nation, as Sardinia had been merged in Italy, or would they rule Germany? Answers to these questions were soon forthcoming.

The death of Frederick IV in 1861 called to the throne, at the age of sixty-four, his abler brother, William I. The new king had industry, conscientiousness, a thoroughly practical mind, and, what was still more important, the faculty of finding capable servants and of trusting them absolutely. A firm believer in divine right, he did not allow the constitution granted by his predecessor to interfere with the royal authority. His ideals, to which he steadily adhered through a long reign, were those of the benevolent despots in the eighteenth century.

William I was above everything a soldier. The Prussian mobilization at the time of the Austro-Sardinian War convinced him that the army needed strengthening, if it was again to be, as in the days of Frederick the Great, the most formidable weapon in Europe. With the assistance of Albrecht von Roon as war minister and Hellmuth von Moltke as chief of the general staff, the king now brought forward a scheme for army reform. Universal military service had been adopted by Prussia during the Napoleonic wars, but many men were never called to the colors or were allowed to serve for only a short time. William I proposed to enforce strictly the obligation to service and in this way to more than double the size of the standing army.

The scheme met strenuous opposition on the part of Prussian Liberals, who saw in it a detestable alliance between militarism and autocracy. So large an army, they argued, could only

---

1 See page 235.
be intended to overawe the people and stifle all democratic agitation. The Liberals held a majority in the lower house of parliament and refused to sanction the increased expenditures necessary for army reform. William I decided to abdicate if he could not be supreme in military matters. A deadlock ensued. It was only broken when the king summoned Otto von Bismarck to be his chief minister.

The man who crippled German liberalism and created militaristic, imperial Germany belonged to the *Junker* class, which from the beginning had been the chief support of Hohenzollern absolutism. Birth, training, and inclination made him an aristocrat, an enemy of democracy, a foe of parliamentary government. He was born in Brandenburg of a wealthy country family and received his education at Göttingen and Berlin, acquiring, however, in these universities a reputation for beer-drinking and dueling rather than for studiousness. Young Bismarck entered the Prussian parliament and quickly became prominent as an outspoken champion of divine-right monarchy. Then followed eight years of service as the Prussian delegate to the Frankfort Diet, where he gained an unrivaled insight into German politics. Appointments as ambassador to the Russian and the French courts completed his diplomatic training. Such was the man, now forty-seven years of age, tall, powerfully built, with a mind no less robust than his body, who had come to the front in Prussia.

Ministers, under the Prussian constitution, were neither appointed by the parliament nor responsible to that body. It was "Blood and iron" therefore possible for a resolute minister, supported by the king and army, to govern in defiance of the legislature. This is what Bismarck proceeded to do. For four years he ruled practically as dictator. Each year, when the parliament refused to vote necessary supplies, Bismarck levied, collected, and spent taxes without an accounting to the people's representatives. The necessary military reforms were then carried out by the masterly hands of Roon and Moltke. The

---

1 See page 68.
country as a whole seems to have acquiesced in this bold viola-
tion of the constitution. Public opinion, except that of the
liberal middle classes, reëchoed Bismarck’s famous and oft-
quoted words: “Not by speeches and majority resolutions are
the great questions of the day to be decided — that was the
mistake of 1848 and 1849 — but by blood and iron.”

82. United Germany, 1864–1871

Successful at home, Bismarck now turned his attention
abroad. He and his royal master were firmly determined to
place Prussia at the head
of Germany. **Bismarck**
and Austria
This meant a
conflict with Austria, for
Bismarck’s experience at
Frankfort had convinced
him that Austria would
never willingly surrender
her place in the Germanic
Confederation. From the
moment of becoming chief
minister he had disclosed
an anti-Austrian bias. He
refused to admit Austria
to the Zollverein and re-
ognized the new Italian
kingdom with unfriendly
haste; finally, he opposed
Austrian policy in the so-
called Schleswig-Holstein
question.

The duchies of Schleswig and Holstein — the one partly
Danish and partly German in population, the
other entirely German — had been united to Den-
mark by a personal union through its ruler.
They remained otherwise independent and stoutly resisted all
efforts to incorporate them in the Danish kingdom. Since 1815, moreover, Holstein had been a member of the Germanic Confederation. Matters came to a head in 1863, when the sovereign of Denmark imposed a constitution upon the duchies which practically destroyed their independence. This action aroused deep resentment among German nationalists, who wished to have Schleswig and Holstein united with the Fatherland.

Bismarck saw clearly what the possession of the two duchies, with their strategic position between the Baltic and the North Sea and fine harbor at Kiel, would mean for the development of German sea-power. Their annexation was the goal which he kept steadily before his eyes. Accordingly, he proposed joint intervention by Austria and Prussia. Austria assented. A brief war followed, in which the Danes were overcome by weight of numbers. Denmark had to sign a treaty ceding Schleswig and Holstein to the victors jointly.

As Bismarck anticipated, Austria and Prussia could not agree concerning the disposition of the conquered duchies. The quarrel between them furnished a pretext for the conflict which he had determined to provoke between the house of Hapsburg and the house of Hohenzollern. Before hostilities began, his astute diplomacy isolated Austria from foreign support. Napoleon III engaged to remain neutral, on the strength of Bismarck's promises (never meant to be kept) of territorial "compensations" to France from a victorious Prussia. Alexander II, the tsar of Russia, also preserved neutrality, as a return for Bismarck's recent offer of Prussian troops to suppress an insurrection of the Poles. With Italy Bismarck negotiated a treaty of alliance, promising her Venetia for military assistance to Prussia. Austria, on her side, had the support of Saxony, Hanover, and lesser German states.

Thanks to the careful organization of the Prussian army by Roon and to Moltke's brilliant strategy, the war turned out to be a "Seven Weeks' War." The Prussians at once took the offensive and quickly overran the territory of Austria's German allies. The three
After a painting by Franz von Lenbach in 1894.
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Prussian armies which invaded Bohemia crushed their Austrian adversaries in the great battle of Sadowa (Königrätz). Francis Joseph I then sued for peace.

The negotiations which followed revealed Bismarck's statesmanship. His royal master wished to enter Vienna in triumph, impose a heavy indemnity, and take a large slice of the Hapsburg realm. Bismarck would not agree, for he did not desire to create any lasting antagonism between Austria and Prussia which would prevent their future alliance. William I finally yielded to his imperious minister and consented to bite "the sour apple" of a moderate peace. By the Treaty of Prague, Austria lost no territory except Venetia to Italy and her claims upon Schleswig-Holstein to Prussia.¹ She consented, however, to the dissolution of the Germanic Confederation.

Bismarck had now a free hand in Germany. His first step was the annexation to Prussia of the Schleswig-Holstein duchies, together with the kingdom of Hanover, the electorate of Hesse-Cassel, the duchy of Nassau, and the free city of Frankfort-on-Main. The Prussian dominions for the first time stretched without a break from Poland to the frontier of France. All the independent states north of the Main — twenty-one in number — were then required by Bismarck to enter a North German Confederation, under the presidency of Prussia. The four states south of the Main,² which had thrown in their lot with Austria, did not enter the new confederation. They secretly agreed, however, to place their armies at the disposal of Prussia in the event of war with France.

For Bismarck a Franco-German War "lay in the logic of history." He believed it necessary, for joint action by the

¹ The treaty contained a reservation that the inhabitants of northern Schleswig might again unite with Denmark, if they expressed their desire to do so by a plebiscite. Prussia, however, would not surrender an inch of the territory which she had gained. Such a plebiscite was provided for in the peace treaty with Germany in 1919. See the map on page 269.

² Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, and Hesse-Darmstadt. The latter state was henceforth called simply Hesse.
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North German and South German states against a common foe would quicken national sentiment and complete the work of unification under Prussia. He also believed it inevitable, in view of the traditional French policy of keeping Germany disunited in order to have a weak neighbor across the Rhine. Napoleon III had now begun to regret his neutrality in the Austro-Prussian War and to realize that if German unity was to be prevented France must draw the sword. The emperor did not shrink from a struggle which he believed would satisfy French opinion and, if victorious, would firmly consolidate his dynasty. After 1867 both governments prepared for the war which both desired.

In 1870 a single spark set the two countries aflame. A revolution had broken out in Spain, and the Liberals there had offered the crown to a cousin of William I. Napoleon III at once informed the Prussian monarch that he would regard the accession of a Hohenzollern as a sufficient justification for war. William then gave way and induced his cousin to refuse the crown. Thereupon Napoleon went further and demanded William’s pledge never to allow a Hohenzollern to become a candidate in the future. This pledge William declined to make, and from the watering-place of Ems, where he was staying, telegraphed his decision to Bismarck at Berlin. After learning from Roon and Moltke of Prussia’s complete readiness for hostilities, Bismarck sent the king’s statement to the newspapers, not in its original form, but so abbreviated as to be insulting. Bismarck himself said later that the Ems dispatch was intended to have “the effect of a red flag upon the Gallic bull.” Soon after receiving it, France declared war.

What followed took away the breath of Europe. Fighting began in mid-July; by mid-August a French army under Bazaine was shut up in Metz; and on September 2 the other army, commanded by MacMahon, was defeated and captured at Sedan. Napoleon III himself became a prisoner. Bazaine surrendered Metz in October. Meanwhile, the Germans pressed forward the siege of
United Germany, 1864–1871

Paris. It held out for four months and then capitulated (January, 1871) to cold and hunger rather than to the enemy. The war now ended.

Bismarck’s harsh treatment of France contrasts sharply with his previous moderation toward Austria. By the Treaty of Frankfort, France agreed to pay an indemnity of one billion dollars within three years and to support a German army of occupation until this sum was forth-

![Map of Alsace-Lorraine]

coming. She also ceded to Germany Alsace, including Strasbourg, and a large part of Lorraine, including Metz. These two fortified cities were regarded as the “gateways” to Germany.

As far back as 1815 Prussia had tried to secure Alsace and Lorraine, in order to provide a more defensible frontier for her Rhenish possessions. Bismarck took them, ostensibly to regain what had once been German territory, but really because of their economic resources (Lorraine is rich in coal and iron) and their value as a barrier against

1 Zola’s powerful novel, The Downfall, deals with the Franco-German War.
2 French, Strasbourg.
3 See pages 44 and 207.
future French aggression. France could never reconcile herself to the loss of the two provinces; after 1871 she always hoped to win them back. The majority of the inhabitants themselves continued to be French in language and feeling, despite German schools, German military training, and a heavy German immigration. Alsace and Lorraine thus became another open sore on the face of Europe. More than anything else, their annexation helped to unsettle the peace of the world for nearly half a century.

Paris had not capitulated, the Treaty of Frankfort had not been signed, before united Germany came into existence. The four South German states yielded to the national sentiment evoked by the war and agreed with Prussia to enter the North German Confederation, rechristened the German Empire. On January 18, 1871, in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles, William I took the title of German Emperor.

The national movement between 1848 and 1871 turned much of Europe upside down. Austria had been driven out of Italy and Germany, which were now transformed into great unified states. Denmark had lost her duchies. France had lost Alsace-Lorraine. All this meant the end of the European Concert and the balance of power established in
1815. Napoleon III, Cavour, and Bismarck, between them, thus destroyed the Vienna settlement. The national movement did not stop or even lag after 1871. Combined henceforth more inextricably with democracy, nationalism continued to be a moving force in European history during the forty-three years which were yet to elapse before the outbreak of the World War.

Studies

1. Locate the battle-fields of Magenta, Solferino, Sadowa (Königrätz), and Sedan. 2. Differentiate the meanings of the terms “nation,” “people,” “state,” and “government.” 3. “Nationalism is simply the tangible outward manifestation of the growth of democracy.” Does this seem to be a defensible statement? 4. Mention some of the “submerged nationalities” of Europe at the middle of the nineteenth century. 5. “Nations are seldom born except on the field of battle.” Illustrate this statement. 6. Compare the coup d'état of Louis Napoleon with that of Napoleon Bonaparte. 7. What is meant by saying that Napoleon III could not “sit still”? 8. Show that the Alps provide a less satisfactory boundary for Italy than the Pyrenees for Spain. 9. Why has the Po Valley been called the “cockpit of Europe?” 10. Why should Garibaldi, rather than Cavour, be the national hero of Italy? 11. Where is the republic of San Marino? 12. How could Bismarck justify his policy of unification through “blood and iron?” 13. Why was Austria excluded from unified Germany? 14. Why did Prussia treat Austria mildly in 1866 and France harshly in 1871? 15. “The Seven Years’ War may be looked upon as the first act of the drama that was played out at Sadowa and Sedan.” Explain this statement. 16. What is meant by the saying that “Prussia was hatched from a cannon ball?” 17. Show that the German Empire, as established in 1871, was not a continuation or restoration of the Holy Roman Empire. 18. Compare William I with Victor Emmanuel II and Cavour with Bismarck. 19. Contrast the methods employed in the unification of Italy and Germany, respectively.
CHAPTER XII

THE UNITED KINGDOM AND THE BRITISH EMPIRE

83. Great Britain

Great Britain affords unusual advantages for the development of an independent, numerous, and wealthy people. Its proximity to the mainland makes intercourse easy, but since 1066 the English Channel and North Sea have been wide enough to form an effective barrier against sudden invasion. A position on the western edge of Europe and opposite the New World enabled Great Britain to profit by the geographical discoveries of the fifteenth century, which shifted the seat of trade from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic seaboard. Commercial expansion has also been facilitated by the extended coast line and many good harbors of the islands. The shallowness of the surrounding seas accounts for the fact that British fisheries are among the most valuable in the world. Agriculturally, Great Britain owes much to its equable climate and abundant rainfall. Farming and sheep raising were the most important occupations during the Middle Ages and early modern times. After the introduction of machinery and steam power, the country was found to contain vast stores of coal and iron. These resources, together with the wool produced at home and the cotton imported from abroad, furnished the foundation of British supremacy in mining and manufacturing during the past one hundred and fifty years.

Nature has divided England into two distinct regions. South-eastern England is prevailing level, though varied with hills or uplands of limestone and chalk. This part of the island has the most fruitful soil. It was

1 Webster, Historical Source Book, No. 22, "Chartist Petition, 1838."
Great Britain

therefore the part first settled by the Germanic invaders, and until the nineteenth century was the most prosperous and progressive section of the country. Recent economic changes have made northern and western England the chief seat of population and industry, with the exception of London. Once solitary stretches of mountain side and bleak moorland are now studded with busy cities: Manchester, center of the cotton manufacture, Leeds, of the woolen; Birmingham and Sheffield, headquarters for the production of iron and steel; Liverpool, the world's greatest seaport; and many others.

The boundary between England and Scotland is formed by the Solway Firth, the Cheviot Hills, and the Tweed River. The Lowlands, especially the district drained by the Forth and the Clyde, include most of the towns of Scotland. The Clyde is a great shipbuilding center, and Glasgow on its banks ranks next to London among British cities. The Highlands, bounded by a rocky coast and cold, stormy seas, comprise about two-thirds of the total area of Scotland. They are, however, poor and thinly populated.

The mountainous character of Wales has always fitted it for sheep raising rather than for farming. Scarcely more than half the soil is now under cultivation. Wales, however, possesses rich resources in its mines of coal, iron, copper, and zinc and its slate and limestone quarries. Nearly all the towns are situated on the narrow coastal plain.

The people of Great Britain, though one in government, scarcely form a real nation. England is still the principal country, as containing the capital city and in respect to extent, population, and wealth. There exists a real contrast between the "Old England" of the southeast, conservative, aristocratic, and Anglican, and the new industrial England, democratic in outlook and prevailingly Dissenting in religion. The English of the north and west, with the Scotch, Welsh, and Irish, formed the mass of the Liberal Party during the nineteenth century.

Scotland joined with her southern neighbor and former enemy
in a personal union (1603), when the Scottish king, James VI, inherited the throne of England as James I.\(^1\) The Act of Union (1707) gave the two countries a common Parliament and abolished all trade restrictions between them.\(^2\) Since then Scotland has continued to enjoy local self-government, as well as the benefits of close and friendly intercourse with England. The former hostility between Scots and English has practically disappeared. It is significant of the complete change of sentiment that within the past twenty-five years three Scots have served as prime ministers of Great Britain.\(^3\)

Wales was conquered by Edward I near the close of the thirteenth century, but was not finally incorporated into the English parliamentary system until the reign of Henry VIII, about two hundred and fifty years later. In spite of the immigration of English people into Wales and the teaching of English in the schools, the Welsh have managed to retain their own language. Of the two million inhabitants of Wales, about half still speak Cymric. Many newspapers, periodicals, and books are also printed in that ancient tongue. Popular festivals (\textit{eisteddfodau}), both local and national, also do much to stimulate interest in the music, art, and literature of this little people. Their national consciousness has found expression in politics by the rise of a distinct Welsh political group, which endeavors to advance the special interests of Wales in Parliament.

An Act of Union, passed by Parliament in 1800,\(^4\) joined Ireland and Great Britain to form the United Kingdom. Ireland received one hundred seats in the House of Commons and thirty-two (later twenty-eight) seats in the House of Lords. This measure, unlike the earlier act which united England and Scotland, was not one of consent; it was a forced union which Irish patriots have never since ceased to resent.

\(^1\) See page 13. \(^2\) Earl of Rosebery, Mr. A. J. Balfour, and Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman. The present prime minister, Mr. Lloyd George, is a Welshman. \(^3\) Effective January 1, 1801.
**THE UNION JACK**

The Act of Union with Scotland (1707) required that England and Scotland should have one flag made of the crosses of St. George and St. Andrew combined. After the union with Ireland (1801) the cross of St. Patrick was incorporated in the flag. The name "Jack" comes from the French *Jacques*, referring to James I, the first sovereign of Great Britain.

**84. Parliamentary Reform, 1832**

Whig rule under the first two Georges came to an end ten years after the accession of George III in 1760.\(^1\) It was the Tory ministry of Lord North (1770–1782) which plunged Great Britain into the contest with the Thirteen Colonies. The Younger Pitt, who became prime minister shortly after the conclusion of the Revolutionary War, reorganized the Tory Party. Pitt's first ministry (1783–1801),

\(^1\) See page 82.
with the exception of Walpole's, was the longest in English history. Other Tory leaders succeeded Pitt in office during the remainder of George III's reign and that of his son and successor, George IV.¹

The French Revolution, with its insistence upon "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," promised at first to advance the democratic cause in Great Britain as on the Continent. Such a Whig as Charles James Fox could hail the news of the fall of the Bastille with the exclamation: "How much is this the greatest event that has ever happened in the world, and how much the best!" Burke, another prominent Whig, took the opposite view, and in his celebrated Reflections on the French Revolution predicted that the overthrow of the Old Régime would be followed by mob violence, anarchy, and military despotism. The excesses of the French radicals soon justified Burke's fears and filled both liberal Whigs and conservative Tories with deep distrust of all innovations in government or society. The long struggle with France also set back the popular movement, for foreign warfare on a large scale generally suspends internal reforms. The revolutionary and Napoleonic period formed, therefore, a period of Tory reaction in Great Britain.

A century ago Great Britain was still an undemocratic country. The "Glorious Revolution" had preserved the liberty of the upper classes, but not the liberty of the middle and lower classes. The House of Lords, composed of nobles and bishops who sat by hereditary right or by royal appointment, continued to be a stronghold of aristocracy. Even the House of Commons, the more popular branch of Parliament, represented only a fraction of the British people.

According to the representative system which had been fixed in medieval times, each of the counties (shires) and most of the towns (boroughs) of Great Britain and Ireland had two members in the House of Commons. Representation, however, bore no relation to the size of the population in either case: a large county and

¹ 1820–1830.
a small county, a large town and a small town, sent the same number of representatives. Some flourishing places, such as Manchester, Leeds, Birmingham, and Sheffield, which had grown up since the Middle Ages, were without representation. Other places — the so-called "rotten" boroughs — continued to enjoy representation long after they had so decayed that nothing remained of them but a single house, a green mound, a park, or a ruined wall. The electoral system was equally antiquated. Only landowners could vote in the counties, while in many of the boroughs a handful of well-to-do people alone exercised the franchise. Not more than five percent of all the adult males in Great Britain possessed the right to vote. There were even some "pocket" boroughs, where a rich man, generally a nobleman, had acquired the privilege of naming the representatives. As the Younger Pitt truly declared, "This House is not a representative of the people of Great Britain; it is the representation of nominal boroughs, of ruined and exterminated towns, of noble families, of wealthy individuals, of foreign potentates."

The restricted franchise in the boroughs made it easy to corrupt elections to the House of Commons. Bribery of voters reached its height under George III, who fostered the system in order to strengthen his own authority. Not only were individual voters bribed, but "rotten" and "pocket" boroughs were often sold outright to the highest bidder. The average price of a borough was about five thousand pounds. Thanks to the custom of open polling, voters in the counties were particularly subject to intimidation by landlords, employers, and officials. The evils of bribery and coercion were increased in borough and county alike by the drunkenness and turmoil which prevailed during elections.

Efforts to improve these conditions began in the eighteenth century, but for a long time accomplished nothing. Sober people, alarmed by the events in France, coupled parliamentary reform with revolutionary designs against the government. After 1815, however, the Reign of Terror and Napoleon Bona-
Agitation for parliamentary reform

parte were no longer bogeys; and public opinion grew steadily more hostile to a system of representation which excluded so many educated, prosperous members of the middle class from political power. Great Whig nobles also espoused the liberal cause and made it a party question. The Tories on their side, stood rock-like against anything which savored of democracy. The duke of Wellington, who had become prime minister, even declared that nothing better than the existing system could be devised "by the wit of man." This obstinate refusal to make even the slightest concessions caused the downfall of the duke's ministry. In 1830, the year of the "July Revolution" in France, the Whigs under Earl Grey returned to office, under pledge to introduce a measure for parliamentary reform.

The events which followed cast much light on British methods of government. The Reform Bill introduced by Earl Grey failed to pass the House of Commons. Parliament was then dissolved, in order to test the sentiment of the country by means of a general election. "The bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the bill," cried the reforming Whigs. They triumphed, and another Reform Bill passed the new House of Commons by a large majority. The House of Lords, staunchly Tory, threw it out. During the next session yet a third bill was put through the Commons. The Lords insisted upon amendments which the ministry would not accept. Meanwhile, popular excitement rose to fever pitch, and in one mass meeting after another the Lords were denounced as a corrupt and selfish oligarchy. Earl Grey advised the king ¹ to create enough Whig peers to carry the measure in the upper chamber. The king refused to do so; the premier and his associates resigned; and the duke of Wellington tried without success to form another Tory ministry. Earl Grey then resumed office, having secured the royal promise to create the necessary peers. This extreme step was not taken, however, for the mere threat of it brought the Lords to terms. In 1832 the long-debated bill quietly became law.

¹ William IV (1830–1837), a brother of George IV
The First Reform Act achieved two results. It suppressed most of the "rotten" and "pocket" boroughs, thus setting free a large number of seats in the House of Commons for distribution among towns and counties which were either unrepresented or insufficiently represented. It also gave the franchise in the counties to tenants who paid a rent of at least ten pounds a year, and in the towns to all who owned or rented a building of the same annual value. The act thus considerably increased the number of voters in the United Kingdom. Workingmen and agricultural laborers — the majority of the population — still remained unenfranchised.

The First Reform Act effected a momentous change in British politics. The Revolution of 1688–1689 had transferred the chief power from the sovereign to the [Advent of the middle class upper class, or landed aristocracy. The parliamentary revolution of 1832 shifted the balance to the middle class of merchants, manufacturers, and professional men — the Continental bourgeoisie. Henceforth for many years it continued to rule Great Britain.

The events of 1832 have another significance as well. They proved that the Tory aristocracy, entrenched in the House of Lords, could not permanently defy the popular will, that "it was impossible for the whisper of a faction to prevail against the voice of a nation." The Lords yielded, however ungraciously, to public opinion. Their action meant that for the future Great Britain would progress by peaceful, orderly reform, rather than by revolution. That country is the only considerable state in Europe which during the past century has not undergone a revolutionary change of government.

85. Political Democracy, 1832–1867

The passage of the First Reform Act profoundly affected the two historic parties. The Whigs appeared henceforth as

1 See page 30.
the particular champions of all liberal, progressive measures. They soon discarded their old name and began to call themselves Liberals and Conservatives. The Tories, now known as Conservatives, were in theory opposed to further changes, but when holding office generally went as far as their opponents in the direction of reform. Both parties realized that the time had come for Great Britain to correct old abuses and to modernize her institutions.

The next thirty-five years constituted a veritable era of reform in almost every field. During these years Parliament abolished slavery throughout the British Empire, enacted a judicious Poor Law to reduce pauperism, passed legislation ameliorating conditions of employment in factories and mines, modified the harshness of the criminal code, began to establish a system of popular education, and adopted free trade. Nothing was done, however, toward further extension of the suffrage.

The failure of Parliament to enfranchise the masses produced much popular discontent, and during the early years of Queen Victoria’s reign ¹ the movement known as Chartism began to make headway among workingmen. The Chartists derived their name from a charter of liberties which they proposed to secure. It demanded the famous Six Points: (1) universal manhood suffrage; (2) secret voting; (3) equal electoral dis-

¹ Victoria (1837–1901) was the niece of George IV and William IV.
tricts; (4) removal of the property qualifications for membership in Parliament; (5) payment of members of Parliament; and (6) annual parliamentary elections. All but the last of these demands, which seemed so radical at the time, have since been granted.

The “February Revolution” in Paris, reverberating in London, led to preparations for a great Chartist demonstration. Six million persons, it was announced, had signed a petition for the Six Points, and half a million men, many of them armed, made ready to carry it to Parliament. The government took alarm and put a large force of special constables under the command of the aged but still courageous duke of Wellington, to protect life and property. The government’s firm attitude, coupled with a downpour of rain on the day appointed for the procession, dampened the spirits as well as the bodies of the Chartists, and they dispersed. Their monster petition, upon examination, was found to contain less than half the boasted number of signatures, and of these many were fictitious. This exposure discredited the whole Chartist movement.¹

The collapse of Chartism did not end the agitation for a more democratic Great Britain. The popular movement there owed much to the outcome of the American Civil War, which was regarded as a triumph for democracy. It began to seem anomalous that British workingmen should be denied the vote about to be granted negroes in the United States. Two great statesmen — one a Liberal and the other a Conservative — perceived this clearly, and each became an advocate of further parliamentary reform. The two statesmen were Gladstone and Disraeli.

William Ewart Gladstone, the son of a rich Liverpool merchant of Scottish birth, had been educated at aristocratic Eton and Oxford. When only twenty-four years old, he entered Parliament from a “pocket” borough. Gladstone’s rise was rapid, for he had wealth, family

¹ Charles Kingsley’s *Alton Locke* is a novel dealing with Christian Socialism and Chartist
influence, an attractive personality, wide knowledge both of books and of men, enormous energy, and oratorical gifts of a high order. All things considered, no Englishman of Gladstone's generation equaled him as a public speaker. His voice, singularly clear and far-reaching, his eagle glance, his command of language, and his earnestness made him an impressive figure, whether in the House of Commons or on the platform. This "rising hope of the stern, unbending Tories," as the historian Macaulay called him, in time disappointed his political backers by joining the Liberal Party. It was as a Liberal that Gladstone four times became prime minister of Great Britain.¹

Benjamin Disraeli belonged to a converted Jewish family of London. His father, a well-known author, had him educated privately. He first appeared before the public as a novelist, and in one book after another proceeded to heap ridicule upon the upper classes. Entering Parliament as an independent radical, Disraeli's florid speech and eccentricities of dress — he wore bright colored waistcoats and decked himself with rings — at first only provoked derision. Gradually, however, the young man's cleverness and courage overcame the prejudice against him. His own radical viewpoint altered, and before long he became a Conservative, posing henceforth as a staunch defender of the Crown, the Established Church, and the aristocracy. Disraeli proved to be an expert parliamentarian, always formidable in debate. For thirty years he absolutely dominated the Conservative Party and twice he realized a once "wild ambition" to be prime minister.²

In 1866 Gladstone, then leader of the House of Commons, introduced a measure for franchise reform. Such old-fashioned Liberals as were opposed to further concessions to democracy combined with the Conservatives to defeat the bill and overthrow the ministry. The Conservatives then returned to power, with Disraeli the real, though not the titular chief of the party. The Conservative ministry was even less friendly to reform than

¹ In 1868–1874, 1880–1885, 1886, and 1892–1894.
² In 1868 and 1874–1880.
its Liberal predecessor, but popular demonstrations throughout the country convinced Disraeli that an extension of the suffrage could no longer be delayed. He decided "to dish the Whigs" by granting it himself. This was done in 1867.

The Second Reform Act gave the vote in the boroughs to all householders, whatever the value of their property, and to all lodgers who paid ten pounds or more a year for unfurnished rooms. By thus enfranchising workingmen, it almost doubled the electorate. The only considerable class still without the vote was that of the agricultural laborers.

86. Political Democracy, 1867–1918

Disraeli expected that the Second Reform Act would unite under the Conservative banner both aristocrats and working people against the great middle class represented by the Liberals. He was disappointed. The next election showed that the enfranchised workingmen preferred Gladstone's Liberal leadership. In 1872 Gladstone, who had now become premier, secured the passage of a bill providing for the secret or Australian\(^1\) ballot, in place of open elections. The Ballot Act did away with the old-time corruption and intimidation in elections.

During his second ministry Gladstone carried democratic reform still farther by the passage of the Third Reform Act. It made the county franchise practically identical with that of the boroughs, thus giving the vote to agricultural laborers. Most Conservatives and many Liberals thought it dangerous to go to such lengths. But Gladstone answered: "I take my stand upon the broad principle that the enfranchisement of capable citizens, be they few or be they many — and if they be many so much the better — is an addition to the strength of the state."

The United Kingdom after 1884 enjoyed virtually universal manhood suffrage, such as had already been established in

\(^1\) First used by British colonists in Victoria, Australia, and now found in the United States and many other countries.
France (1848), Germany (1871), and the United States. But
the demand for "votes for women," which began to be heard
from about this time, only aroused the anger
or ridicule of Liberals and Conservatives alike.
Nevertheless, woman suffrage organizations were
formed, debates were held on the platform and in the
newspapers, and equal franchise bills were introduced into
Parliament. The movement made slow progress, though some
women received the right to vote in local elections. A num-
ber of the leaders, including Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst and
her two daughters, then adopted "militant" methods, in
order to bring the issue prominently before the public.
This they succeeded in doing, though the average Britisher
was rather repelled than attracted by the petty outrages which
the "suffragettes" committed. As late as 1913 Parliament
rejected a bill for a reform of the suffrage, in which women
should share.

The World War gave women the vote in the United King-
dom. Their patriotic service in the hospitals, in munition
factories, and on the farms had its reward in 1918,
when both parties in Parliament assented to an
Equal Franchise Act. This measure ranks in
importance with the three acts of 1832, 1867, and 1884. It
not only confers the franchise for the House of Commons upon
substantially every man over twenty-one years of age in Great
Britain and Ireland, but also confers it upon every woman over
thirty years of age who has hitherto voted in local elections
or is the wife of a local elector.1 There are now about sixteen
million voters in the United Kingdom, or one in three of the
population.

After almost a century of gradual reform Great Britain has
thus definitely abandoned the old theory, rooted in feudal
conceptions, of the franchise as a privilege attached
to the ownership of property, especially land.
Voting henceforth becomes a right to be enjoyed by every

1 The first woman to be elected to the House of Commons was Lady
Astor (a former American girl), who took her seat in December, 1919.
citizen, whether man or woman. A general election for members of Parliament is now an appeal to a responsible people, and the will of the majority of the people must be carried out by Parliament. Politically, Great Britain ranks among the most democratic of modern countries.

87. Government of the United Kingdom

The British constitution is both written and unwritten. The written part consists, first, of such documents as Magna Carta and the Bill of Rights, which represented the agreements between king and people; second, of parliamentary statutes, such as the Habeas Corpus Act, the Act of Settlement, and the various Reform Acts; third, of international treaties, including the Union with Scotland and the Union with Ireland; and fourth, of the Common Law as expressed in court decisions. All these documents have never been brought together in one comprehensive instrument like the constitutions of the United States, of France, and of other modern countries.

The unwritten part of the British constitution includes a mass of customs binding on both Crown and Parliament. Some of them reach back to medieval times, but others are more recent, for instance, those relating to the cabinet. Traditional usages of this sort grow up about any constitution, even our own, as may be seen from comparing the constitutional provision for an electoral college with the actual method in vogue for choosing the President. In Great Britain they play a still larger part in the conduct of government, owing to the love of precedent so characteristic of the British people.

As far as appearances go, the sovereign of Great Britain and Ireland is a divine-right monarch. Coins and proclamations still recite that he rules "by the grace of God." The Crown (dei gratia), and the opening words of the British national anthem are "God Save Our Lord and King." He is also, as far as appearances go, an absolute monarch. Whatever the government does, from the arrest of a criminal to the
declaration of a war, is done in his name. But everyone knows that the British sovereign now only acts by and with the advice of his responsible ministers. Should George V attempt to revive the absolutism of James II, he would meet the fate of James II.

This figurehead king occupies, nevertheless, a useful place in the British governmental system. As the representative of the nation, he often exercises a restraining, moderating influence upon public affairs, especially through his consultations with politicians of both parties. He himself stands above party. A common loyalty to the Crown, as an ancient, dignified, and permanent institution, also helps to bind together the self-governing commonwealths of the British Empire. It is a symbol of imperial unity such as could scarcely be afforded by an elective and constantly changing Presidency. The rising tide of republicanism has thus failed to affect the British monarchy, and the personal popularity of Queen Victoria, Edward VII, and George V seems to have established it more solidly than a century ago in the esteem of their subjects.

British legal theory makes Parliament consist of the Crown, the House of Lords, and the House of Commons. The share of the Crown is now limited to expressing assent to a bill after its passage by the Commons and the Lords. Such assent the king must give. The royal veto has not been expressly taken away, but Queen Anne in 1707 was the last sovereign to exercise this former prerogative. Nor may the courts set aside an act of Parliament as unconstitutional, for every statute is a part of the constitution. An American student, accustomed to the water-tight division of powers between President, Congress, and the federal courts, finds it hard to appreciate the legal omnipotence of the British Parliament. The only check upon it is the political good sense of the British people.

The House of Lords contains upwards of seven hundred members. The Lords Spiritual include the two archbishops and most of the bishops of the Anglican Church in England. The Lords Temporal include princes
INTERIOR OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

The narrow room in which the House of Commons holds its sessions contains seats for less than 150 of the 790 members. The decoratation in
of the royal blood, English peers holding office by hereditary right, sixteen representative peers of Scotland, and twenty-eight representative peers of Ireland. There are also four law lords, who, with the Lord Chancellor, form the highest court of appeal for certain cases. The Lord Chancellor presides over the House of Lords. The power to create new peers belongs to the Crown, but usually the prime minister decides who shall be selected for this honor. Distinction in any field is frequently recognized by the grant of a peerage. Lawyers, authors, artists, scientists, and generals rub shoulders with gentleman landlords, capitalists, and politicians on the floor of the House of Lords.

The House of Lords was the dominant chamber until the passage of the First Reform Act. Since then it has been understood that the Lords might not oppose the Commons on any measure supported by a majority of the electorate. This purely conventional restriction was written into the constitution by the Parliament Act of 1911. The Lords agreed to it only when confronted, as in 1832, with the prospect of being "swamped" by a large number of newly created Liberal peers. The Parliament Act deprives the upper chamber of all control of money bills, that is, bills levying taxes or making appropriations. Such measures become laws one month after being sent from the Commons to the Lords, whether accepted by the latter or not. The act further provides that every other bill, passed by the Commons in three successive sessions (extending over two years at least) and rejected by the Lords at each of the three sessions, shall become law. The House of Lords is thus left with only a "suspensive veto" of legislation.

The hereditary House of Lords is so frankly an anachronism in democratic Great Britain that from time to time various proposals have been made for its "mending or ending." Many reformers would like to see it become an elective upper chamber like the French and American Senates. Some radicals would abolish the House of Lords.

1 See page 136.
altogether, thus doing away with the bicameral system. There seems reason to believe, however, that in one form or another it will survive for many years. Birth and family still count for much in British society, and the average citizen retains a profound respect for the aristocracy.

The House of Commons consists of seven hundred and seven members, chosen by universal suffrage from equal electoral districts in Great Britain and in Ireland. Commoners serve for five years, which is the maximum life of a single Parliament. This period is curtailed whenever the Crown, on the advice of its ministers, dissolves the House of Commons and orders a new general election. Voting does not take place on one day throughout the United Kingdom; it may extend over as much as two weeks. Nor need a candidate be a resident of the district which he proposes to represent. Defeat in one constituency, therefore, does not necessarily exclude a man from Parliament; he may always "stand" for another constituency. Prominent politicians, as a rule, retain seats in the House of Commons year after year. The property qualification for members of the House of Commons has been abolished, and since 1911 they have received salaries.

Parliament works through a committee known as the cabinet. This body exists purely by custom and has no place whatever in the written constitution of the United Kingdom. The cabinet usually includes about twenty commoners and lords, who belong to the party

---

1 See page 79. The terms "cabinet" and "ministry" are used interchangeably. The ministry, however, contains a large number of administrative officers who do not attend cabinet meetings.
in power. During the World War, however, a "coalition" cabinet, representing both parties, carried on the government. Members of the cabinet are selected by a caucus of the majority party in Parliament, always, of course, with the approval of the prime minister, who is the recognized leader of the party. The cabinet acts together in all matters, thus presenting a united front to Parliament and the country.

The cabinet shapes legislation, determines policy, and administers the laws. In secret sessions it drafts the more important measures to be laid before the House of Commons. That body may amend bills thus presented to it, but amendments are usually few and unimportant. Should a cabinet measure fail to pass the Commons, or should the Commons vote a resolution of "no confidence," custom requires the cabinet to resign or "go to the country." In the former case, the king "sends for" the leader of the opposite party and invites him to form a cabinet which will have the support of the Commons. In the latter case, the king dissolves Parliament and calls a general election. The return of a majority favorable to the cabinet permits it to remain in office; otherwise the prime minister and his associates give way to a cabinet formed by the Opposition.

However powerful, the cabinet is not an irresponsible oligarchy. Public opinion prevails in Great Britain as in other democratic countries. Proposals for new legislation, as a rule, are thoroughly discussed in newspapers and on the platform before and after their submission by the cabinet to the House of Commons. No cabinet would think of backing a measure which in its judgment was not favored by the great body of the electorate. As has been noted, general elections must be held at least every five years and may be held at any time in order to secure an expression of the popular will. Furthermore, a defeat at a general election or a defeat or vote of censure in the House of Commons is not always necessary for the downfall of a cabinet. The prime minister sometimes resigns office even
Ireland and the Irish Question

when he retains a majority in the Commons, if he feels that his policies are no longer acceptable to the country at large. Lord Rosebery did this in 1895, and so did Mr. Balfour ten years later. Public opinion thus affects all legislative measures and determines the rise and fall of cabinets.

The Liberals and Tories continue to control Parliament in the twentieth as in the nineteenth century. The last general election (December, 1918) returned a large number of Laborites, some of them trade unionists and others socialists. Since the middle 'eighties the Irish Nationalists, who advocate Home Rule for Ireland, have been an important minority party, usually in alliance with the Liberals. In the last election, however, the Nationalists were swallowed by the Sinn Feiners, whose program is a completely independent Ireland.

88. Ireland and the Irish Question

Nature has been less favorable to Ireland than to Great Britain. Communication between different parts of the island is interrupted by numerous lakes, large areas of bog and marsh, and isolated groups of mountains. The Shannon forms the only navigable river. A moist climate, resulting in an average of over two hundred rainy days in the year, makes much of the soil too wet for the cultivation of cereals. The green meadows of Ireland, which give it the name of the Emerald Isle, are consequently better adapted to cattle raising and dairy pursuits than to farming. The natural resources of the country in coal and minerals are very limited. It also suffers from a remote position on the western margin of Europe, with Great Britain in a position to intercept its Continental trade. The relative backwardness of Ireland, agriculturally, industrially, and commercially, provides a partial explanation for its failure to keep pace with the rest of the United Kingdom in wealth and population.

The people of Ireland are commonly known as Celts. This

1 Since 1886 often called Unionists, because they oppose Home Rule and desire to retain the union of Great Britain and Ireland under a common Parliament.
only means that, like the Welsh, they speak a Celtic language. The Romans never attempted to conquer the aboriginal inhabitants of Ireland. The Northmen in the ninth century overran part of it, settling chiefly along the coast, where they founded Dublin and Limerick. Throughout the Middle Ages most of the island remained divided among numerous clans and tribes. Irish history during this period is a confused record of the struggles for ascendancy between the O'Neills of Ulster, the O'Connors of Connaught, the McCathys of Munster, and other native chieftains.

The English entered Ireland during the reign of Henry II in the twelfth century. They first occupied the region around Dublin, which received the name of the Pale.\(^1\) Later sovereigns, especially Henry VIII and Queen Elizabeth, extended English dominion throughout the island and sought to Anglicize it by introducing the English language, the Common Law, and the Anglican Church. The Irish, however, would not give up their own Celtic speech, their tribal customs, and their Roman Catholic faith. Ireland constantly seethed with rebellion, and it required the iron hand of Oliver Cromwell to bring peace to the distracted country. At the time of the "Glorious Revolution" the Roman Catholic Irish espoused the side of James II, but William of Orange (William III) completely defeated James II at the battle of the Boyne in 1690. For the next century Ireland remained quiescent under alien rule.

The government of England in its efforts to subdue Ireland early adopted the policy of colonizing parts of it with immigrants, who would be more tractable than the natives. Early in the reign of James I Protestant Scotch and English were settled in the province of Ulster, where they received ample estates and privileges. After Cromwell's pacification of Ireland, other "plantations" of Englishmen took place in Leinster and Munster. William III subsequently rewarded his adherents by granting them more than a million acres of Irish soil.

\(^1\) See the map on page 23.
Ireland and the Irish Question

These confiscations gave rise to an acute agrarian problem in Ireland. Much of the country belonged to the heirs and successors of the Englishmen who had received Absentee landlordism Irish estates. They lived as a rule in England, seldom or never visited Ireland, and took no interest in the welfare of the Irish tenantry. The management of their property was left to hard-hearted agents, who seized every opportunity to raise the rents of tenants.

Such opportunities constantly arose. There were few ways of earning a living in Ireland except from the soil, and keen competition among the peasantry for farms forced "Rack-renting". The landlord, as a rule, received everything above a bare subsistence for the tenant and his family. "Rack-renting" increased the misery of the peasants. All improvements on a farm had to be made by the tenant, but if he made them his rent was immediately raised. Refusal to pay it meant eviction from his cottage home. No wonder that under this system the soil was wretchedly cultivated.

Year after year Irish peasants sank deeper in poverty. The high rents and the scanty yield of the ill-used soil kept them constantly on the verge of starvation. They did The Potato Famine starve whenever there was a failure of the potato crop, on which they chiefly relied for food. Conditions were worst during the Potato Famine of 1846–1847. Eighty thousand persons, it is estimated, perished at this time, in spite of charity and government aid. The survivors emigrated in great numbers to America. Within four years the population of the country decreased by more than a million. The decline continued to the end of the nineteenth century, until Ireland had lost by mortality and emigration half of its people.

Many years elapsed before the British government made a resolute attempt to remedy agrarian distress in Ireland. Gladstone's Land Act in 1881 marks the first constructive legislation to meet the Irish demand for the "three F's"—fair rent (a rent fixed by public authority

1 The potato had been introduced into Ireland from America.
instead of by competition), fixity of tenure (the right of a peasant to hold his land as long as he paid rent), and free sale (his right to sell to his successor any improvements made by him). The Land Purchase Acts, passed by the Conservative Party in 1891 and 1903, create a state fund from which tenants may borrow money on easy terms to buy their holdings. Thousands of Irishmen have already availed themselves of this opportunity to get rid of the hated landlords and become independent proprietors. The agrarian problem in Ireland bids fair soon to be solved.

The religious problem has already been solved. Ireland, it will be remembered, did not become Protestant at the time of the Reformation, and to this day three-fourths of the population remain attached to the Roman Catholic faith. Nevertheless, Irish Catholics had to pay tithes for the support of the Anglican Church in Ireland, until after the middle of the nineteenth century. Gladstone's first ministry removed this grievance by disestablishing the Anglican Church in Ireland. Disestablishment meant that Ireland would no longer have a state church to which all the people, irrespective of their religious beliefs, were obliged to contribute.

The third problem is that of Home Rule. Since the Act of Union in 1801, Ireland has continued to be ruled by the British Parliament, in which the English and Scots hold an overwhelming majority. Irishmen objected to this arrangement and demanded the restoration of the former Irish Parliament, which sat in Dublin. The first leader of the Home Rule agitation was the celebrated orator and patriot, Daniel O'Connell. His failure to secure by constitutional means the repeal of the Act of Union led to the formation of a Young Ireland party, which unsuccessfully imitated the Continental revolutions of 1848. About twenty years later Irish-Americans organized the Fenian Brotherhood, a secret revolutionary society. Fenians in America tried to invade Canada, while those in Ireland fomented riots, blew up public buildings, and murdered officials. Terrorism failed, as always, but it at least kept the attention of British statesmen fixed on the perennial Irish Question.
Ireland and the Irish Question

During the 'seventies and 'eighties of the last century the cause of Home Rule found its ablest advocate in Charles Stewart Parnell. He was a landlord and a Protestant, but nevertheless won the enthusiastic support of all Irish patriots. Parnell took the leadership of the Irish Nationalists, a political party devoted to Home Rule. When Gladstone entered upon his third ministry in 1886, the Nationalists were numerous enough to hold the balance of power in the House of Commons. Gladstone could only secure their support by introducing a Home Rule Bill. So bitter was the opposition to it that nearly a hundred Liberals deserted their party and joined the Conservatives, thus defeating the measure. In 1893 the "Grand Old Man," now premier for the fourth time, brought in his second Home Rule Bill. It passed the Commons but met defeat in the Lords. Mr. Asquith's Liberal ministry subsequently introduced a third Home Rule Bill. Having thrice passed the House of Commons, it became a law in 1914, notwithstanding its rejection by the House of Lords. The outbreak of the World War, however, suspended the operation of the measure. It proved to be so unpopular with all classes of Irishmen that in December, 1919, Mr. Lloyd George laid before the House of Commons still another Home Rule Bill. This latest measure provides for the creation of two legislative bodies, one in the north of Ireland (Ulster) and one in the south, with a council selected by the two legislatures to form a connecting link between them. The Irish parliaments would control all local matters, most of the administrative machinery except the army and navy, and would have powers over taxation equivalent to
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those of state legislatures in the United States. Should such a compromise scheme be adopted, the representation of Ireland in the British Parliament at Westminster will be reduced to forty members.

The recent land legislation, disestablishment, and the Home Rule bills sufficiently indicate the desire of liberal-minded Ulster Britishers to do the right thing by Ireland. Nevertheless, there is still an Irish Question. The answer to it is complicated by the existence in Ulster of a part of Ireland which is not truly Irish. More than half of the people of Ulster are descendants of Protestant immigrants during the seventeenth century. It was these Orangemen, as they called themselves because they adhered to William of Orange, who overthrew James II and his Irish army at the famous battle of the Boyne. Since then there has been only antipathy between Ulster and the rest of the Emerald Isle. Rightly or wrongly, the Ulsterites believe that with Home Rule the Catholic majority in an Irish Parliament would exclude them from political life, tax them excessively, and deprive them of religious liberty. They prefer, therefore, to retain the Act of Union, or else to have a separate parliament of their own. In 1914 the Ulsterites seemed ready to provoke a civil conflict rather than accept Home Rule.

Meanwhile, an agitation in favor of complete independence has been making rapid progress in the rest of Ireland. It owes much to a group of quiet scholars, who devoted themselves to the revival of Irish literature, the old Irish language (Erse), and the sentiment of Irish nationality. This national movement gave birth to the Sinn Fein Party. The members will have nothing to do with Home Rule and insist upon the entire separation of Ireland from Great Britain. In the spring of 1916 they allied themselves with radical workingmen in Dublin and proclaimed an Irish Republic. British troops put down the insurrection and executed some of its leaders. Despite the fact that the Sinn Feiners, acting on the old Irish motto "England's extremity is Ireland's opportunity," lent aid and comfort to Germany during the World War, they

1 Irish for "Ourselves alone."
secured nearly all the Irish representation in Parliament at the last general election.

The geographical situation in Ireland seems to make some form of union with Great Britain inevitable. An independent Ireland would be the prey of the first great power to quarrel with her or the tool of the first to quarrel with Great Britain. In either case the British people would be gravely imperiled, for Ireland commands the most important sea routes over which come the foodstuffs and raw materials indispensable to their existence. This is the principal reason why forty-four million Britishers continue to deny political sovereignty to four million Irishmen.

89. Extension of the British Empire

The United Kingdom is the cradle and present center of the British Empire. That empire is of comparatively recent origin. In 1600 England did not possess a mile of foreign territory, excepting the Channel Islands. Before the end of the seventeenth century the foundations of the empire were laid all the world over. Valuable trading stations had been secured in India and the East Indies, on the coast of Africa, and in the West Indies, while many settlements had been planted along the eastern shores of North America. This first period of imperial history was marked by three wars between England and Holland.1 All the fighting took place on the sea. Neither side could claim a decided victory, but the Dutch had to surrender the colony of New Amsterdam and to admit the maritime supremacy of England.

The next period of imperial history saw the long struggle between Great Britain and France, which has been called a second Hundred Years’ War.2 Its outcome dissipated French dreams of dominion in India and Canada and established British sea-power more firmly than ever. As an offset to these gains, Great Britain lost the Thirteen Colonies — the “one disruption” of her empire.

---

1 The Dutch Wars of 1652–1654, 1665–1667, and 1672–1674.
2 See page 118 and note 1.
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The wars of the revolutionary and Napoleonic era only confirmed Great Britain's mastery of the ocean, and after Lord Nelson's victories she utilized her naval superiority to appropriate most of the remaining French colonies. The dependence of Holland on France enabled the British to seize the Dutch colonies of Guiana, Ceylon, and South Africa (Cape of Good Hope). Their colonization of Australia also began during this third period of imperial history.

The British Empire continued to expand throughout the past century in India, Africa, Australia, North America, and the islands of the seas. The Union Jack now floats over a quarter of the land surface of the globe.¹

90. Organization of the British Empire

Unlike most of the great empires of the past, which stretched continuously on land, the British Empire is scattered over all the continents, and its several states are separated from one another by all the great oceans of the world. British trade routes and lines of communication are manifold.

¹ Chief British Possessions in 1914

**Europe:** The United Kingdom, Gibraltar, Malta.

**Africa:** Ascension Island, St. Helena, Gambia, Sierra Leone, Gold Coast Colony, Ashanti, Northern Territories, Nigeria, Union of South Africa (Cape of Good Hope, Natal, Orange Free State, Transvaal), Basutoland, Swaziland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, Zanzibar, British East Africa, Uganda Protectorate, British Somaliland, Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, Egypt, Mauritius, Seychelles.

**Asia:** Cyprus, Aden, Sokotra, Perim, Ceylon, British India (Madras, Bombay, Bengal, United Provinces of Agra and Oudh, Punjab, Behar and Orissa, Central Provinces and Berar, Northwest Frontier Province, Ajmer-Merwara, Coorg, Delhi, Baluchistan, Assam, Burma, Andaman and Nicobar Islands), Feudatory Indian States, Malay States, Straits Settlements, Hongkong, Wei-hai-wei.

**Oceania:** British North Borneo, Sarawak, Papua or British New Guinea, Australian Commonwealth (New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, South Australia, Western Australia, Tasmania), New Zealand, Fiji Islands, Tonga Islands, Cook Islands, Gilbert Islands.

**America:** Newfoundland and Labrador, Dominion of Canada (Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, British Columbia, Yukon, Mackenzie, Franklin, Keewatin), Bermudas, British West Indies (Bahamas, Jamaica, Leeward Islands, Windward Islands, Barbados, Trinidad, Tobago), British Honduras, British Guiana, Falkland Islands.
cation by steamship and submarine cable lie across thousands of miles of water. Without sea-power the empire could not be preserved. It would break into fragments, some becoming independent countries and others falling a prey to their stronger neighbors.

Sea-power depends primarily on superiority of naval force, which the British secured by their maritime warfare with the Dutch and French in the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries. The World War, resulting in the capture or destruction of most of the German fleet, has confirmed Great Britain's position as mistress of the seas. This position she intends to keep. It is her declared purpose to maintain a navy at least as strong as any two foreign navies. A smaller margin of strength, the British people believe, would endanger the safety of their empire.

Sea-power is also dependent to some degree upon the existence of naval bases, where warships may obtain coal and other supplies. Great Britain possesses them at convenient intervals on nearly all the great trade routes. Gibraltar, Malta, and Cyprus give her control of the Mediterranean. Suez, Aden, and various islands in the Indian Ocean guard the shortest route to India and Australia. In the Far East she has Singapore, Hongkong, Weihaiwei, and other important ports. Her African stations include the islands of Ascension, St. Helena, Mauritius, and Seychelles. In American waters the Bermudas and the British West Indies provide stations for military and commercial purposes, all the more valuable since the completion of the Panama Canal. These naval bases are the real sea-links of the empire.

The population of the British Empire, excluding the United Kingdom, is estimated at 400,000,000. Of these, about 20,000,000 are "colonials," the descendants of English, French, Dutch, and Spanish immigrants. The other inhabitants are "natives"—a comprehensive term to include the peoples of India, together with Malays, Chinese, Polynesians, Arabs, negroes, and American Indians. All the races of man, all stages of culture from sav-
agency to civilization, all the principal religions, and nearly all the principal languages, of mankind are represented in the British possessions.

The word empire usually suggests the autocratic rule of conquerors over subjects. Autocracy indeed exists in the British Empire, for the "natives," who comprise nineteen-twentieths of the population, have as yet little or no voice in the management of their own concerns. On the whole, Great Britain rules them wisely, justly, even benevolently. She maintains peace — the Pax Britannica — keeps domestic order, abolishes such evil customs as slavery, cannibalism, and human sacrifice, introduces systems of education and sanitation, and spends large sums for the development of the natural resources of each possession. More and more it becomes the conscious purpose of Great Britain to train the more advanced of her native subjects in democracy, so that they may ultimately take a place among the great self-governing peoples of the empire.¹

As respects government, India stands by itself. British India, which includes two-thirds of the area of the country and three-fourths of the population, is ruled directly from London through a cabinet officer called the Secretary of State for India. The actual administration rests in the hands of an appointive viceroy, assisted by two councils and the officials of the Indian Civil Service. The remainder of India consists of native or feudatory states, about six hundred in number. These continue to be ruled by their own princes, under the oversight and protection of Great Britain.

Besides the feudatory states of India, Great Britain has numerous protectorates in Africa, including Egypt, the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, and various tropical districts valuable for their productions but generally unfit for European settlement. She also possesses certain spheres of influence in Africa and other parts of the world, where foreign countries agree not to acquire territory or control, either by treaty or annexation.

¹ Read Rudyard Kipling's poem, The White Man's Burden.
Organization of the British Empire

In the seventeenth century trading companies chartered by the Crown established nearly all the American colonies of Great Britain and laid the foundation of her charted companies. In the nineteenth century similar chartered trading companies carried the British flag into the interior of Africa and among the islands of the Pacific. The British South Africa Company (1889), organized by Cecil Rhodes, still controls the vast tract of territory called Rhodesia. Similarly, the British North Borneo Company (1882) governs North Borneo, though this country has now been declared a protectorate.

The most numerous group of British possessions is composed of the Crown colonies. They are all under governors appointed by the Crown. In a few Crown colonies the governor exercises entire authority, both legislative and executive; in the others he is assisted by councils which are sometimes nominated by the Crown and sometimes selected by the colonists. This system of government resembles that of the royal colonies in America before the Revolution. The Crown colonies lie chiefly within the tropics and contain relatively few English-speaking inhabitants. Examples are the British West Indies, British Guiana, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Ceylon, and the Straits Settlements.

The group of self-governing colonies is small in number, but it includes Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. Their government closely parallels that of the United Kingdom. In each colony the Crown is represented by a governor or governor-general; the House of Lords, by an upper chamber; and the House of Commons, by a popularly elected assembly. Each one has also a prime minister and the cabinet system. Great Britain controls the foreign relations of these five colonies, but otherwise allows them practically complete independence in matters of legislation. Without interference, they tax themselves, impose tariff duties, even on British goods, control immigration, raise their own armies, support their own navies,

1 See page 112.
and have their own national flags. They are, in fact, "colonial nations."

The nineteenth century was well advanced before Great Britain learned the right policy to adopt toward the "colonials" in North America, Australasia and South Africa. The rising tide of democratic sentiment, as seen in the reform of parliamentary representation, more than anything else stirred the British people to extend full rights to their colonies. Political emancipation at home had a natural result in political emancipation abroad. Canada first received self-government in the 'forties of the last century, and since then Great Britain has cordially bestowed the same precious gift upon her Australasian and South African dominions. Though virtually independent, they continue to enjoy the protection of the British Empire and to share in its glory.

This change of British colonial policy, which has converted so much of the empire into an alliance of free states, is one of the outstanding facts of modern history. It was the rare good fortune of Great Britain to secure in the territories of her self-governing colonies practically all the available area of the world with a climate and productions similar to those of the home land and not too thickly occupied by native peoples. Their vast extent, enormous resources, and rapidly growing population give promise of unlimited development in the future. They form a Greater Britain for the perpetuation through the ages of the language, laws, and institutions of the mother country.

91. Imperial Federation

Great Britain did not set out deliberately to conquer a fourth of the globe. Many of her acquisitions were made reluctantly and often as an incident to the Continental wars upon which she engaged. In fact, colonial expansion was either distasteful or indifferent to most Englishmen. The French statesman, Turgot,¹ had compared colonies to fruits which, when ripe, drop from the parent tree, and the

¹ See page 157.
loss of the Thirteen Colonies by Great Britain apparently confirmed the truth of this maxim. It seemed the height of un-wisdom for the British people to tax themselves for the support and protection of colonies destined soon to become independent. Furthermore, Adam Smith and other laissez-faire economists, whose views increasingly affected public opinion, taught that colonies were really unnecessary to national prosperity. The United States had continued to trade heavily with Great Britain after securing independence. If trade with the colonies continued, it mattered little or not whether the Union Jack flew over them. Such arguments had great influence upon the Liberal Party, which controlled the British government through so much of the nineteenth century. Gladstone and his followers were frankly “little Englishers,” who turned their eyes away from colonial enterprise and devoted themselves to domestic reforms.

The last fifty years have witnessed a profound change in Great Britain’s attitude toward her colonies. Rapid transportation by railways and steamships, together with the telegraphs and submarine cables, swept away the barriers of distance between the mother land and her overseas offspring. It was vastly easier than ever before to secure their cooperation. A change in the international situation likewise made their cooperation seem more desirable than ever before. After 1871 Great Britain occupied a position of “splendid isolation” in European politics, without an ally on the Continent. The expansion of Russia in Asia, threatening India, the rise of Japan to a predominant position in the Far East, and above all, the growing competition of Germany in commerce, colonies, and naval armaments troubled British statesmen, who feared that further isolation might spell their country’s ruin. Instead of valuing colonial possessions lightly, these were now regarded as potential assets on which Great Britain might rely in time of war. The Conservative Party, under Disraeli, especially fostered this new imperial sentiment, though in recent years the Liberals also have worked to strengthen the bonds

---

1 See page 144.  
2 See page 128.
of union between the mother country and her daughter colonies.

The British Empire, as at present constituted, is a complex and apparently inharmonious organization of protectorates, Crown colonies, self-governing Dominions, and Indian states. The empire lacks a central body representing all its members and capable of united action. Steps in the direction of closer union have been taken by means of imperial conferences. The first was held at London in 1887, on the occasion of Queen Victoria's Jubilee celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of her accession to the throne, and was attended by representatives of the Dominions. Representatives of India also appeared at the last conference in 1917. Naval and military defense, tariffs, and other matters of common concern are discussed at these periodical gatherings. They make, therefore, for a better understanding between Great Britain and her dependencies.

Further steps toward uniting the British Empire will doubtless be taken in the immediate future. The problem of federation, however, bristles with difficulties. As respects the Dominions and India, how devise a workable scheme which will give them a voice in deciding the foreign policy of the empire and at the same time a fair share of the burden of its defense? In regard to Great Britain, the "predominant partner," how reconcile her world-wide interests with the purely local interests of her dependencies? Representation of the colonies in a federal parliament to be created or in the existing Parliament of the United Kingdom has been suggested in answer to these questions; but as yet the suggestion finds little favor. The more probable development seems to be some sort of "Britannic Alliance," in which Great Britain shall be first among equals.

But the machinery of federation is a secondary matter, as long as the British Empire is one in spirit. The defects of its body are compensated for by the unity of its soul. The real strength of the bonds between Great Britain and her children overseas was first shown during the
Boer War of 1899, when they rallied loyally to her support. During the World War both "colonials" and "natives" made huge contributions in money, food, ships, and men to Great Britain in her hour of need. The British Empire, in the words of Burke, is held together "by the close affection which grows from common names, from kindred blood, from similar privileges, and equal protection. These are ties, which, though light as air, are as strong as links of iron."  

Studies

1. "Doubtless the most significant and momentous fact of modern history is the wide diffusion of the English race, the sweep of its commerce, the dominance of its institutions, its imperial control of the destinies of half the globe." Comment on this statement.  2. On the map, facing page 278, name the water boundaries of the British Isles.  3. "The simple and obvious fact that Great Britain is an island has woven itself in a thousand ways into the texture of English history." Illustrate this statement.  4. Distinguish between England, Great Britain, the United Kingdom, and the British Empire.  5. Compare the area of England with that of New York, of Wales with that of Massachusetts, and of Scotland with that of South Carolina.  6. Explain the royal, aristocratic, and democratic elements, respectively, in the British system of government.  7. Show that in Great Britain "the king reigns, but does not govern."  8. Why is the British government sometimes called a "crowned republic"?  9. Contrast the unlimited powers of the British Parliament with the limited powers of the American Congress.  10. Why has the House of Lords been called "the Westminster Abbey of living celebrities"?  11. Mention some noteworthy differences between the British cabinet and the American cabinet.  12. How does the British system of government represent a "union of powers," as contrasted with the American system of a "separation of powers"?  13. Why has England been called the "mother of parliaments"?  14. "The Irish Question is the Achilles' heel of the British Empire." What does this statement mean?  15. "Without Drake, Raleigh, Clive, and Gordon, English history of the last three centuries is not English history at all." Comment on this statement.  16. On the map between pages 304 and 305, locate the self-governing colonies, the more important Crown colonies, the chartered companies, and the protectorates of the British Empire.

1 Read Kipling's *Recessional*. 
CHAPTER XIII

THE THIRD FRENCH REPUBLIC

92. Land and People of France

France possesses the best situation in Europe, for it lies at the western edge of the Continent between the Mediterranean and the Atlantic, the busiest bodies of water in the world. Two great natural highways connect them. The one, following the Rhône and Saône rivers, gains the valley of the Seine; the other, skirting the southern base of the Cévennes mountains, reaches the Bay of Biscay by way of the Garonne valley. Many other navigable rivers penetrate deeply into the country and bring all parts of it together. The natural boundaries of France also make for unity. It is enclosed on two sides by the ocean, and elsewhere, in large part, by mountains. The Pyrenees form a rampart on the southwest against Spain; the Alps, on the southeast against Italy; and the Jura, on the east against Switzerland. The recovery of Alsace, as a result of the World War, once more makes the Rhine the barrier between France and part of Germany. Only the northeastern boundary of France is conventional and unprotected by nature.

France consists of two dissimilar physical regions. The great European plain occupies fully three-fourths of the total area. In the center, east, and southeast the lowlands rise into plateaus and mountains. The topography of France thus offers no obstacle to the prevailing "westerlies," which are enabled to distribute their abundant moisture somewhat evenly over the country. The climate of France, on the whole, is temperate. The fierce cold of Switzerland, the depressing fogs of Germany, and the mists and per-
petual dampness of the British Isles are unknown to a land which a medieval poet well christened France la Douce — Gentle France.

The fertile soil of France makes it possible for fully one-half of the inhabitants to live by agriculture. Farms are often very small, owing to the fact that after the death of parents the land is divided equally among the heirs. The typical agricultural products are wheat and the vine. More wheat is produced in France than in any other European country except Russia, and more grapes are raised there than in any other country of the world. In minerals, France is decidedly inferior to either England or Germany. The principal coal beds are near the Belgian border; the richest iron mines are in Lorraine. The fisheries, including both those in home waters and off Newfoundland, must be included among the natural resources of France.

The population of France during the nineteenth century increased to a less extent than that of any other European country, except Ireland. The decline of the birth-rate has been accompanied, however, by a lessened death-rate, so that the population remains practically stationary (about 39,000,000 in 1914). What keeps French families small seems to be chiefly the universal desire to maintain a high standard of comfort as respects food, clothing, housing, and other necessities of life. This situation has a military significance, in view of the rapid increase of the German people. Germany, which was not much more populous than France in 1871, was over one and a half times as populous in 1914. "Every year we win a battle against France," said the famous General Moltke.

France has been less affected than other modern industrial nations by the tendency of population to concentrate in cities. While fully sixty per cent of the German people and seventy-five per cent of the British people are now city dwellers, the French continue to live chiefly in agricultural villages and small towns. There are only about a dozen cities in France having more than one
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hundred thousand inhabitants. Of these, the largest are Paris, Lyons, and Marseilles.

The average Frenchman is very thrifty. His small savings amount to an immense sum in the aggregate. It was the well stocked “woolen stocking” of the French peasant which enabled the government to pay off the German indemnity\(^1\) within little more than two years, and subsequently to make enormous loans to Russia and other countries. The investments of France in foreign stocks and bonds fell not far short of ten billion dollars in 1914. This amount has now been considerably increased by her advances to her allies during the war. France is still one of the greatest creditors in the world.

Nations, like individuals, possess their special qualities, particularly old nations such as France. The French people, in the first place, are artistically gifted. An French culture appreciation of the beautiful in all its forms is general among them. Their leadership in the fine arts has been acknowledged since the age of Louis XIV.\(^2\) In the second place, the French are very appreciative of intellectual achievement. They give a high place among their national heroes to great scholars, philosophers, scientists, artists, and men of letters. No other country boasts such an institution as the French Academy,\(^3\) with its forty “Immortals,” election to whose ranks is almost the highest honor a Frenchman can win. In the third place, the French are an intensely individualistic people. Their history has been a long struggle for liberty, not only to govern themselves, but also to think, feel, and speak for themselves. Thought and the expression of thought are perhaps freer in France than in any other country. It is principally for these reasons that she continues to be the artistic and intellectual center of the world.

93. Republican France, 1871–1914

The Third French Republic arose in the midst of war. Two days after the battle of Sedan, upon the receipt of a dispatch

\(^1\) See page 273. \(^2\) See page 51. \(^3\) See page 50.
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from Napoleon III announcing his army captured and himself a prisoner, Paris broke out in revolt. The empress Eugénie fled with her son to England, and the absent emperor was deposed as being responsible for the "ruin, invasion, and dismemberment of the country." The revolutionists then set up a provisional government, republican in character. Similar action was taken independently in Lyons, Marseilles, Bordeaux, and other provincial cities. Paris in 1870 did not impose a republic upon the rest of the country; much of urban France declared spontaneously for it. The fact is important, as helping to explain why the Third Republic has lasted so much longer than its predecessors.

The provisional government undertook the task of driving the Germans from French soil. Gambetta, the most prominent Republican leader, escaped from Paris in a balloon, roused the fighting spirit of the French people by his eloquence, and carried on for several months a brave but futile struggle against the German enemy. Equally futile

---

Set up by Napoleon I in the Place Vendôme. It is 143 feet in height and 13 feet in diameter. Like Trajan's column, of which it is an imitation, the monument is encircled with a spiral band of bronze bas-reliefs commemorating the campaign of 1805. The summit is surmounted by a statue of the emperor. During the rule of the "communards" in 1871 the column was overthrown, but it was subsequently refrected and restored.
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were the diplomatic missions which Thiers\(^1\) made to one European court after another, to enlist foreign aid for France. Paris could not be saved. After the fall of the capital an armistice was arranged, in order that the French people might elect a National Assembly to treat with Germany. The peasants, who formed the great majority of the voters, now wanted peace even on unfavorable terms. Accordingly, they avoided the Republican ticket as the "war ticket" and elected to the National Assembly representatives of the old Monarchist parties pledged to conclude peace. This "assembly of clod-hoppers," as the Republicans nicknamed it, promptly ratified the humiliating Treaty of Frankfort.\(^2\)

Peace had not been made before France was called upon to endure the agonies of a civil conflict. The Commune,\(^3\) or municipal council, of Paris fell into the hands of radical Republicans, socialists, and anarchists, who raised the red flag. They set up an independent government in the capital and even proposed to divide all France into a loose confederation of self-governing communes. The French people this time did not accept a revolution made in Paris. Loyal troops laid siege to the city, entered it after hard fighting, forced their way through the barricades, and suppressed the insurrection. The victors knew no mercy. Thousands of the "communards" were shot without trial, and thousands more were transported to penal colonies in the tropics. The events of this "Bloody Week" of 1871, like the Reign of Terror, fill a lurid page in French history.

Fortunately for France during these troubled times, she possessed a statesman at the head of affairs. Adolphe Thiers was seventy-three years old when the Franco-German War broke out. He had long been famous as a historian of the revolutionary and Napoleonic era, as a journalist whose trenchant pen helped to overthrow Charles X, as the prime minister of Louis Philippe, and as the most effective critic in parliament of Napoleon III's short-

\(^1\) See page 237. \(^2\) See page 273. \(^3\) See page 164.
The Third French Republic

sighted policies. The downfall of the Second Empire gave Thiers a great opportunity, and he embraced it. Appointed head of the government by the National Assembly, he negotiated the peace treaty with Germany, put down the "communards," and raised one billion dollars to pay the indemnity and free France from the occupation of the German armies. "Liberator of the territory," the French people gratefully acclaimed him. This little old man deserved well of his country.

The National Assembly in 1871 made Thiers "President of the Republic." Nevertheless, a long time elapsed before France became republican in much more than name. Two-thirds of the members of the National Assembly were really attached to monarchical principles. In 1873 they forced Thiers to resign in favor of Marshal MacMahon,¹ who was to make way for a king as soon as one should be chosen. There were three candidates for the crown, representing as many Monarchist groups. The Imperialists (few in number) supported the Prince Imperial, son of Napoleon III. The Orléanists championed the claims of the count of Paris, grandson of Louis Philippe. The Legitimists rallied about the count of Chambord, grandson of Charles X. But as Thiers declared, three candidates could not sit on one throne. The Orléanists and Legitimists finally agreed that the count of Chambord, who was childless, should become king as "Henry V" and should be succeeded by the count of Paris. "Henry V," however, refused to accept the crown unless the National Assembly would abolish the revolutionary tricolor and restore the white flag of the Bourbons, the symbol of absolutism and divine right. But even monarchical Frenchmen did not want a restoration of the Old Régime, and so the provisional republican government was allowed to continue.

The failure of the Monarchists in the National Assembly to choose a king played into the hands of the Republicans under Gambetta. He occupies a place beside Thiers among

¹ See page 272.
the founders of the Third Republic. To Gambetta, a republic meant the salvation of France, and he made it his mission to spread republican ideas among conservative Frenchmen. No one could have been better fitted for the work. Gambetta's services during the Franco-German War endeared him to the masses, while his oratory and vivacious personality fascinated even political opponents. More and more people who had hitherto been Monarchists, now joined the Republicans, with the result that in 1875 France adopted a republican constitution.

No great enthusiasm for the republic was felt in 1875, except among the followers of Gambetta. It had been established because, in view of the rivalries between the various political groups, it seemed to be the form of government which divided the French people the least. When the first elections under the new constitution took place, the voters chose a Republican Chamber of Deputies. The Senate, however, remained Monarchist by a small majority. President MacMahon was also a Monarchist. Unable to work harmoniously with the Chamber of Deputies, MacMahon dissolved it in 1877, but the voters again returned a majority of Republican members. Two years later the Senate became Republican as well. MacMahon then resigned, and Jules Grévy, a life-long Republican, took the presidential office.

The Republicans since 1879 have remained in control of both branches of the legislature and of the presidency. The army, formerly officered by men of the upper classes, has sometimes threatened the permanence of the Republican régime. During the late 'eighties, General Boulanger seemed likely for a time to play the rôle of both Napoleons and to overthrow the government by a coup d'état. His popularity, however, did not prevent his trial and condemnation as a public enemy. The Boulanger episode resulted in the dismissal of many Monarchist officers from the army. The Third Republic has also had to meet the opposition of the Roman Catholic clergy, always strongly Monarchist in sympathies. Anti-clerical agitation led in 1905
to the Separation Act, which abolishes the Concordat and definitely separates Church and State in France. Neither army officers nor clergy now menace the stability of the Third Republic. As the World War showed, it enjoys the support of practically every Frenchman.

94. Government of France

The Constitution of 1875, the last of the many constitutions of France since the Revolution, consists of a series of laws passed by the National Assembly. These laws may be, and have been, amended by the two branches of the legislature in joint session. They provide for a parliamentary form of government, which resembles, in many respects, that of the United Kingdom.

Legislative authority is vested in a Chamber of Deputies, containing (1919) 626 members, who are elected for four years by manhood suffrage, and a Senate of 300 members chosen indirectly for a term of nine years. The two houses have substantially equal powers in introducing and amending bills, except money bills, which must emanate from the Chamber of Deputies. The Senate has less importance than the Chamber of Deputies, because the premier and his associates in the ministry are responsible to the latter body. The ministry must keep a majority in the Chamber of Deputies or resign.

Executive authority is nominally vested in a president, who holds office for seven years. He may be re-elected, but this has happened only once. In order to prevent the rise of some future Louis Napoleon through popular election, the constitution prescribes that the president shall be chosen by a majority vote of the two branches of the legislature in joint session at Versailles. An election is therefore a very tame affair, all over in an afternoon. Any citizen, except a member of a French royal or imperial family, may offer himself for the presidency. The successful candidate is

1 See page 190.
2 In the case of President Grévy, re-elected in 1885.
usually a prominent senator or deputy. Whenever the presidential office becomes vacant by the death or resignation of the incumbent, his successor must be immediately chosen for the full term. The president lives in the beautiful Palais de l'Élysée at Paris. He receives a salary of 1,200,000 francs, half of it a compensation for his services and half to meet his expenditure for traveling and entertainments.

CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES, PARIS

This fine structure was built in the eighteenth century as a palace for members of the Bourbon-Condé family. It became national property during the French Revolution. The façade, which faces the Pont de la Concorde, is in the style of an ancient temple.

Like the British sovereign, the French president is largely a figurehead. He sends messages to parliament, receives foreign visitors, and presides at public functions, but his powers are very limited. The constitution provides that every presidential act shall be countersigned by some minister, who thereby assumes responsibility for it. The president possesses the right, with the consent of the Senate, to dissolve the Chamber of Deputies before the expiration of its term and order a new election; but this has been done only once.1 His veto of legislation may be overridden

1 By President MacMahon in 1877.
by a simple majority of parliament. When a change of ministry occurs, the president chooses a leading parliamentarian to be premier and the latter selects his own colleagues.

The real executive in France, as in all parliamentary countries, is the ministry or cabinet. Ministers are almost always members of parliament. They may sit in both chambers and may address the legislators as often as seems desirable. A minister's position is no sinecure. Not only must he conduct his department, but he must also be constantly before parliament to present, explain, and defend his measures. Any senator or deputy may direct a formal question at a minister on the conduct of his office. Such an "interpellation" puts the ministry on the defensive and precipitates a brisk debate. If the Chamber of Deputies ends by passing a vote of "no confidence," the ministry resigns.

France has no real parties, but only political groups. The elections of 1919, for instance, returned representatives of nine such groups to the Chamber of Deputies. The majority of members are Republicans of various shades of opinion, ranging from conservatism to radicalism. There are several large groups of Socialists, as well as a few Monarchists, who would like to restore either the Bourbons or the Bonapartes. Following the system in vogue in most Continental parliaments, members of the Chamber of Deputies occupy seats according to their affiliations. The Monarchists sit at the extreme right of the presiding officer, and the Socialists at his extreme left. The other and larger groups sit in the center of the chamber. This arrangement gives rise to the terms Right, Left, and Center, as party designations.

The existence of so many political groups explains why changes of ministry are frequent in France. No ministry can arise except one which represents a coalition (bloc) of several groups; no ministry can live long unless it keeps the support of several groups. In fact, it never does live long. France since 1875 has averaged more than one ministry a year. A ministerial change, however, is far less
significant in France than in Great Britain, owing to the absence of one opposition party able to take the reins of government. Many members of a defeated ministry are found, as a rule, in the ministry which succeeds it, with perhaps a change of portfolios. Leading politicians may thus remain almost continuously in office for a long period.

It should be noted, finally, that France has a permanent body of nearly one million officials, who carry on their administrative duties unvexed by ministerial “crises.” The bureaucracy necessary in France, which, as contrasted with the United States, forms a highly centralized republic. The systematic organization of the country into départements and their subdivisions by the French revolutionists and Napoleon¹ has been retained to the present time, with the result that the government, both national and local, is directed from Paris. The state keeps representatives everywhere, and an hour after an order has been given at the capital it can be carried out in the remotest hamlet. Such centralization seems curious in so democratic a country as France, but it apparently satisfies the French demand for order and regularity in the conduct of public affairs.

95. Colonial Expansion of France

The Seven Years’ War and the wars of the revolutionary and Napoleonic era reduced the once-imposing colonial empire of France to small dimensions. Her possessions in 1815 included the coast of Senegal in Africa, five ports in India, French Guiana in South America, and a few islands in the West Indies and off the coast of Newfoundland. During the nineteenth century, however, France took up again the work of empire-building. The reign of Louis Philippe saw the difficult conquest of Algeria from the warlike Turks, Arabs, and Berbers. Napoleon III annexed the Senegal Valley and part of Indo-China. The Third Republic, in order to offset the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, embarked

¹ See pages 168 and 189.
still more definitely upon colonial enterprise in many parts of the world.

The most extensive French colonies are those in Africa. From Algeria, France has expanded eastward over Tunis, westward over Morocco, and southward into the Sahara. Nearly all the vast region between the Mediterranean and the Congo is now subject to France. She also holds French Somaliland, a strategic point at the entrance of the Red Sea, and the large island of Madagascar. In Asia she has retained her Indian possessions and has enlarged her territories in Indo-China. In Oceania she possesses New Caledonia and several archipelagoes. The American colonies of France have not been increased since 1815. The area of this colonial empire is, roughly speaking, about twenty times that of France. Its population about equals that of the home country.

Nearly all the colonies lie within the tropics. The only countries having a considerable French population are Algeria, Tunis, and New Caledonia. It follows that the value to France of her overseas possessions is mainly commercial, as a source of raw materials and a field for the investment of capital. The World War also demonstrated their value in furnishing native soldiers and laborers. The French government respects the institutions of the inhabitants and makes every effort to raise their moral and economic condition. None of the colonies is self-governing in the manner of the British Dominions, but some of them elect representatives to the French legislature. Algeria is treated in many respects, not as a colony, but as an integral part of France. 1

1 Chief French Possessions in 1914

**Africa:** Algeria, Tunis, Morocco, French West Africa (Mauretania, Senegal, Upper Senegal and Niger, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, Sahara), French Equatorial Africa, French Somaliland, Madagascar, Comoro Islands, Réunion Island.

**Asia:** French India (Mahé, Karikal, Pondicherry, Yanaon, Chandernagore), Tonkin, Anam, Laos, Cambodia, Cochin-China, Kwangchauwan.

**Oceania:** New Caledonia, Society Islands, Marquesas Islands.

**America:** French Guiana, French West Indies (Guadeloupe, Martinique), Miquelon Island, St. Pierre Island.
Colonial Expansion of France

Studies

1. How did the boundaries of France in 1914 differ from its boundaries in 1789?
2. What is the origin of the names Brittany, Normandy, and Lorraine?
3. Contrast the circumstances under which the Third Republic came into existence with those leading to the organization of the First and Second Republics.
4. Name and explain the different Monarchist groups in France.
5. Distinguish the "communards" from communists.
6. Why may the French government be described as a "parliamentary republic"?
7. How is the French Parliament more powerful than the Congress of the United States?
8. Compare the position of the Chamber of Deputies with that of the House of Commons.
9. Compare the powers of the French and American presidents, respectively.
10. Define the terms (a) "representation," (b) bloc, and (c) "bureaucracy."
11. How does the party system of France differ from that of Great Britain?
12. Discuss the relative importance of the British and French colonial empires.
13. Locate on the map the chief French possessions enumerated in the foot-note on page 322.
CHAPTER XIV

ITALY, SPAIN, AND THE MINOR COUNTRIES OF WESTERN EUROPE

96. Italy

The kingdom of Italy ranks next to the French Republic among the Latin states of contemporary Europe. The Italian constitution is the royal charter (Statuto) granted by Charles Albert of Sardinia in 1848, and between 1859 and 1870 extended by plebiscites to the entire peninsula. During these momentous years Italy thus gained both national unity and constitutional government.

Italy has a well developed parliamentary system. Supreme authority resides in a parliament of two houses, consisting of an appointive Senate and an elective Chamber of Deputies. Senators hold office for life. Deputies are elected by popular vote for five years, unless a dissolution of parliament shortens their term. A ministry or cabinet conducts the government, subject to the will of the Chamber of Deputies. When a ministry resigns, some party leader is selected by the king to form its successor. The king otherwise exerts little influence upon domestic politics. He never vetoes bills passed by both branches of the legislature, seldom attends cabinet meetings, and appoints to office only those recommended by his ministers. An Italian monarch holds essentially the same ornamental position as a British sovereign or a French president. The house of Savoy is very popular in Italy, for Victor Emmanuel II, his son Humbert I, and Victor Emmanuel III, the present ruler, have shown themselves truly democratic and devoted to the welfare of their subjects.
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Property and educational qualifications for the suffrage formerly limited the voters to less than two and a half per cent of the population. Laws passed in 1882 and 1912 introduced almost complete manhood suffrage. Only men under thirty years of age, who have neither performed their military service nor learned to read and write, are now denied the right to vote.

The party system of Italy resembles that of France. Political groups are numerous, rather loosely organized, and subject to constant fluctuation. Only three groups have well defined programs and constituencies. The Republicans, faithful to the traditions of Mazzini and Garibaldi, continue to agitate for a republican form of government; they are few in number. The Socialists stand for the same things as their brethren in other countries. They find recruits chiefly among the working-men of the cities. The Catholics or Clericals, who were allowed by the pope to form a separate political party only as recently as 1919, uphold the influence of the Church in politics; their strength is among the peasantry. The other political groups differ in the main only as they support or oppose the ministry which happens to be in power. The elections of 1919 gave to the Socialists and Clericals combined a majority of seats in the Chamber of Deputies.

Italian politics have long been complicated by the hostility
between the government and the papacy. Cavour wanted the pope to adopt the principle of a "free Church in a free State," that is, to give up his temporal power and retain only a spiritual sway over Catholics throughout the world. The pope did not favor this solution of the problem and clung to the States of the Church, which after 1860 included only Rome and its neighborhood. He lost even these possessions ten years later, when Italian troops occupied Rome. The temporal power of the papacy thus disappeared, after an existence of more than a thousand years.

The relations of Church and State in Italy were henceforth defined by the Law of Papal Guarantees, enacted in 1871. It allowed the pope to retain his position as an independent sovereign, and as such to have his own court and diplomatic representatives without interference from the Italian government. The papal territory, however, was limited to the Vatican and Lateran palaces in Rome, with their extensive gardens. Parliament also granted to the pope an annual subsidy of over six hundred thousand dollars, as indemnity for the loss of his estates.

The Law of Papal Guarantees has never been acknowledged as valid by the popes. Pius IX, who occupied the chair of St. Peter in 1871, refused to recognize the new Italian kingdom, declined to accept any part of the financial grants, and shut himself up in the Vatican. He also issued a decree forbidding Italian Catholics to vote or hold office under the royal government. His successors, Leo XIII and Pius X, continued this prohibition, but it has been entirely removed by the present pope, Benedict XV. With the entrance into Italian politics of a distinct Catholic party the relations between the government and the "prisoner of the Vatican" promise to enter upon a new phase.

Italy's desire to rank among the great powers led her to take

1 See page 262.
2 The pope has also the villa of Castel Gandolfo on the Mediterranean, but he never uses this residence.
part in the scramble for overseas possessions, which has been so marked a feature of European history during the last half century. Her colonial aspirations were especially fostered by Francesco Crispi, the most prominent Italian statesman since Cavour. During Crispi’s premiership, the Italians established themselves in Eritrea and part of Somaliland, on the eastern coast of Africa. Their attempt to set up a protectorate over Abyssinia ended disastrously at the battle of Adowa in 1896, and the ancient Abyssinian “empire” still remains independent. In 1911, Italy declared war on Turkey and conquered Tripoli and Cyrenaica in northern Africa. The two provinces have been organized as a colony under the name of Libya. None of these African territories offers an inviting field for Italian settlement. The New World (Argentina, Brazil, and the United States) continues to receive most of the peasants and workingmen who emigrate from Italy.

97. Spain

Spanish history during the nineteenth century falls into four periods. The first is covered by the reign of Ferdinand VII. That Bourbon monarch came back after Napoleon’s overthrow amid popular acclaim; but he ruled so wretchedly as to provoke a revolution in 1820. After three years of constitutional and parliamentary government, the Concert of Europe intervened, crushed the revolutionists, who were a small minority of the people, and restored Ferdinand
Spain

to the throne. A decade of unbenevolent, unenlightened despotism followed.

Ferdinand’s bequest to his distracted country was a dynastic quarrel. Being without sons, he set aside the Salic law, which fixed the royal succession only in the male line, and left the crown to his youthful daughter Isabella, under the regency of her mother Christina. Don Carlos, Ferdinand’s brother, considered himself the legal heir and took up arms to enforce his claim. The result was much desultory fighting between Christinists and Carlists, as the supporters of the regent and of the pretender were called, respectively. The Christinists triumphed at last, and Don Carlos fled the country. Isabella’s reign proved to be thoroughly reactionary. In 1868 another revolution by the Liberals deposed the queen.

No regular government existed in Spain for the next seven years. The country passed into the hands of military politicians, who kept a semblance of order by means of the army. After ransacking Europe for a king, they offered the very shaky throne to one of the Hohenzollerns, thereby producing the “Spanish incident” which brought on the Franco-German War. Prince Amadeo of Savoy, a younger son of Victor Emmanuel II, did consent to wear the crown, only to abdicate after a troubled reign of a little more than two years. A republic, which was then set up, lasted even a shorter time. Two insurrections, four coups d’état, and five presidents marked its brief course. After this experiment most Spaniards were ready to try a monarchy once more. In 1875, they recalled the Bourbon line in the person of Isabella’s son and Ferdinand’s grandson, Alfonso XII.

Under the constitutional rule of Alfonso XII and his successor, Spain has begun to recover in some measure from the political ills which afflicted her in the nineteenth century. Progress is also being made in curing her economic and social ills. The country still remains very

---

1 See pages 212 and 222.  
2 See page 272.  
3 Alfonso XIII succeeded in 1885, but did not become of age until 1902. He married a granddaughter of Queen Victoria.
poor and undeveloped, in spite of a good soil and climate in the south, great mineral wealth in the north, and an excellent geographical position. The introduction of better agricultural methods, railroad building on a considerable scale, steady improvement in public finances, and declining illiteracy are some of the signs of progress within recent years.

The present constitution, which dates from 1876, is liberal in character. It provides for a parliament (cortes) of two chambers and a responsible ministry. Manhood suffrage has prevailed since 1890. The king, as in Italy, enjoys little real authority, for all his decrees must be countersigned by a minister to be valid. Should the royal line become extinct, the constitution provides for popular election of a monarch.

The vast colonial empire of Spain was still intact a little more than a hundred years ago. The Spanish possessions in Mexico, Central America, and South America first became separate republics when Joseph Bonaparte mounted the throne of Spain in 1808. They definitely separated from the mother country after the restoration of Ferdinand VII.¹ Cuba continued to be a badly governed and restless dependency until the United States intervened in 1898. At the Peace of Paris, which concluded the Spanish-American War, Spain renounced her sovereignty over Cuba and ceded Porto Rico and the Philippines to the United States. A year later, she sold to

¹ See pages 200 and 222.
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Germany her remaining island possessions in the Pacific. Her few African possessions, recently acquired, are a poor compensation for the loss of what was once the greatest colonial empire in the world.\(^1\)

96. Portugal

Portuguese history in the nineteenth century to some extent duplicates that of Spain. As we have learned,\(^2\) the royal family of Braganza fled to Brazil when the French invaded Portugal in 1807. After Napoleon's downfall, John VI continued to rule the home country from the colony, until the Portuguese, resenting this arrangement, rose in revolt and demanded a constitution. The king then returned from Brazil, to rule henceforth as a constitutional sovereign. His death in 1826 marked the beginning of a long period of disorder. Misgovernment, insurrections, and armed conflicts between rival factions kept the little country in turmoil for many years. From about the middle of the century the Portuguese had peace, but the failure of kingly rule to lessen taxes and introduce reforms resulted in much discontent, which found expression in republican propaganda.

Matters came to a crisis in 1910, when a well-planned uprising in Lisbon drove the Portuguese king into exile. The revolutionists declared the Braganzas forever deposed and set up a republic. It still endures, in spite of much opposition from those who remain attached to the old monarchical régime.

The republican constitution follows that of France in providing for a bicameral legislature, a ministry responsible to it, and a president with very limited powers, who is chosen by a joint session of the two chambers. All hereditary titles and privileges have been abolished; toleration has been granted to all religions; and Church and State have been separated, as in France. By the establishment of

\(^1\) Spanish colonies: Rio Muni, Rio de Oro, the northern coast of Morocco, Fernando Po, and the Canary Islands.

\(^2\) See pages 200 and 221.
Italy, Spain, and the Minor Countries

a common school system the republic is also beginning to remove the reproach of illiteracy, from which Portugal suffers to a like extent with Spain.

Though Portugal lost Brazil in the early twenties of the last century, she still keeps a colonial empire surpassed in extent only by the dominions of Great Britain and France. It is almost twenty-five times the size of the mother country. The most important Portuguese possessions are in Africa. The Azores and Madeira Islands, which belong to Portugal, scarcely rank as colonies, being fully incorporated in the government of that country.¹

99. Switzerland

The Congress of Vienna left Switzerland a confederation of twenty-two semi-independent cantons. The only bond between them was a common Diet, whose limited authority recalls that of the American Congress before the adoption of the Constitution. Even this loose union threatened to dissolve toward the middle of the nineteenth century, when seven cantons formed a separate league called the Sonderbund. A brief and almost bloodless civil war resulted. The secessionists were easily overcome by the government forces and were compelled to rejoin the confederation.

The secession movement induced the Swiss in 1848 to adopt a stronger federal government. Their new constitution, as framed in 1848 and revised in 1874, sets up a bicameral legislature modeled upon that of the United States. The National Council, like the House of Representatives, is elected directly by popular vote; the Council of States, like the Senate, consists of two delegates from each canton. The two chambers in joint session select a committee of seven — the Federal Council — to act as an executive. The president of the confederation is merely the

¹ Portuguese colonies in Africa: Cape Verde Islands, Portuguese Guinea, Angola, Mozambique or Portuguese East Africa; in India: Goa, Damaum, Diu; in China: Macao; in the East Indies: part of Timor.
chairman of this committee. He serves for one year only and has no greater authority than his fellow members. In the dovetailing of federal and state powers the Swiss constitution again follows American precedents. The federal government regulates matters affecting all the people, such as foreign relations, tariffs, coinage, the postal service, and the army, but the several cantons retain control of local concerns.

In some parts of Switzerland the inhabitants have preserved their ancient open-air assemblies (folkmoos), where all the male citizens appear personally, once a year, and by a show of hands elect officials, levy taxes, and make the laws. Such direct or pure democracy is possible only in the smaller and less thickly populated cantons.

The larger cantons possess representative assemblies, but over them the people exercise constant control by means of the referendum and the initiative. In some cantons every measure passed by the cantonal legislature must be submitted to a popular vote for adoption or rejection; in the others submission takes place only upon petition of a specified number of voters. The complement of such a referendum is the initiative, giving a specified number of voters the right to propose new laws, which must then be referred to a popular vote. The referendum and initiative also apply to federal legislation, for both ordinary laws and constitutional amendments. Many American states and cities have recently adopted these two devices, in order to bring government nearer to the people. It is quite appropriate that they should have been perfected in Switzerland, the birthplace of Rousseau, who preached the doctrine of unrestricted popular sovereignty.

The Swiss differ markedly among themselves in language, in religion, and customs. About seventy per cent of the inhabitants are German-speaking; the remainder speak either French or Italian. All three languages are used for the proclamation of laws and in legislative debates. Zwinglian and Calvinist Protestants include more than three-fifths of the population, but have a majority in only half of the
cantons. Full religious liberty is guaranteed to all citizens. This policy of mutual toleration prevents either language or religion from becoming a divisive force; it keeps the Swiss a united nation.

100. Belgium

The circumstances under which Belgium separated from Holland and became independent, with her perpetual neutrality guaranteed by the Concert of Europe, have been related in an earlier chapter. The Belgians, like the Swiss, form a united nation, in spite of the linguistic barriers between them. French is spoken by the Walloons in the southern provinces, and Flemish, a Teutonic tongue, by the Flemings in the northern provinces. Both Walloons and Flemings are almost wholly Roman Catholics.

The present constitution, framed in 1831, set up a limited monarchy of the modern type. Legislative authority is vested in a parliament of two houses, the upper partly, the lower wholly, elected by direct popular vote. Executive authority is lodged in a ministry responsible to parliament. The king may propose new laws, but otherwise he acts only through his ministers. Belgium has never had any trouble with her rulers, because Leopold I (1830–1865), Leopold II (1865–1899), and Albert I have steadily adhered to that clause of the constitution which declares that "all powers emanate from the people." The liberties of citizens are further secured by constitutional provisions establishing freedom of speech, press, worship, petition, and assembly.

Property qualifications for the suffrage kept the electorate
very small until 1893, when the constitution was amended to provide for manhood suffrage. At the same time, an interesting system of plural voting went into effect. A married man, or a widower with children, or the owner of a certain amount of property, has two votes; while a citizen who satisfies certain educational requirements or who holds a public office has three votes. Plural voting consequently augments the political influence of married men, of the propertied classes, and of the educated classes. Belgian law makes voting obligatory and punishes a citizen for unexcused absence from the polls. In 1919 suffrage was partially extended to women.

**Palais de Justice, Brussels**

This huge building, for the use of the law courts of Brussels, was erected during the years 1866–1883 at a cost of $12,000,000. The architectural style combines Assyrian and Renaissance features.

Belgium has the distinction of being the first European country to adopt proportional representation. Under the system of representation found in most democracies, a candidate having a majority, or even a simple plurality, of the votes in his district is declared elected. This arrangement leaves the minority unrepresented. The
device of proportional representation gives to each party its rightful number of seats by having candidates elected only by those who vote for them. The procedure followed seems somewhat complicated, but its practical result is to assure to even a small minority representation in the legislature.\(^1\)

Belgium has only one colony, but it is about ten times her size. The vast district in Central Africa formerly known as the Congo Free State and now as the Belgian Congo, was established in the early 'eighties by Leopold II, mainly as a commercial undertaking. The king became personal sovereign of the state, which proved to be very valuable for its rubber, ivory, and other products. In 1908 Leopold surrendered his Congo properties to Belgium.

101. Holland

The kingdom of Holland—more accurately, the Netherlands—is one of the creations of the Vienna Congress. It forms a federal state, consisting (since the loss of Belgium) of eleven provinces. These retain a large measure of self-government. The house of Orange has reigned continuously since 1815, the present sovereign being Queen Wilhelmina.

The constitution of Holland also dates from 1815. Successive revisions, especially in the revolutionary year, 1848, have made it a fairly liberal document. The Crown is still powerful, but the royal ministers are responsible to the Estates-General, or parliament. Property qualifications, which formerly excluded a good many Dutchmen from voting, have been lowered in recent years. In 1918 the franchise was granted to all adult men and women without restriction.

Holland still keeps various tropical dependencies secured in

---

1 Suppose that an electoral district in Belgium has 32,000 voters and eight representatives in the lower house of parliament. Suppose, further, that four parties nominate candidates—eight Clericals, eight Liberals, eight Socialists, and one Clerical-Democrat. If there are 16,000 Clerical, 9000 Liberal, 4500 Socialist, and 2500 Clerical-Democrat votes, then the apportionment of seats would be four Clerical, two Liberal, one Socialist, and one Clerical-Democrat.
the seventeenth century. They are about sixty times as large and six times as populous as the mother country. Their coffee, tea, sugar, spices, tobacco, and Dutch colonies indigo reach Holland in large quantities, for distribution throughout Europe. On the whole, she administers them very successfully.¹

102. Denmark, Norway, and Sweden

Nature seems to have intended Scandinavia to be one country. Only a narrow, shallow sea parts Denmark from her northern neighbors, while the well settled districts of Norway and Sweden are not separated by any natural barrier. The Danes, Norwegians, and Swedes have also very much in common. They descend from the old Vikings, who became the terror of Europe in the ninth century. Their languages resemble one another closely, Danish and Norwegian in the written form being identical. They have all been Lutheran Protestants since the sixteenth century. They all live under similar physical conditions and support themselves by agriculture, commerce, and the fisheries, rather than by manufacturing. Nevertheless, antagonisms due to historical causes proved stronger than unity of race, language, and culture, with the result that there are three small and comparatively weak nations when one large and powerful nation might have been consolidated.

The Union of Calmar (1397) brought the Scandinavian peoples together for more than a century, under the common rule of the Danish king. The secession of Sweden in 1524 dissolved the union. Norway remained attached to Denmark until the Congress of Vienna, to punish the Danes for adhering to Napoleon and to reward the Swedes for siding with the allies, united the country with Sweden. This action reduced the population of the Danish kingdom by fully one-third. The forced cession of Schleswig-Holstein to Germany in 1864 restricted Denmark to the peninsula of

¹ Dutch colonies: Sumatra, Java, part of Timor, Dutch Borneo, Celebes, Molucca Islands, Dutch New Guinea, Dutch Guinea (Surinam), Curacao.
Jutland, with the adjacent islands. It became, henceforth, the smallest of the Scandinavian countries.

Norway and Sweden were joined after 1815 in a personal union under the Swedish king. Each country retained its separate constitution, parliament, and courts. Norway resented even this slight measure of dependence upon Sweden. The differences between them, though scarcely greater than those which formerly kept England and Scotland apart, only became more acute with the passage of time. Their separation occurred peacefully in 1905, as the result of a plebiscite in which the Norwegians, almost to a man, voted for independence. The new Norwegian king assumed the title of Haakon VII, thus indicating the historical continuity of his kingdom with the free Norway of the Middle Ages.

Denmark, Norway, and Sweden are monarchies, with written constitutions, bicameral parliaments, responsible ministries, and universal suffrage. The present Swedish dynasty goes back to the Frenchman Bernadotte, one of Napoleon's marshals, who was adopted as Crown Prince of Sweden, and subsequently ascended the throne.

The year 1914 saw the formation of the Scandinavian League, an informal alliance of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden for defensive purposes. It recalls the earlier Union of Calmar, and if maintained, promises to give these three nations greater weight in the councils of Europe.

Neither Norway nor Sweden has any colonies.\textsuperscript{1} Denmark had three, until recently. The most important was Iceland, which the adventurous Vikings settled more than a thousand years ago. Iceland received home rule during the 'seventies, and in 1918, in complete agreement with Denmark, became a sovereign state under its own flag. The king of Denmark remains Iceland's king, but for purely

\textsuperscript{1} In 1920 the Peace Conference placed the Spitzbergen Archipelago in the Arctic Ocean under the sovereignty of Norway.
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ornamental purposes. Denmark has also recently parted with her possessions in the West Indies, which she sold to the United States in 1917, for $25,000,000. They have been renamed the Virgin Islands. Greenland continues to be Danish but enjoys self-government. The Faroe Islands are definitely incorporated in the Danish kingdom.

Studies

1. Who is the reigning monarch of the house of Savoy? Of the house of Orange?
2. Mention some of the economic advantages to Italians of a united Italy. 3. Why is the pope called the "prisoner of the Vatican"?
4. How does Spain happen to have a Bourbon dynasty?
5. What historical reasons may be assigned for the relative backwardness of Spain during the nineteenth century?
6. "The disappearance of the Spanish colonial empire is one of the most significant features of the nineteenth century." Comment on this statement.
7. When did Switzerland become a neutralized state?
9. Compare the Swiss referendum with the French plebiscite.
10. How is Belgium a "buffer state"?
11. Which is more democratic, plural voting or the "one-man, one-vote system"?
12. What advantages are claimed for the system of proportional representation?
13. Locate on the map the principal possessions of Holland in the East Indies.
14. Name and locate the capitals of the three Scandinavian states.
CHAPTER XV

THE GERMAN EMPIRE AND THE DUAL MONARCHY

103. Land and People of Germany

After 1871 Germany occupied the third place among European countries as respects area, and the second place as respects population. She was surpassed in size only by Russia and Austria-Hungary, and in number of inhabitants by Russia alone. On the land side, Germany faced seven independent states. The water boundary on the North Sea and the Baltic includes considerably less than a third of the whole frontier. The shallow coasts afford few good harbors; consequently nearly all the important trading ports are river ports. Germany is provided with many navigable streams, whose usefulness has been increased by means of connecting canals. Freight can be carried all the way from the Rhine to the Vistula on these interior waterways. A very extensive system of railroads, nearly all state-owned, helps further to bring the chief Continental markets within easy access of Germany.

Geographically, there are two Germanys. The larger part of the country consists of North Germany, which, with the Baltic seacoast at its back, forms a continuation of the great European plain. The plain is lowest and flattest in the neighborhood of Holland; farther east it becomes rolling and hilly. North Germany, east of the Elbe, is devoted almost entirely to agriculture.

South Germany, including also the central portion of the country, contains much more diversified scenery. It possesses large plateaus; fertile valleys such as those of the Main and the Rhine; and mountain ranges, com-
paratively low in height and so situated as not to interfere seriously with communication. The chief mineral products of Germany come from these central and southern highlands.

There are also two German peoples. It has been pointed out \(^1\) that the early inhabitants of North Germany belonged to the racial type called Baltic or Nordic; they were, and their descendants still are, tall in stature, narrow-headed, light-haired, blue-eyed, and fair-complexioned. South Germany in remote times was occupied by the Alpine racial type, whose shorter stature, broader heads, and darker hair, eyes, and complexion still characterize the present inhabitants. Both peoples now use one language, though some differences (formerly much greater) exist between Low German, as spoken in the North, and High German, as spoken in the South. The latter became the literary language of all Germany as early as the Middle Ages. The two sections of the country have differed in religious affiliations ever since the Reformation. Most of North Germany is Protestant, and most of South Germany, especially south of the Main, is Roman Catholic. This geographical distribution now tends to be obscured by the greater mobility of the population since the introduction of railroads and the abolition of restrictions upon emigration from one state to another.

It is important to note that several non-German peoples were incorporated in the German Empire against their will. The Poles of West Prussia, East Prussia, and Non-German Posen, the Danes of Schleswig, and the inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine made up about one-twelfth of the total population of Germany. The three "submerged nationalities" managed to maintain their own languages and separate culture, in spite of persistent efforts on the part of the government to Germanize them.

The success of Prussia in raising Germany from disruption to unity, from weakness to strength, affected the German national character. Outwardly, all Germany adopted Prussian

\(^1\) See page 5.
armaments and conscription; inwardly, she came to accept the Prussian ideals of military discipline, the supremacy of the soldier over the citizen, the subordination of the individual to the state, and autocratic, though efficient, government. It has been well said that Prussia put an iron girdle around the whole of German life. A study of the imperial constitution, which shows Bismarck's hand in every section, will make this clearer.

104. The German Constitution

The German Empire, as established in 1871, was a federation. It included twenty-six states: four kingdoms, six grand duchies, five duchies, seven principalities, three free cities,¹ and the imperial territory of Alsace-Lorraine. The constitution allowed each state (but not Alsace-Lorraine until 1911) to manage its local concerns and specified what authority should be exercised by the federal government. The German Empire thus represented a compromise between the old Germanic Confederation, which formed a union of sovereign states, and the thoroughly centralized Prussian monarchy.

The king of Prussia, as ex officio president of the federation, received the title of German Emperor (Deutscher Kaiser). He was not called "Emperor of Germany," for such a title would have implied his superiority in rank to the other German kings. The kaiser had very great powers, particularly in time of war. He commanded the army and navy, thus controlling the entire military organization of the empire; appointed and received ambassadors; and through the imperial chancellor, whom he selected, influenced both foreign and domestic policies. He might also of his own notion declare a defensive war, but the declaration of an offensive war required the consent of the Bundesrat. The kaiser was quite irresponsible in his exercise of these powers; he could neither be punished nor removed from office for his acts.

¹ Hamburg, Bremen, and Lübeck.
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The Federal Council, or Bundesrat, consisted of sixty-one members, apportioned among the states roughly according to size. Prussia had seventeen; Bavaria, the next largest, six; and a great many states, only one each. The delegation from each state voted as a unit and always in accordance with instructions given to them by their respective governments. The consequence was that the Bundesrat formed an aristocratic council of diplomats, repre-

The Reichstagsgebäude, Berlin

The building housed both the Bundesrat and the Reichstag.

senting (except in the case of the free cities) the hereditary German princes. The Bundesrat, in practice, made all the laws. It shaped in secret sessions the bills to be laid before the Reichstag for approval, and it had a veto of any measure passed by the latter body.

The Imperial Diet, or Reichstag, contained three hundred and ninety-seven members, elected for a five-year term by all male citizens who had reached the age of twenty-five years. Each member represented a single district. In 1871 the districts contained about one hundred thousand inhabitants each, but their boundaries were never altered subsequently with the increase or decrease of population. As the result of this "rotten-borough" system,
the rural region of East Prussia, whose population in 1914 was about equal to that of Berlin, sent nearly three times as many representatives to the Reichstag. Similar discrepancies existed in other parts of the empire. They would have been more serious had the Reichstag been more powerful. As a matter of fact, it exerted little influence on legislation. It might introduce bills, but few of them were likely to receive the assent of the Bundesrat. If, however, the Reichstag refused to pass a government measure, the Bundesrat and the emperor could dissolve it and order a new election. The Reichstag was dissolved four times, and after each dissolution the new assembly meekly passed the bill which its predecessor had rejected. As compared with the British House of Commons or the French Chamber of Deputies, the Reichstag was little more than a debating society; it discussed, it did not govern.

The emperor's representative in dealing with the legislature was the chancellor. This official corresponded only in slight degree to the prime minister or premier in other governments. He was responsible solely to the emperor, who appointed him and dismissed him at will. The chancellor presided over the Bundesrat, and in the name of the emperor laid before the Reichstag all measures which the Bundesrat had framed. He also selected the chief federal officials and supervised their activity.

It is clear that, while the German Empire was a constitutional state, it was not a democratic state. No ministry rose or fell at the will of the Reichstag, and the chancellor, the emperor's agent, held his position as long as he retained the emperor's confidence. Unlike Great Britain, France, Italy, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Holland, and the Scandinavian countries, Germany did not have a genuine parliamentary system.

The parties or political groups of Germany included Conservatives, representing the landed aristocracy (Junkers), public officials, and peasants; National Liberals, representing the middle classes; Roman Catholic
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Clericals, or Centrists, so designated from the seats which their representatives occupied on the floor of the Reichstag; and the Social Democrats or Socialists. In 1914 the latter formed the largest party in Germany. While most of its supporters were workingmen, many middle-class people who rejected the economic doctrines of socialism, also voted for Social Democratic candidates, in order to protest as effectively as possible against autocracy and militarism. The unfair system of representation, however, gave this party far fewer seats in the Reichstag than it was entitled to.

Prussia, with approximately two-thirds the area and two-thirds the population of Germany, naturally held the leading place in the empire. The king of Prussia was German emperor; of the five chancellors between 1871 and 1914 all but one were Prussians; and Prussia kept a majority of representatives in the Reichstag. Her seventeen votes in the Bundesrat did not assure her a majority there, but she almost always obtained the support of enough states to carry any legislation desired. On the other hand, if Prussia opposed a bill in the Bundesrat, not less than twelve of the largest states had to combine in order to secure a majority against her. Let it be noted, finally, that no amendment to the constitution might be adopted if fourteen votes were cast against it in the Bundesrat. This meant that Prussia's solid block of votes, controlled by the kaiser, could prevent any democratic modifications of the constitution, no matter how much desired by the German people generally.

The paramountcy of Prussia makes it highly important to understand the government of that country. The constitution which Frederick William IV "granted" in 1850 to his faithful subjects,¹ did not seriously limit the royal power. The upper house of the Prussian parliament (Landtag) consisted of nobles and wealthy Junkers, whom the king appointed for life and whose numbers he could enlarge at will. The lower and supposedly popular branch of parliament was elected according to a system which gave the

¹ See page 244.
richer classes an overwhelming influence. All the voters of a district were divided into three classes, according to the amounts of taxes paid by them, and each class received equal representation in the convention which elected the member of parliament for the district. It might happen — it did happen — that the vote of one wealthy man had as great weight as the votes of a thousand poor workingmen. Even Bismarck, no friend of democracy, called the Prussian electoral system the worst ever devised. To complete this outline, it should be added that the king possessed a veto of all legislation passed by the Landtag; that the ministry was responsible to him and not to the Landtag; and that the constitution expressly recognized his divine right to rule. "Absolutism under constitutional forms" is the description which a great German scholar — himself a Prussian — once correctly applied to the government of Prussia.

105. Imperial Germany, 1871–1914

German history between 1871 and 1914 falls naturally into two periods, the first of which is covered by the reign of William I. The emperor left both domestic and foreign affairs almost entirely in the strong hands of Bismarck, who served as imperial chancellor and president of the Prussian ministry. The architect of the empire presided over its destinies for almost twenty years. Many problems confronted him. "Blood and iron" had unified the German peoples, but other bonds were required to keep them one. They must now learn to think and feel and act imperially, sinking their local tendencies and old "particularism" in a new national consciousness.

Bismarck's prestige as the maker of Germany enabled him to secure the enactment of much legislation enlarging the functions of the federal government at the expense of the several states. Uniform codes of civil and criminal law were provided for the entire empire. A supreme court at Leipzig was created to hear appeals from state courts. An imperial bank (Reichsbank) was set up at Berlin.
The German National Monument

Designed by Johannes Schilling; begun in 1877; completed in 1883. The monument stands on a wooded hillside opposite Bingen and overlooking the Rhine valley. The great base, 84 feet high, supports an impressive figure of Germania, 34 feet high, with the imperial crown and the laurel-wreathed sword. On the side of the pedestal facing the river is a design symbolizing "The Watch on the Rhine." The other sides of the pedestal bear designs representing various scenes in the Franco-German War.
to become the central institution in Germany for financial operations and the issue of banknotes. All the state railroads were placed under the control of an imperial railroad bureau. An imperial coinage, with the mark as its basis, also appeared. The new coins bore on one side the emperor's effigy, and on the other side, the arms of the empire; they carried everywhere the "good news of unity." All these measures helped to foster national sentiment throughout Germany.

There were other problems which even Bismarck could not solve. Germany contained important non-German elements, but he did little or nothing to reconcile them to the imperial régime. Danes, Poles, and Alsatians remained unwilling members of the empire, and through their representation in the Reichstag or in the Prussian parliament continued to be a source of embarrassment to the government. Again, unification of Germany had brought together Protestant North Germans and Catholic South Germans, thus sowing seeds of religious dissension between the two sections. Bismarck carried through parliament many laws forbidding the Roman Catholic Church to intervene in any way in civil affairs. The net result was the formation of a Catholic Party, whose influence in the Reichstag at length compelled the Iron Chancellor to "go to Canossa," that is, to repeal nearly all the obnoxious anti-clerical legislation. Finally, he came off second-best in his political struggle with the Social Democrats, who were equally opposed to monarchy, aristocracy, and the existing economic system. His measures of repression against this party proved to be no more effective than those against Catholics, and the steady growth of socialism continued to alarm the ruling classes of Germany.

Bismarck still held office when William I passed away in 1888, at the age of ninety-one. His successor, Frederick III, who had married a daughter of Queen Victoria, seems to have been a man of decidedly democratic views and an admirer of the British parliamentary system. German Liberals looked forward with great hope to his reign. But
the third Frederick mounted the throne only to die within a few months. In the light of subsequent events, his untimely death was a misfortune for Germany, for Europe, and for the world.

Frederick's son, William II, became king of Prussia and German emperor when not quite twenty-nine years of age. In this last of the Hohenzollerns\(^1\) culminated all their absolutism, their contempt of popular government, and their firm belief in the doctrine of divine right. "The will of the king is the supreme law," he himself declared. The young ruler could not work well with the old chancellor, who had so long reigned in all but name. Friction between them led to Bismarck's enforced resignation of the chancellorship in 1890. His four successors in that office were merely mouthpieces of the emperor; after 1890 William II was, in effect, his own chancellor.

\(^1\) Hohenzollern Dynasty (1640-1918)

Frederick William, the Great Elector (1640-1688)

Frederick I (1688-1701, elector; 1701-1713, king)

Frederick William I (1713-1740)

Frederick II, the Great (1740-1786) August William

Frederick William II (1786-1797)

Frederick William III (1797-1840)

Frederick William IV (1840-1861) William I (1861-1888, king; 1871-1888, emperor)

Frederick III (1888)

William II (1888-1918)
106. Colonial Expansion of Germany

All the German colonies dated from the last two decades of the nineteenth century, when the best parts of the world had already been appropriated by Great Britain, France, and other powers. The explanation of Germany's delay in colonization was her late entrance into the family of nations. Even after 1871 she did not embark immediately upon colonial enterprises. Bismarck, like Frederick the Great, believed that distant dependencies were a burden to the state. It would be far better, he thought, for Germany to devote all her energies to domestic problems. The Iron Chancellor was so much of a "no colony man" that he refused to take any of the French overseas possessions as a prize of victory in the Franco-German War.

But Bismarck soon had to change his policy. The reasons were principally three. First, colonies would furnish homes for German emigrants, who otherwise had to settle in the United States and other foreign countries. Second, colonies would provide new markets for German manufactures and raw materials for German factories. Third, the possession of colonies seemed to be demanded by Germany's new position in Europe: they would be the badge of her success and perhaps the stepping stones to a world empire.

African colonization began in 1884-1885, when extensive territories on the Gulf of Guinea, in southwestern Africa, and in eastern Africa, which had been secured by German agents through treaties with native chieftains, were transferred to the imperial government. Upwards of one million square miles of the Dark Continent thus came under the German flag. In 1897 Germany seized the bay of Kiauchau and adjacent territory in the Chinese province of Shantung, ostensibly as "compensation" for the murder of two German missionaries. She then extorted a ninety-nine year lease of Kiauchau and asserted a "sphere of influence" embracing all of Shantung. A part of the island of New Guinea,
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together with various small groups in the Pacific, was also annexed by Germany.

These colonies, more than four times the size of the Fatherland, made a fine showing on the map. However, they cost an enormous sum for maintenance; their savage inhabitants preferred to fight Germans rather than buy German goods; and their hot, unhealthy climate kept away immigrants. The German population of all the colonies amounted in 1914 to only 16,000. Except as sources of raw materials, they were liabilities rather than assets to the home country.¹

107. Constitution of Austria-Hungary

The student will recall how the democratic and national movement, which swept over Europe after the "February Revolution," threatened at first to break the Hapsburg realm into fragments. But the time for its dissolution had not yet come. Austria emerged triumphant from the storm of revolution, and under the youthful emperor, Francis Joseph I, returned to the well-worn path of absolutism and reaction. Hungary, especially, felt the full weight of Austrian displeasure, as the result of her failure to win freedom under Kossuth in 1849. Ever since 1526, when the Magyars sought the protection of Austria against the Ottoman Turks and elected a Hapsburg king of Hungary, they had continued to enjoy some measure of self-government. Their country was now cut into five districts, ruled by Germans from Vienna, and German was made the official language everywhere. These measures did not succeed in obliterating the sense of nationality among the Magyars. After the two disastrous wars of 1859 and 1866, which expelled the Austrians from Italy and Germany, Francis Joseph found

¹ German Colonies (1914)

Africa: Togo, Cameroons, German Southwest Africa, German East Africa.

Asia: Kiauchau.

Oceania: German New Guinea (Kaiser Wilhelm's Land), Bismarck Archipelago, northern Solomon Islands, German Samoa, Pelew Islands, Caroline Islands, Ladrone or Marianne Islands (except Guam), Marshall Islands.
himself obliged to pursue a more conciliatory policy toward the Magyars. "What does Hungary demand?" he asked the great Magyar statesman, Deák, a few days after the battle of Sadowa. "Only what she wanted before Sadowa" was the reply. Hungary soon got what she wanted — the restoration of her historic rights as a nation.

The constitution known as the Ausgleich (Compromise), was framed by Deák and the emperor. It created a dual monarchy, something more than a personal union and yet less than a close federation. The dominions of the Hapsburgs were split into two self-governing states: (1) the Austrian Empire, including Upper Austria, Lower Austria, Bohemia, Moravia, Galicia, and twelve other provinces; and (2) the kingdom of Hungary, including Croatia-Slavonia. Each country had its own parliament, ministry, courts, officials, language, and capital (Vienna and Budapest). Both had one flag, one army and navy, and one sovereign, who wore the joint crown of Austrian emperor and Hungarian king. There was also a common tariff, a common
coinage, and a common administration of foreign affairs. This political makeshift had to be renewed every decade. It managed to survive until the revolutionary year of 1918.

The Dual Monarchy was somewhat more democratic than the German Empire. Laws in Austria were made by a majority of the two houses of parliament and were executed by a ministry nominally responsible to both houses, but practically servants of the Crown. The emperor, by playing off one parliamentary faction against another, could often secure his own way in legislation. Manhood suffrage prevailed since 1907.

The law-making power in Hungary was also vested in a bicameral parliament and a nominally responsible ministry. Very illiberal qualifications for the suffrage, both property and educational, limited the number of voters before 1913 to a fourth of the adult male population. Franchise reform in that year doubled the electorate, but did not disturb the privileged position which the Magyars enjoyed in the state.

The relations between Austria and Hungary under the Ausgleich were not always amicable. Perhaps the strongest tie holding the two countries together was a deep-seated loyalty to the venerable Francis Joseph. The emperor's long reign bridged the gap between the era of Metternich and the World War, between 1848 and 1914. De-
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spite heavy private griefs — the execution of his brother Maxi-
milan, whom Napoleon III had set on the throne of Mexico
and then deserted; the suicide of his only son; the murder of
his wife by an anarchist; and the assassination of his nephew
and heir — Francis Joseph never forgot the duties of a monarch.
He mixed freely among the people, received them in public
audience, speaking now one, now another, of the seventeen
languages of his dominions, and worked harder at the business
of governing than any of his ministers. The emperor-king
died in harness in 1916. The crowns of Austria and Hungary
then descended to his grandnephew, Charles I, who reigned
less than two years.  

108. Nationalities in Austria-Hungary

The Dual Monarchy could claim to be only in part — the
smaller part — Teutonic. The ruling family was German,
Diversity of nationalities and German was the official language in most
common use. But out of a total population of
about 50,000,000 in 1914, there were only 12,000,000 Germans.

1 HAPSBURG DYNASTY (1745–1918)
Maria Theresa m. Francis I
(Austrian ruler, 1740–1780) (Holy Roman Emperor, 1745–1765)

| Joseph II | Leopold II |
| (1765–1790) | (1790–1792) |

| Francis II |
| (Holy Roman Emperor, 1792–1806; as emperor of Austria, Francis I, 1806–1835) |

| Ferdinand I | Francis Charles |
| (1835–1848) | |

| Francis Joseph I | Charles Louis |
| (1848–1916) | |

| Francis Ferdinand | Otto |
| | |

| Charles I |
| (1916–1918) |
Nationalities in Austria-Hungary

The other nationalities included Magyars (10,000,000), Slavs (24,000,000), and Latin or Romanic peoples (4,000,000).

The Germans of Austria, forming about one third of the population, extended in a compact group from the Tyrol in the south to some distance east of Vienna. A German belt almost encircled the Czechs of Bohemia. Small German settlements (enclaves) were also dotted like islands over Hungary. Excepting the Tyrolese, a peasant people, the Austrian Germans generally belonged to the middle and upper classes. They were the dominant element in Austria.

In Hungary the Magyars were dominant. Though only a bare half of the population, they held the balance of power between the Slovaks, Serbo-Croats, and Rumanians in the Hungarian kingdom.

The Slavs composed by far the largest racial group of the Dual Monarchy, but they differed greatly in language, religion, and customs, and as the map shows, occupied widely separated territories. The northern Slavs included the Czechs in Bohemia and Moravia, the Slovaks in northern Hungary, the Poles of western Galicia, and the Ruthenians (Little Russians) of eastern Galicia. All these peoples had nationalist aspirations. The Czechs could not forget that Bohemia, as well as Hungary, had been a sovereign state before its union with Austria in 1526; they demanded the same measure of independence that the Magyars enjoyed. The Slovaks in Hungary wanted to be united with their Czech brethren in Bohemia. The Galician Poles, like the Poles in Prussia and Russia, looked forward to the restoration of a free Poland.

The southern Slavs, or Jugoslavs, as they call themselves, comprised the two groups of Slovenes in Styria and Carniola and Serbo-Croats in Croatia-Slavonia, Dalmatia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina. These Slavs were separated from their kinsmen in the north by the Magyar settlement in central Europe during the Middle Ages. The Serbo-Croats speak the same language as the people of Serbia, with whom they desired to be incorporated.
Two other nationalities held an inferior place in the Dual Monarchy. The Rumanians, who occupied the Hungarian province of Transylvania, agitated for union with the kingdom of Rumania. The Italians living in Istria and the Trentino wanted to be “redeemed” from Austrian rule and restored to Italy.¹

¹ See page 262.
The Ausgleich, as we have seen, formed a league between the Germans and the Magyars, the two strongest nationalities of Austria-Hungary. They were not only determined to preserve their own language and customs, but also to force them on the Slavs, Rumanians, and Italians. The result was great and increasing bitterness between the dominant and subject peoples. This discord of nationalities helped to precipitate the war in 1914, and in 1918 to disrupt the Dual Monarchy.

Studies

1. On an outline map of the German Empire in 1914 indicate the territories of Prussia. 2. On an outline map of Austria-Hungary in 1914 indicate the regions predominantly German, Slavic, Romanic, and Magyar in population. 3. Compare the German Empire as a federation with the United States. 4. What was the historical origin of the free cities of the German Empire? 5. Explain the distinction between the titles “German Emperor” and “Emperor of Germany.” 6. Contrast the organization and powers of the Bundesrat with the American Senate, and of the Reichstag with the American House of Representatives. 7. Why was the Reichstag described by its own members as merely a “hall of echoes”? 8. Explain how Prussia held a paramount position in the German Empire. 9. Why was Germany called the “political kindergarten of Europe”? 10. Name and locate the colonial possessions of Germany in 1914. 11. Why was the Austrian Empire called a “ramshackle empire”? 12. What was meant by calling Austria “a Slav house with a German façade”? 13. Comment on the statement, “You Magyars are only an island in an ocean of Slavs.”
CHAPTER XVI

RUSSIA

109. The Russians

Before the World War, Russia in Europe comprised three-fifths of the area of that continent and contained perhaps 150,000,000 people. The bulk of the inhabitants are eastern Slavs, the descendents of Slavic emigrants from the Danube and Elbe valleys during the early Middle Ages. The emigrants separated, centuries ago, into three groups, which have persisted to the present day.

The Great Russians, who are much the largest of these groups, occupy the interior, the north, and the east of Russia. Their historic center is Moscow on the Moskva River, the capital of the medieval principality of Muscovy. To every patriotic Russian that city is still "Mother Moscow."

The Little Russians (Ruthenians, Ukrainians) hold the south and southwest of the country. They center about the holy city of Kiev on the Dnieper, where in 988 the Scandinavian Northmen adopted the Eastern or Greek form of Christianity for themselves, and for the Slavs among whom they settled. Intellectually, the Little Russians are far more energetic and imaginative than the Great Russians, and to them Russia owes most of her music, her poetry, and her folk song.

The White Russians, whose name is probably derived from their light-colored clothes, dwell to the west, in lands which once belonged to Lithuania. They number only a few millions.

The three Russian peoples speak different dialects of one Slavic language. The dialectical differences are sufficient to prevent a Muscovite from understanding a Ukrainian and both from conversing with a White
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Russian. For literary and official purposes, the Moscow dialect is everywhere employed. The alphabet in use comes from the Greek, enriched with special signs for Slavic letters. The three Russian peoples also unite in a common allegiance to the Orthodox Church. This was an offshoot of the medieval Greek Church, from which most of its doctrines and ritual have been derived. Until the Russian Revolution of 1917, the tsar remained the head of the church, as far as to make and annul all appointments to ecclesiastical office. Theological questions were dealt with by a council of ecclesiastics called the Holy Synod. Russia, it may be noted, contains numberless dissenting sects, which formerly encountered persecution by the government for their unorthodox beliefs and practices.

110. The Non-Russians

The seaward expansion of Russia in Europe gradually enrolled many non-Russians among the tsar's subjects. They were found principally along the frontier. Peter the Great annexed several Baltic provinces containing Estonians, Letts, and Germans. Catherine II absorbed the greater part of Poland, and by her conquest of the Crimea and the northern coast of the Black Sea added to the empire millions of Mohammedan Tatars. Early in the nineteenth century Alexander I took Finland from Sweden (1809), wrested Bessarabia from Turkey (1812), secured a further slice of Poland (1815), and began the conquest of Caucasia. The Caucasian territory with its mixed population (Georgians, Circassians, Armenians, etc.) was not finally incorporated in the empire until after the middle of the century. Russia then reached her territorial limits in Europe. The break-up of the country since the World War has enabled most of these frontier peoples to establish independent states.

About ninety per cent of the inhabitants of Finland are Finns; the remainder are chiefly Swedes, who occupy the

1 See the maps on pages 54 and 360.
coast of the Gulf of Bothnia. The Finns came from Asia early in the Middle Ages. They still keep the low stature, round heads, flat features, oblique eyes, and prominent cheek-bones of the Mongolian race. Their language is also of Asiatic origin. In spite of constant struggle with a poor soil and an adverse climate, the Finns have made remarkable progress in civilization. Illiteracy is almost unknown among them. Nearly all are Lutherans.

A Finnish people, the Esths or Estonians, dwell just south of the Gulf of Finland. Once wild and adventurous pirates,
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the terror of the Baltic, the Esthonians were first conquered and Christianized by the Danes. The Danish king subsequently sold his Esthonian possessions to the Esthonians crusading order of Teutonic Knights, who spread German influence throughout the country. Sweden during the sixteenth century assumed control of Estonia, but after the wars of Charles XII it was ceded to his victorious rival, Peter the Great.1 The Esthonians, like the Finns, are Lutherans.

The Letts of Livonia and Courland and the Lithuanians are two peoples who resemble each other closely in speech, personal appearance, and habits of life. With a third kindred group, the Borussi or Old Prussians,2 they formerly occupied all the southeastern coast of the Baltic from the Vistula to the Düna. Owing to their impene-trable forests and swamps, the Letts and Lithuanians long remained heathen and did not accept Christianity until the fourteenth century. Their languages, though of Indo-European type, are the most archaic spoken in Europe. Force of circumstances denied the Letts a prominent place in history, but the Lithuanians during the Middle Ages built up a powerful state stretching from the Baltic to the Black Sea. The grand duchy of Lithuania united with Poland in 1569, and thereafter shared the vicissitudes of that kingdom.3

Russian Poland, as constituted by the Vienna Congress,4 had a mixed population of Lithuanians, Polish Slavs, Little and White Russians, and many Jews. The Lithuanians and Polish Slavs — conveniently referred to as Poles — belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, and though subjects of the tsar, kept their national spirit.

No account of the non-Russians could well omit a reference to the Jews. Five million Jews were found within the empire, especially in Poland, which had long been a Jewish settlement. The Jews preserved their religion, national traditions, and even their Yiddish language, a German dialect intermixed with many Hebrew and Slavic words and written in Hebrew characters.

1 See page 62. 2 See pages 67–68. 3 See pages 73–74. 4 See page 214.
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111. Alexander I, 1801–1825

The hodge-podge of territories and Babel of peoples composing the Russian Empire in the nineteenth century was ruled by an autocratic tsar. His decrees (ukases) were binding on all his subjects. Russian laws called him an “independent and absolute sovereign” and declared that God “orders men to submit to his superior authority, not only from fear of punishment, but as a religious duty.” Many educated Russians, who perhaps were not greatly impressed by this appeal to divine right, nevertheless considered autocratic government a practical necessity for Russia. The enormous size and varied population of the country, the dense ignorance of most of its inhabitants, and the absence of a prosperous, progressive middle class, which could take part in political life, seemed to indicate that the triumph of democracy would be long postponed in the tsar’s domains. The chief interest of Russian history during the last century lies, therefore, in the development of liberalism, which gradually undermined the whole fabric of autocracy, and in the revolutionary year of 1917 brought it crashing to the ground.¹

Alexander I, grandson of Catherine II and son of the emperor Paul, who had been assassinated after a brief rule, began as a

¹ ROMANOV DYNASTY (1762–1917)
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The Kremlin, Moscow
monarch of enlightened views. Under the influence of his Swiss tutor, he imbibed many democratic ideas of the revolutionary period in Europe, and he aspired to put them into practice. The earlier part of the tsar’s reign revealed him as a liberal-minded autocrat. He began to free the serfs on the crown lands; drew up an elaborate scheme of primary education, which, however, was shipwrecked by the lack of teachers and the stupidity of the popular mind; and started to codify the chaos of laws, consisting principally of seventy thousand ukases issued by his predecessors. Alexander also acted most generously toward the Finns and Poles, who received practical independence. Their only connection with Russia lay through the tsar in his capacity of grand duke of Finland and king of Poland.

Alexander’s ardor for reform grew cold during the latter part of his reign, especially after he came under the influence of that foe of liberalism, Prince Metternich. The tsar not only signed the Protocol of Troppau, but also coöperated with his brother monarchs in putting down the first liberal uprisings in Italy and Spain. The last years of his life found him equally reactionary at home.

112. Nicholas I, 1825–1855

Alexander’s sudden death in December, 1825, resulted in some uncertainty as to the succession, and three weeks elapsed before his brother Nicholas mounted the throne. During this interval the revolutionary secret societies, which had begun to spring up in Russia as in western Europe, organized a mutiny among the troops at St. Petersburg. The ringleaders planned the overthrow of autocracy and the establishment of a constitutional régime under the grand duke Constantine. Their slogan was “Constantine and the Constitution,” but many ignorant soldiers who shouted it actually supposed that “Constitution” was Constantine’s wife! The

1 See page 230.
Nicholas I uprising ended in a fiasco, and the Decembrists were severely punished by the new tsar.

Nicholas I, unlike his brother, never felt any sentimental sympathy with liberalism. The Decembrist uprising only confirmed him in the belief that Russia needed to be ruled with a strong hand. To prevent liberal ideas from spreading among his subjects, the tsar relied on a strict censorship of the press, passport regulations which made it difficult for any one to enter Russia or to leave it, an army of spies, and the secret police known as the Third Section. The chief of the Third Section had unlimited power to arrest, imprison, or deport a political suspect, without warrant and without trial. During the thirty years' reign of Nicholas I, Liberals by tens of thousands languished in jail or trod the path of exile to Siberia. The tsar seems finally to have realized that this system of repression was a mistake, but he clung to it until the end. "My successor," said he, "may do as he pleases; I cannot change."

Nicholas was no less autocratic in his foreign policy. We have already learned how ruthlessly he put down the Polish insurrection and how he aided Francis Joseph I to destroy the Hungarian Republic.¹ Once only did the tsar espouse a revolutionary cause. In 1828 he sided with the Greeks who had risen against the Turks, but even then his purpose was not so much to free Greece as to exalt Russia. Nicholas afterwards waged the Crimean

¹ See pages 234 and 241.
War, a venture which brought him into conflict with Great Britain, France, and Sardinia as the allies of Turkey. He died before the war ended.

113. Alexander II, 1855–1881

Alexander II started out as a benevolent despot. The survivors of the Decembrist movement were allowed to return home, and other political offenders were also pardoned. The censorship of the press was relaxed, and the prohibition upon foreign travel was removed. The tsar issued a new code of laws, based on those of western Europe. He improved the courts of justice, long notorious for their incompetence and corruption. More important still, he entrusted the administration of roads, schools, churches, and other local concerns to provincial and district assemblies (zemstvos), freely elected by all classes of the people. His most memorable achievement was the abolition of serfdom, which had lasted longer in Russia than in any other European country. Alexander’s decrees between 1858–1861 freed nearly fifty million peasants and earned for their author the title of the “Tsar Liberator.”

The era of reform lasted scarcely a decade. Alexander II was not a liberal at heart, and his counselors were men trained in the school of Nicholas I. They convinced him, as Metternich had convinced the first Alexander, that liberalism was a Western novelty, quite unsuited to holy
Russia, and bound to be followed by revolution and the overthrow of autocracy. After the Polish insurrection of the early 'sixties,¹ which thoroughly frightened the tsar, reaction had full swing in Russia.

The intense disappointment of the educated classes (the intelligentsia) at Alexander’s relapse into the traditional ways of Russian monarchs, gave rise to nihilism.² It began as an academic doctrine. Radical thinkers, building where the French philosophers of the eighteenth century had left off, set up reason and science as the twin guides of life. Russia, they urged, must make a clean sweep of autocracy, of the Orthodox Church, and of every other institution that had come down from an unreasoning, unscientific past. Only when the ground had been thus cleared, would it be possible to reconstruct a new and better society.

The nihilists before long began to seek converts among the masses. Under the guise o doctors, school teachers, factory hands, and common laborers, they preached the gospel of social and economic freedom to those who, as they said, were “exhausted by hunger, broken down by toil, the eternal slaves of the privileged classes, laboring without pause, without hope of redemption.” Nothing could exceed the devotion of these youthful missionaries, both men and women, but their success was slight. The peasants remained just as deeply attached as ever to the “Little Father,” the tsar. The government soon got wind of the revolutionary movement and imprisoned or exiled those who took part in it.

The nihilist propaganda of words now passed into a propaganda of deeds. Since the government ruled by terror, it was henceforth to be fought with terror. A secret committee at St. Petersburg condemned to death a number of prominent officials, spies, and members of the hated Third Section, and in some cases succeeded in assassin-

¹ See page 234, note 1.
² Latin nihil, “nothing.” The term was first introduced by Turgenev in his novel, Fathers and Sons.
atating them. The terrorists were few in number, but their fearlessness made them extremely dangerous.

Coercion having failed to stamp out nihilism, Alexander II adopted conciliation. A scheme was drawn up, providing some sort of constitution and representative parliament for Russia. The very day when the tsar reluctantly consented to it, he was killed by a bomb while driving to his palace in the capital.
114. Alexander III, 1881–1894

The revolutionary party issued a manifesto offering to refrain from further terrorism provided a representative assembly elected on the basis of manhood suffrage was summoned, and freedom of the press, of speech, and of public meeting was granted. These were the only means, the manifesto declared, by which the country could secure tranquility. But Alexander III, undeterred by his father’s fate, continued to be “Autocrat of all the Russias.”

The evil genius behind the throne now appeared in the person of the tsar’s former tutor, Pobédonostsev, who had risen to be procurator, or secular chairman, of the Holy Synod. This position at the head of the governing body of the Orthodox Church enabled him to exercise immense influence upon ecclesiastical affairs, and hence upon the government, since Church and State were one in Russia. To Pobédonostsev liberalism was anathema. He has left a presentation of his opinions in his Reflections of a Russian Statesman.¹ We read here that a constitutional system is the “great political lie which dominates our age”; that a representative parliament is merely an institution “serving for the satisfaction of the personal ambition, vanity, and self-interest of its members”; and that democracy produces “the most complicated and the most burdensome system of government recorded in the history of humanity.” The procurator of the Holy Synod really believed all that, and he lost no opportunity of instilling his views into the mind of his royal master.

Another minister upon whom Alexander III leaned was Plehve, director of the state police. Plehve ferreted out and punished the leading terrorists so remorselessly that revolutionary nihilism almost disappeared. It was bound to disappear in any event. A few men and women, however heroic and determined, could not overthrow an autocracy which commanded the support of the official

¹ English translation, 1898.
classes, of the Orthodox Church with its tens of thousands of priests, and of the stolid, conservative peasants, who formed the bulk of the population. As one of the terrorists regretfully confessed, terrorism was merely an "exercise in the art of self-sacrifice."

Pobédonostsev, Plehve, and the other reactionaries surrounding the tsar were responsible for the efforts made to unify the empire by compelling all its non-Russian inhabitants to use the Russian language, accept Russian customs, and worship according to the rites of the Orthodox Church. The policy of "one Russia, one creed, and one tsar" had been occasionally followed in the reigns of Nicholas I and Alexander II. It became systematic under Alexander III and led to severe treatment of the Finns, Estonians, Letts, Lithuanians, Poles, and Germans. In the case of the Jews, persecution sometimes resulted in the organized massacres known as "pogroms," which were carried out by mobs in the cities, often with the connivance of the officials. Thousands of Jews, in consequence, fled to the United States and other countries, cherishing fierce hatred of all things Russian.

If Russia during the reign of the third Alexander seemed to be politically dead, economically she made rapid progress. It was at this time that the country, for centuries almost wholly agricultural, began to be industrialized. The emancipation of the serfs allowed many of them to congregate in the cities, where they furnished an abundant supply of cheap labor. The government also started railroad building on an extensive scale, and by the grant of special privileges induced foreign capitalists to invest in Russian coal mines, iron mines, oil fields, and other natural resources. Factories sprang up like mushrooms, and millions of Russians, especially in the western portion of the empire, became factory workers. So tremendous a change could not fail to affect the life of the people in many ways. Old cities grew rapidly, and new cities developed. A middle class appeared, together with an industrial proletariat more intelligent and far less con-
servative than the peasantry. The workingmen organized trade unions, conducted strikes, and as in Germany lent a receptive ear to socialistic agitators against autocracy. These middle and lower classes were fertile soil for the seeds of revolution.

115. Nicholas II, 1894–1914

The accession of Nicholas II brought no change in the political situation. The young man was amiable and well-meaning, but as much an autocrat by nature as any of his predecessors. "Devoting all my efforts to the prosperity of the nation," he announced, "I will preserve the principles of autocracy as firmly and unswervingly as my late father." These were not idle words. The tsar kept in office both Pobédonostsev and Plehve, promoting the latter to the important post of minister of the interior, with almost dictatorial powers. These two reactionaries redoubled their efforts to keep Russia "frozen." Teachers, students, journalists, professional men, in fact, every one who dared think aloud suffered under the iron régime. The suppression of newspapers and the removal of university professors for liberal utterances were common occurrences. No person was secure against arbitrary arrest, imprisonment, exile, or execution.

The opposition to autocracy, which had lain dormant during the reign of Alexander III, revived during that of Nicholas II. Not only the intelligentsia, but also the middle Popular discontent and lower classes now espoused the liberal cause. Enlightened members of the nobility, as in France before the
Revolution, added their voices to the rising volume of criticism. Then came the Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905), revealing in pitiless fashion the government's incapacity and corruption. The assassination of Plehve, which occurred at this time, was a tell-tale symptom of the popular discontent.

On Sunday, January 22, 1905, an event occurred which stirred public feeling to its depths. A radical priest, Gapon by name, organized a procession of working people, both men and women, to march through the streets of the capital and lay their grievances before the "Little Father" in person. They had no faith in the promises of any of his officials. The demonstrators reached the Winter Palace to find, not the tsar, but Cossacks, and to be greeted with volleys of musketry. This was the massacre of "Red Sunday."

The months which followed witnessed an epidemic of strikes throughout Russia. Every strike had a twofold purpose — the improvement of economic conditions and the securing of a constitution. In October, 1905, a general strike began in St. Petersburg and other large cities, together with a stoppage of railway transportation all over the empire. The strike fever extended to the middle class; teachers dismissed school and judges court; merchants closed their stores and doctors their offices; even the ballet dancers refused to dance. It was passive resistance to autocracy on the part of an entire nation.

With life in Russia virtually at a standstill, no alternative remained to the government but submission. The tsar dismissed Pobèdonostsev and issued a manifesto promising freedom of conscience, speech, meeting, and association — the elementary rights of citizenship. He further promised that a representative assembly (Duma) should be elected on a wide franchise, and that henceforth no law should be valid without the Duma's consent. Russia was at last to have the free institutions which were no longer novelties in western Europe.

The first Russian parliament, known as the "Duma of the National Indignation," met in 1906. It was opened by
Nicholas II in person. The members, scarcely without exception, represented all the elements in Russian life opposed to autocracy. A struggle with the government occupied the entire session. The Duma wanted the tsar’s ministers to be responsible to it, as the only means of giving the people control over the officials. The tsar would not accept any further limitation of his authority, and at length cut the matter short by dissolving the assembly. Its failure to cooperate with him was a “cruel disappointment” to this sorely tried autocrat.

Three other Dumas met between 1907 and 1914. The tsar so modified suffrage qualifications that the membership was confined mainly to large landowners, wealthy manufacturers, and other representatives of the propertied, conservative classes. They accomplished some useful legislation, but did not succeed in winning liberty for the people. When the World War broke out, autocracy seemed to be as firmly seated as ever in Russia.

Studies

1. On an outline map indicate the chief European territories acquired by Russia in the nineteenth century. 2. Explain the following: (a) Holy Synod; (b) Third Section; (c) semestros; (d) Yiddish language; (e) intelligentsia; (f) the Decembrists; and (g) Duma. 3. Why has Russia been called the “adopted child” of Europe? 4. Why was the character and personality of the tsars always an important factor in Russian history? 5. Comment on the tsar’s title “Autocrat of all the Russias.” 6. What was meant by calling the Russian imperial government “a despotism tempered by assassination”? 7. Show that Russian nihilism was not the same thing as anarchism. 8. Contrast the methods of Russification with those of Americanization. 9. Account for the slow progress of liberalism in Russia.
CHAPTER XVII

TURKEY AND THE BALKAN STATES

116. The Balkan Peoples

The Balkan Peninsula divides less sharply from the rest of the Continent than the Italian and Iberian peninsulas. The northern boundary is formed by rivers rather than by mountains. It extends from the mouths of the Danube to the junction of that stream with the Save, at Belgrade, and thence follows the course of the Save and the Kulpa to the Adriatic Sea, near Fiume. In its general contour the peninsula resembles an inverted triangle, the apex of which ends in the Morea (anciently the Peloponnesus). Examination of a physical map shows that the surface is almost entirely mountainous, the only extensive plains being those formed by the valleys of the Danube and the Maritza, and the basin of Thessaly. The line of the Balkans clearly separates the upper from the lower portion of the peninsula, but so many routes cross them that they have always formed simply an obstacle, never a barrier, to invading peoples from the north. Owing to the distribution of the mountain ranges, the principal rivers empty into the Black Sea and the Ægean, rather than into the Adriatic. The best harbors and most numerous islands are also located on the eastern side of the peninsula. The Balkans, in fact, form a part of the Near East, and their history during modern times is indissolubly linked with the Eastern Question.

No other part of Europe of equal extent contains so many different peoples as the Balkan Peninsula. The original inhabitants were Illyrians, represented to-day by the Albanians. The Greeks rank as the next oldest inhabitants of the peninsula, though the original
purity of their blood has been adulterated by intermixture with Albanians and Slavs. Toward the end of the sixth century A.D., the Serbo-Croats began to leave their homes among the Carpathians and to occupy the region south of the Danube. The Bulgarians, a people of remotely Asiatic origin and akin to the Magyars and Turks, first appeared in the seventh century. They adopted the Slavic speech, religion, and culture of the Serbo-Croats. The Rumanians claim descent from the Roman colonists of Dacia north of the Danube; they seem to be, however, chiefly the descendants of the Slavic Vlachs or Wallachs, who are also found in Bessarabia and Transylvania. The Turks descend from the Ottoman invaders of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries and from later immigrants. Inter-marriage with their Christian captives and converts from Christianity to Islam has made the Turks substantially European in physique. The Turkish population is nowhere found in compact masses except in northeastern Bulgaria and in the vicinity of Adrianople and Constantinople.

As long as the Ottoman power prevailed in the Balkan peninsula, Turkish was the language officially used. The Serbo-Croats and the Bulgarians preserved their Slavic speech, but borrowed many words from Turkish. The same is true of Rumanian, though grammatically it belongs to the Latin or Romance family of languages. Even modern Greek, as spoken, contains a large number of Turkish terms. These do not appear in the literary language, which attempts to reproduce the Greek of classic antiquity. The Albanian language has high interest to the philologist, as a very ancient Indo-European tongue and the only surviving representative of the primitive speech of the peninsula.

Besides the Turks, about half of the Albanians, many Serbo-Croats of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and some of the Bulgarians are Moslems. The bulk of the Christian population belongs to the Greek Church, which in doctrine and ritual is almost identical with the Orthodox Church of Russia. Roman Catholicism finds nearly all its adherents in this part of Europe among the Serbo-Croats, who settled
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upon the Adriatic coast and came there into contact with Latin civilization.

The Balkan Peninsula, like Russia, has lagged behind western Europe in economic development. Its peoples are mainly small farmers, tilling the soil with rude implements, or herdsmen who keep flocks of sheep and goats. What commerce exists is almost entirely conducted by Greeks and Jews. The principal explanation of this backwardness must be sought in Turkish misgovernment, corruption, and tyranny, prolonged for centuries.

117. The Ottoman Turks

The empire of the Ottoman Turks formed a typical Oriental despotism. The sultan was not only lord of the Turkish realm in both Asia and Europe, but also the caliph, or spiritual head, of all Islam. He lived shut up in his seraglio at Constantinople and depended upon his vizier (prime minister) and divan (council of ministers) to execute his will. Each province had a pasha (governor) nominally subject to the sultan, but more often than not practically independent of him. The professional soldiers known as Janizaries, who at first had been exclusively recruited from Christian children, comprised the standing army.

Only those who accepted Islam were citizens of the Ottoman Empire. The Turks tolerated the presence of Christians, but deprived them of all political rights. Unbelievers could not hold any civil office or serve in the army. They also had to pay heavy taxes not imposed upon Moslems. Some Christians, as we have seen, accepted the faith of their conquerors in order to secure the privileges of citizenship. Even including these converts, the Turks in southeastern Europe remained a small minority of the population. Impassable barriers, raised by differences of race, language, religion, and customs, separated them from their subjects.

The Turks ruled the "Christian cattle" only to exploit them. The taxes were farmed out to collectors, who squeezed
all they could out of the peasantry. Under this system far more money went into the pockets of the tax-gatherer than into the public treasury. An incredible corruption paralyzed the entire administration. Officials purchased their appointment, and once in office depended on bribery and corruption to eke out their salaries. Real government in the interest of the people did not exist.

The Ottoman Empire in the eighteenth century showed plain signs of the blight which inevitably descends upon states built up by the sword and maintained only by the sword. Few of its despotic sovereigns possessed real ability, and the control of affairs passed more and more into the hands of self-seek ing ministers and favorites. The Janizaries, a turbulent body, often used their power to set up and depose sultans at will. The weakness of the central administration was reflected in the provinces, where the pashas acquired substantial independence and in many instances made their power hereditary. Turkey's internal decadence offered a promising opportunity for its partition among European powers.

Ever since the fateful year, 1683,¹ the Turks had lost ground in Europe. Austria soon recovered Hungary, Transylvania, and much of Croatia and Slavonia. Russia under Catherine II seized the Crimea, with the adjoining territory, and under Alexander I took Bessarabia. The settlement of 1815 made the Ionian Islands a British protectorate.² Then, as the nineteenth century progressed, the Christian peoples of the Balkans, stirred by the same enthusiasm for nationality which had moved Italians, Germans, Belgians, Poles, and Bohemians, threw off the Ottoman yoke and declared for freedom. The dismemberment of Turkey began.

118. Montenegro and Serbia

The warlike Serbo-Croats of Montenegro never fully accepted Ottoman sovereignty. A corner of the "Black Mountain" country held out for four hundred years against the Turks. One

¹ See page 64. ² See page 213.
of the greatest of Montenegrin heroes is Ivan, who, when the enemy in the sixteenth century pressed in from all sides, withdrew to the inaccessible heights of Cetigne, where the capital of the little principality has ever since been located. According to the national legend, Ivan still sleeps in a mountain cave — to awake when the hour strikes for the expulsion of the "infidel." The independence of Montenegro was finally recognized by the sultan in 1799.

Montenegro remained a principality until 1910, when Prince Nicholas, after a reign of half a century, assumed the title of king. A new constitution, which went into effect five years previously, established a national parliament elected by manhood suffrage. The tiny Montenegrin kingdom thus took a place among liberal monarchies.

The Serbo-Croats of Serbia have a memorable history. In the fourteenth century one of their rulers, Stephen Dushan, built up an empire which covered nearly the entire Balkan Peninsula from the Danube to the Gulf of Corinth and from the Adriatic to the Aegean. It was Dushan's ambition to unite Serbians, Greeks, and Bulgarians, and by their union to prevent the Ottoman power from taking root in southeastern Europe. The Serbian Empire did not long survive its founder, however, and completely disappeared as a result of the Turkish victory in the battle of Kossovo (1389).

After Kossovo Serbia existed for seventy years as a state tributary to Turkey. The country was then formally annexed by the sultans, who held it until the opening of the nineteenth century. All this time the Serbians never forgot their glorious past. The exploits of Stephen Dushan and other national heroes were handed down by minstrels, who secretly assembled the peasants and sang to them of the days when Serbia held first place in the Balkans. A people with such memories could never be altogether enslaved.

The first founder of modern Serbia was Karageorge ("Black George"), a peasant's son. The uprising which he led in 1804 cleared the country of the Turks, but they soon regained it. The Serbians rose again in 1815, this
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time under the leadership of the peasant Milosh. Supported by Russia, Serbia managed to extort from the sultan the privilege of self-government, with Milosh as hereditary prince.

The Serbians soon showed that they could rule themselves, as well as fight valiantly against Turkish tyranny. After winning freedom they proceeded to make Serbia a kingdom over their assembly of warriors into a genuine representative body. They were the first of the Balkan peoples to set up a constitutional government. Serbia secured complete independence of Turkey in 1878 and four years later became a kingdom. The ruler in 1914 was Peter I, a grandson of the heroic Karageorge.

119. Greece

The Greeks had not been a free people since their conquest by the Romans in the second century B.C. Byzantines, crusading Franks, and Venetians occupied Greece during Greece under foreign sway medieval times. By the middle of the fifteenth century the entire country came under the Turks, whose dominion endured until the nineteenth century had run one-quarter of its course.

The loss of freedom by the Greeks did not extinguish their sense of nationality. The Greek Church, to which all belonged, fostered national sentiment, both by keeping alive Greek nationality hostility to the “infidel” and by preserving in its services something more of the old Greek language than the vernacular of the country contained. A great scholar, Adamantios Korais (1748–1833), made it his lifework to create a literary language for the Greeks of his day. By extending the knowledge of the ancient classics among his compatriots, Korais helped greatly to revive their memories of the free Greece which had thrown back the Persian hordes at Marathon, at Salamis, and at Platæa. A secret society called Hetairia Philike (Association of Friends) also arose, and like the Italian Carbonari carried on revolutionary propaganda far and wide.

The Greeks first raised the standard of revolt in 1821. Volunteers from every European country, as well as a few Americans,
came to help them.¹ The powers at first stood coldly by, for Metternich, the presiding genius of the Concert of Europe, considered the Greeks simply rebels against "legitimate" Ottoman authority. As the struggle proceeded and the Greeks seemed likely to be overwhelmed, public opinion in Great Britain and France increasingly favored intervention, and the accession of Nicholas I in 1825 brought to the throne a tsar ready to follow the traditional Russian policy toward the Turks. The three powers finally agreed to demand that Greece be made, like Serbia, a self-governing state under Turkish sovereignty. When the sultan refused this arrangement, an allied fleet destroyed the Turkish navy at Navarino, a French army drove the Turks out of the Morea, and the Russians, crossing the Balkans, moved upon Constantinople. The sultan had to yield, and in 1829 signed a treaty which granted complete independence to central and southern Greece.

Greek patriots wanted a republican government, but the European powers set up a monarchy. A Bavarian prince wore the crown until 1862, when a popular uprising drove him out with his German soldiers and German courtiers. A Danish prince then became king, with the title of George I.² Greece at this time received a new and liberal constitution.

The kingdom of Greece, as originally established, comprised only a small part of ancient Hellas. More than half of the Greek people remained under Turkish rule, distributed in Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia, Thrace, the Ionian Islands, the islands of the Ægean, Crete, Cyprus, and the western coast of Asia Minor (the classic Ionia).³ A Pan-Hellenic movement soon began to recover as much as possible of these regions from the Turks. Great Britain

¹ The most famous of these Philhellenes was Lord Byron. Read his poems: "Greece" (The Corsair, canto iii, lines 1-54); "Modern Greece" (Childe Harold, canto ii, stanzas 83-92); "The Death of Greece" (The Giaour, lines 68-141); and "The Isles of Greece" (Don Juan, canto iii, between stanzas 86 and 87).
² Succeeded in 1913 by his son, Constantine I.
³ See the map facing page 386.
The Crimean War and Treaty of Paris fostered it in 1863–1864 by ceding the Ionian Islands, and in 1881 by inducing the sultan to relinquish Thessaly. The Balkan Wars of 1912–1913, which will be described presently, gave Greece southern Epirus, a valuable part of Macedonia, Crete, and many smaller islands. When the World War broke out and Turkey sided with the Central Powers, it was the hope of the Greek premier, Venizelos, that Greece might now completely realize her Pan-Hellenic ambitions by entering the struggle on the side of the Allies.

120. The Crimean War, 1854–1856, and the Treaty of Paris

The successful revolutions in Montenegro, Serbia, and Greece pointed to the impending dissolution of the Ottoman Empire. Such, at least, was the belief of Nicholas I. He once remarked to the British ambassador at St. Petersburg: "We have on our hands a sick man—a very sick man; it will be a great misfortune if one of these days he should slip away from us, especially before all necessary arrangements were made." The arrangements hinted at by the tsar involved a partition of the remaining Turkish possessions between Great Brit-

"What Nicholas Heard in the Shell"
A cartoon by Sir John Tenniel which appeared in the English journal Punch for June 10, 1854. The tsar is shown holding a bombshell to his ear and, as he listens to it (as children do to sea shells), having a vision of armed men.
ain and Russia, the former taking Crete and Egypt, the latter securing the Balkan provinces. The British ministry, however, refused to have anything to do with a scheme which would have placed Constantinople, the gate of the Black Sea and the Mediterranean, under the Russian flag. Nicholas I then determined to settle the Eastern Question himself. An opportunity to do so arose in 1853, following the sultan’s rejection of a demand made by the tsar that all Greek Christians in the Ottoman Empire be placed under Russian protection. Had the sultan yielded, Russia would have been enabled to interfere constantly in the affairs of Turkey. The dispute between the two countries soon resulted in an open rupture.

The Turks did not fight alone. Great Britain supported them because of the fear that the downfall of the Ottoman Empire would be followed by the Russian occupation of Constantinople and Russian control of the eastern Mediterranean, thus menacing British communications with India. France joined Great Britain, principally because the adventurous Napoleon III, who had recently become emperor, wished to pay off the grudges against Russia which Napoleon I had accumulated.¹ Count Cavour and Victor Emmanuel II added the Sardinian kingdom to the alliance, in order to further their plans for the unification of Italy.² The Russians fought alone, for both Austria and Prussia preserved neutrality.

The war was confined to the Crimea, where the allies sought to capture Sevastopol, Russia’s naval base on the Black Sea. The siege lasted eleven months. It proved to be a difficult

¹ See pages 251-252. ² See pages 257-258.
The Crimean War and Treaty of Paris

operation, for Russian reinforcements continually entered the place by the northern roads, while the allied armies could only be maintained by sea. Both sides suffered fearfully from the winter weather, lack of food, and inadequate hospital service. More men lost their lives through disease than in the bloody battles of the Alma, of Balaklava (celebrated in Tennyson’s poem, The Charge of the Light Brigade), and of Inkermann. After the fall of Sevastopol, Russia withdrew from the unequal contest.\footnote{Read Sevastopol by the Russian novelist Tolstoi.}

The conditions of peace were drawn up by representatives of all the great powers, meeting at Paris. The treaty provided that the Black Sea should be neutralized, neither Russia nor Turkey being allowed to build arsenals on its coasts or to maintain naval craft in its waters. This prohibition, however, was soon ignored by Russia. The Dardanelles and the Bosporus were also to be kept closed to foreign warships, as long as Turkey remained at peace with her neighbors.

The most important clause of the treaty guaranteed the integrity of the sultan’s possessions, only exacting from him promises of freedom of worship and better government for his
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Christian subjects. The promises were never kept; and the lot of Christians in the Ottoman dominions became harder than ever.

The Treaty of Paris thus gave a new lease of life to the decrepit Ottoman Empire. In their anxiety to keep Russia out of Constantinople, Great Britain and France abandoned the tradition, which had come down from the crusades, that the Turks were a barbarous people and the enemies of civilization. Turkey was to be treated henceforth as no longer outside the pale, but as a respectable member of the European family of nations.

121. Rumania

The dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire recommenced soon after the Treaty of Paris. Turkey's principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia had been semi-independent under a Russian protectorate since 1829. They command the lower Danube, and their acquisition would have enabled Russia to control the navigation of the most important river of Europe. Consequently, the diplomats at Paris converted Moldavia and Wallachia into self-governing states, with Turkey as their nominal overlord. The Rumanians, who inhabit both principalities, desired, however, to form a united nation. The powers and the sultan gave a grudging consent, and in 1862 the new state of Rumania came into existence.

After being governed for several years by a native prince, the Rumanians in 1866 took Charles I,¹ a member of the Hohenzollern family, as their ruler. He built up a large army, provided it with Prussian artillery, and had it drilled by Prussian officers. These military reforms enabled Rumania to be an effective ally of Russia in the Russo-Turkish War of the 'seventies. As her reward, Rumania gained complete independence in 1878. Three years later Prince Charles assumed a kingly crown.

The population of Rumania numbered about seven millions

¹ Succeeded in 1914 by his nephew, Ferdinand I.
A painting by August von Werner in the City Hall, Berlin. The six figures in the foreground are, in order from left to right: Count Caroli; Prince Pavlovsky; second Russian Plenipotentiary; Prince Hohenlohe; Arthur Plenipotentiary; Count Andrey; and Carl von Petersen. The Earl of Beaconsfield; and the Earl of Hertford.
The Russo-Turkish War and Treaty of Berlin

in 1914. Three-fourths as many more lived in Transylvania and Bukowina, as subjects of the Dual Monarchy, and in the Russian province of Bessarabia. Rumania, like Italy, thus had her "unredeemed" peoples, and like Italy, she entered the World War principally to liberate them from an alien rule.

122. The Russo-Turkish War, 1877–1878, and the Treaty of Berlin

Russia's desire to rescue the Christians of the Balkans from oppression and, incidentally, to take Constantinople, brought about another war between the two countries. Origin of the Russo-Turkish War

Sufficient justification for it existed in the cruelty with which Turkish soldiers had suppressed an insurrection of the Bulgarians. The atrocities committed in Bulgaria aroused all Europe. Gladstone issued from retirement to denounce the "unspeakable Turk" and to demand that Great Britain join with the other powers in driving him back into Asia. Unfortunately, not Gladstone, but Disraeli was then prime minister, and in Disraeli's mind British interests in supporting Turkey against Russia outweighed the sufferings of Christians in the Balkans. Great Britain, therefore, did nothing, but Montenegro and Serbia boldly declared war on the sultan. Many Russians volunteered to help their Slav brethren, and at length the tsar (Alexander III) decided upon intervention.

This time western Europe remained neutral and watched the duel between Slav and Turk. Russian armies promptly crossed the Danube, only to be held up for months before the fortress of Plevna in Bulgaria. The Turks fought well, and their defense of Plevna is celebrated in military annals. Its fall allowed the tsar's troops to advance within sight of the Golden Horn. Here they paused, for both Great Britain and Austria-Hungary threatened hostilities, in case Russia occupied Constantinople.
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Russia and Turkey now made peace. By the Treaty of San Stefano \(^1\) the sultan agreed to the creation of a new state, Greater Bulgaria, stretching from the Danube to the Ægean and including nearly all Macedonia. Both Greece and Serbia protested vigorously against this arrangement, which upset their own plans for expansion in the Balkans. Far more serious was the opposition of the Western powers. Austria did not relish the idea of a strong Balkan state lying across her path to the Mediterranean, while Great Britain feared that Greater Bulgaria would be merely the willing tool of Russia. A general European conflict threatened, until the tsar agreed to submit the treaty to revision by an international congress to be held at Berlin, under Bismarck’s presidency.

The assembled diplomats attempted still another solution of the Eastern Question. The Treaty of Berlin recognized Montenegro, Serbia, and Rumania as sovereign states, wholly independent of Turkey. That part of Bulgaria between the Danube and the Balkans became a self-governing principality under Turkish sovereignty. Bulgaria south of the Balkans — Eastern Rumelia — went back to the sultan, together with Macedonia. Austria-Hungary was allowed to occupy and administer the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Great Britain was given the right to hold the island of Cyprus. These arrangements having been made, the powers again solemnly guaranteed the “integrity” of the sultan’s remaining possessions in Europe.

123. Bulgaria

Diplomacy did not bring peace to the Balkans. The inhabitants of Eastern Rumelia in 1885 revolted against the Turks and united with Bulgaria. The European powers protested against this infraction of the Berlin treaty, but took no measures to prevent the union of the two Bulgarian territories.

\(^1\) A suburb of Constantinople.
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Bulgaria owed her existence to Russia, and for a number of years the influence of that country predominated in the new principality. Russian officials conducted the government, organized the army, and directed Bulgarian policies. The first ruler was a German prince, Alexander of Battenberg. Alexander developed an independent spirit and more and more relied upon native leaders, whose motto was "Bulgaria for the Bulgarians." Russia at length forced his abdication. The new ruler, Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, proved to be no more tractable than his predecessor. As time passed, the Bulgarians became completely alienated from their Russian protectors.

Bulgaria remained tributary to the sultan until 1908. By that time she had grown strong enough to repudiate another clause of the Berlin treaty and to set up as an independent kingdom. Ferdinand exchanged his princely dignity for the more pretentious title of tsar of the Bulgarians.

124. The Balkan Wars, 1912–1913, and the Treaty of Bukharest

The year 1908 saw also a revolution in the sultan’s dominions. This was the work of the Young Turks, a group of patriotic reformers who aimed to revive and modernize the Ottoman Empire. They won over the army and carried through a sudden, almost bloodless coup d'état. The terrified sultan (Abdul Hamid II) had to issue a decree restoring
the constitution granted by him at his accession in 1876, but abrogated soon afterwards. His despotism vanished, and the Ottoman Empire, with an elective parliament, a responsible ministry, and a free press took a place among democratic states.

It soon became evident, however, that the Young Turks were nationalists as well as democrats. They intended to weld together all the peoples of the Ottoman Empire into a single nation, with Turkish as the favored language and Islam the only privileged faith. Just as the Russian policy was one of Russification, so that of the Young Turks was one of Ottomanization.

Cruel oppression and massacres of Christians in various parts of the empire followed, particularly in Macedonia. This Turkish province was peopled by Greeks, Serbians, and Bulgarians. Large numbers of them fled to their respective countries, carrying their grievances with them, and agitated for war against Turkey.

The war soon came. Greece, Montenegro, Serbia, and Bulgaria, forgetting for the moment the jealousies which divided them, came together in a Balkan alliance, issued to the sultan an ultimatum demanding self-government for Macedonia, and when this was refused, promptly began hostilities. They were everywhere successful, and Turkey was compelled to give up all her European dominions west of a line drawn from Enos on the Ægean Sea to Midia on the Black Sea. She likewise ceded Crete to Greece. The allies then proceeded to quarrel over the disposition of Macedonia. A second Balkan War resulted, with Greece, Serbia, Montenegro, Rumania, and Turkey ranged against Bulgaria. Tsar Ferdinand could not cope with so many foes and sued for peace.

The treaty signed at Bukharest completely altered the aspect of the Balkans. Bulgaria surrendered to Rumania districts south of the Danube, and allowed Greece, Montenegro, and Serbia to annex most of Macedonia. These three states were now nearly doubled in size. The Turkish province of Albania became an independent
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principality. Turkey, though ignored at the Peace Conference, escaped dismemberment and even secured an accession of territory. The Treaty of Bukharest thus left the Turk in Europe, and by sowing seeds of enmity between Bulgaria and her sister states helped further to postpone a satisfactory solution of the Eastern Question.

Studies

1. On an outline map indicate the shrinkage of Turkey in Europe during (a) the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries; (b) the nineteenth century; and (c) the twentieth century. 2. Name in chronological order the states formed from Turkish territories in Europe. 3. Name and locate the capitals of the Balkan states. 4. "The two forces that have constantly undermined the power of Turkey are religion and nationality." How does Turkish history during the last hundred years confirm this statement? 5. Mention three occasions in the nineteenth century when the Ottoman Empire seemed to be on the point of dissolution. 6. Why did Russia favor nationalism in the Balkans and oppose it in other parts of Europe? 7. Trace on the map the successive steps in the expansion of Greece between 1839 and 1914. 8. On the map facing page 386, trace the proposed boundaries of Montenegro, Serbia, and Bulgaria by the Treaty of San Stefano. 9. Explain the strategic value of Constantinople. 10. Why has the Balkan Peninsula been called the "danger zone" of Europe?
CHAPTER XVIII

EXPANSION OF EUROPE IN THE OLD WORLD

125. Greater Europe

Colonial expansion, begun by Spaniards and Portuguese in the sixteenth century and continued in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by Russians, Dutch, French, and English, culminated during the past hundred-odd years. It is principally this movement which gives such significance to European history. The civilization of Europe, as affected by the Renaissance, the Reformation, and the Revolution, has been spread throughout the world. The languages, literatures, religions, laws, and customs of Europe have been extended to almost all mankind.

Great Britain in 1815 was the leading world power. France had been well-nigh eliminated as a colonial rival by the Seven Years' War, and Holland had lost valuable possessions overseas in the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. In America, Great Britain held Canada, some of the West India islands, and part of Guiana; in Africa, Cape Colony; in Asia, much of India and Ceylon; and in Australia the eastern coast. The British Empire continued to grow throughout the nineteenth century, until it embraced in 1914 approximately a fourth of the habitable area of the earth and a fourth of the earth's population. No such wide dominion had ever been built up before, either in ancient or medieval times.

The spectacle of the British Empire, so populous, so rich in national resources, so far-flung, stirred the imagination and aroused the envy of the witnessing nations. They, also, became eager for possessions in savage or
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half-civilized lands. France, from the time of Louis Philippe, began to conquer northwestern Africa and Madagascar and to acquire territories in southeastern Asia. Italy and Germany, having attained nationhood, entered into the race for overseas dominions. Portugal and Spain annexed new colonies. Diminutive Belgium built up a colonial empire in Africa. Mighty Russia spread out eastward over the whole of Siberia and, having reached the Pacific, moved southward toward the warmer waters of the Indian Ocean. Meanwhile, the United States expanded across the American continent, acquired the Philippines and other dependencies, and stood forth at length as an imperial power. Few and unimportant were those regions of the world which remained unappropriated at the opening of the twentieth century.

126. Imperialism

The word "imperialism" conveniently describes all this activity of the different nations in reaching out beyond their natural boundaries for colonial dependencies. Imperialism, of course, is not a new phenomenon; empire building began almost at the dawn of history. We are concerned here only with its most recent aspects. Sometimes it leads to the declaration of a protectorate over a region, or, perhaps, to the marking off a sphere of influence where other powers agree not to interfere. Sometimes it goes no further than the securing of concessions in undeveloped countries such as Mexico, Brazil, or China. Most commonly, however, imperialism results in the complete annexation of a distant territory, with or without the consent of the inhabitants.

We saw earlier that the colonial rivalry of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries had been largely inspired by the doctrine of mercantilism. Colonies were regarded as farms, which, if properly exploited, would afford necessary supplies of raw materials and exclusive markets for the manufactures of the home coun-

1 See pages 84-85.
try. Mercantilist statesmen regulated colonial commerce, in order to secure the "favorable balance of trade" deemed essential to national prosperity. Mercantilism was searchingly criticized by Adam Smith and other economists of the laissez-faire school,¹ but it revived in somewhat altered form during the latter part of the nineteenth century. Modern methods of manufacture on a large scale now enabled a highly industrialized country to produce more commodities than could be profitably used within its own boundaries and among its own people. Each country, therefore, wanted the wider markets afforded by colonies. Again, modern methods of manufacture required more raw materials than could be found within a single state, or raw materials only procurable abroad. Hence, each state desired to obtain colonies rich in natural resources. Industrial development also led to an immense accumulation of wealth, which capitalists sought to invest in undeveloped territories. Finally, colonies seemed desirable to provide for surplus population. The number of people in Europe more than doubled in the nineteenth century, and the consequent crowding at home induced millions of persons to emigrate to the United States and other foreign countries where land was cheap, wages were high, and the government was liberal and democratic. To prevent the loss of so many energetic and intelligent citizens, European nations endeavored to obtain colonial dependencies, in which the settlers might preserve their own language, culture, and political connection with the fatherland. Colonies, then, were prized as markets, as sources of raw materials, as fields for the investment of capital, and as outlets for surplus population.

The imperialistic ambitions of the great powers more than once led them to disregard the rights of weaker nations in Africa, Asia, and other parts of the world. Thus, Great Britain subdued the two Boer republics in South Africa, Italy attempted to conquer the independent nation of Abyssinia, and Great Britain, France, Germany, and Russia at one time threatened the integrity of

¹ See page 144.
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China. It should be said, however, that in most cases colonial dependencies have been secured only at the expense of savage or semi-civilized peoples. Though there are many things to condemn in the conduct of the European powers toward their subjects, much improvement is to be observed within recent years. Great Britain, France, and other colonial states expend large sums annually in their dominions for roads, railways, schools, medical service, and humanitarian work of various sorts. One may be permitted to hope that the European occupation of so much of the world will prove, in the long run, a blessing to mankind.

It has been manifestly impossible for even the most democratic of modern nations to grant self-government to their rude and backward subjects. Where the level of civilization is higher, as in Egypt and India, the prevailing illiteracy of the inhabitants forms a great obstacle in the way of democracy. We have already noted, however, that Great Britain during the last century raised round herself a circle of self-governing daughters in Canada, Australia, and South Africa, and that France permits some of her colonies to send representatives to the French legislature. Other instances of the bestowal of free institutions upon native peoples will be referred to as we proceed with the story of European expansion in Africa and Asia.

127. The Opening-up of Africa

Speaking broadly, Africa consists of an elevated plateau with a fringe of unindentated coastal plain. Penetration of the interior was long delayed by mountain ranges which approach close to the sea, by rapids and falls which hinder river navigation, by the barrier of dense forests and extensive deserts, and by the unhealthiness of the climate in many regions. Though lying almost in sight of Europe, Africa remained until our own time the "Dark Continent."

1 See pages 306 and 322.
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As was the country, so were its inhabitants. Europeans knew chiefly the Semitic and Hamitic peoples north and east of the Sahara. The Black race, which occupies nearly all Africa south of that desert, dwelt by itself. Some negroes in the course of time blended more or less with Hamites, giving rise to the Bantu-speaking peoples. To these elements of the native population must be added the curious Pygmies in the equatorial districts, together with the Hottentots and Bushmen in the extreme south.¹

Little more than the Mediterranean shore of Africa was known in antiquity. Here were Egypt, the first home of civilization, and Carthage, Rome's most formidable rival for supremacy. During the earlier Middle Ages all North Africa fell under Arab domination. Arab missionaries, warriors, and slave-hunters also spread along the eastern coast and established trading posts as far south as the mouth of the Zambesi River. Of this, however, Europe remained ignorant. The vast extent of the continent was first revealed to Europeans by the Portuguese discoveries in the second half of the fifteenth century. The Portuguese imitated the Arabs in founding stations upon both the eastern and western coasts, where they did a profitable business in ivory, gold, gum, rubber, and especially in black men, who were seized and exported by thousands annually to be sold as slaves. The merchants of Spain, Holland, France, and Great Britain also shared in this traffic. Except for the Dutch colony at the Cape of Good Hope, Europeans, however, did not try to settle in Africa. Nothing tempted them to do so. The shores of the continent were plague-ridden, and its interior was supposed to consist of barren deserts or of impenetrable forests. Maps of Africa a hundred years ago show the interior decorated with pictures of the hippopotamus, the elephant, and the negro to conceal the ignorance of geographers.

The penetration of Africa has been mainly accomplished by following the course of its four great rivers. In the last decade

¹ See the map, page 427.
of the eighteenth century the British African Association, then recently founded, sent Mungo Park to the Niger. He and his immediate successors explored the basin of that river and revealed the existence of the mysterious city of Timbuktu, an Arab capital never previously visited by Europeans. The determination of the sources of the Nile — a problem which had interested the ancients — met with success shortly after the middle of the nineteenth century. Captain Speke first saw the waters of the lake which he named Victoria Nyanza, in honor of England’s queen, and Sir Samuel Baker found the smaller lake called by him Albert Nyanza, in honor of the Prince Consort. The discovery of snow-clad mountains in this part of Africa confirmed what Greek geographers had taught regarding the “Mountains of the Moon.”

Meanwhile, an intrepid Scotch missionary and explorer, David Livingstone, had traced the course of the Zambesi. Starting from the Cape, he worked his way northward, found the wonderful Victoria Falls, and crossed the continent from sea to sea. When on one of his journeys Livingstone disappeared for years in Africa, the New York Herald sent Henry M. Stanley to find him. Stanley, who was a Welshman by birth and an American by adoption, had led an adventurous life as a newspaper correspondent in many lands. He found Livingstone in 1871, greeting him in the heart of Africa with the historic words, “Dr. Livingstone, I presume?” After the latter’s death, two years later, Stanley continued his work and accomplished more than any other explorer of Africa. He discovered Lake Albert Edward
Nyanza, showed that Lake Tanganyika drained into the Congo, and followed that mighty stream all the way to its mouth. Stanley’s fascinating narratives of his travels\(^1\) did much to arouse European interest in Africa.

Mission work in Africa went hand in hand with geographical discoveries. Not a great deal has been accomplished in North Africa, where Islam is supreme from Morocco to Egypt and from the Mediterranean to \(10^\circ\) north of the equator. Abyssinia, the negro republic of Liberia, and South Africa, as far as it is white, are entirely Christian. The accompanying map shows how mission stations, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, have been planted throughout the broad belt of heathenism in Central Africa.

128. The Partition of Africa

The division of Africa among European powers followed promptly upon its exploration. Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Germany, Italy, France, and Great Britain all profited by the scramble for African territory, particularly during the ‘eighties and the ‘nineties of the last century. The Spanish possessions are small, compared with those of the other powers, and, except for the northern coast of Morocco, not of great importance. Portugal, however, controls the two valuable regions of Angola and Portuguese East Africa.

\(^1\) Especially *How I Found Livingstone* (1872), *Through the Dark Continent* (1878), and *In Darkest Africa* (1890).
The possessions of Belgium grew directly out of Stanley’s discoveries. He realized what sources of wealth might be tapped in the rubber, ivory, and palm-oil of the vast Congo basin and persuaded Leopold II,
king of the Belgians, to supply the funds for the establishment of trading stations in that part of Africa. The Congo Free State, which thus came into being, formed practically Leopold’s private property. The forced labor demanded of the natives and the cruel punishments inflicted upon them stirred up so much criticism in Europe and America that Leopold finally converted his African holdings into a colony called the Belgian Congo. Its area has now been considerably increased by the acquisition of former German territories.

Soon after Germany attained national unity, she made her appearance among colonial powers. Treaties with the native chiefs and arbitrary annexations during the years 1884–1885 resulted in the acquisition of extensive regions in Southwest Africa, East Africa, the Cameroons, and Togo. They were all conquered by the Allies during the World War.

Italy was another late-comer on the African scene. She secured Eritrea on the Red Sea and Italian Somaliland. An Italian attempt to annex Abyssinia ended disastrously. Italy’s most important African colony is Libya,\textsuperscript{1} conquered from Turkey in 1911–1912. The country in Turkish hands was misgoverned and undeveloped, but its fertile coast is well adapted to agriculture, and even the barren interior may become valuable through irrigation. It says much for the liberal principles underlying Italian colonial policy that a constitution has recently (1919) been granted to the Libyans. Italy’s three African possessions were considerably enlarged in 1920 by voluntary cessions of territory from France and Great Britain, these powers having augmented their dominions in Africa at the expense of Germany.

The beginnings of French dominion in Africa reach back to the seventeenth century, when Louis XIV began to acquire trading posts along the western coast and in Madagascar. It was not until the nineteenth century, however, that the French entered seriously upon the work of colonization. France now holds Algeria, the con-

\textsuperscript{1} Composed of the two former Turkish provinces of Tripoli and Cyrenaica.
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quest of which began in 1830; Tunis, taken from Turkey in 1881; most of Morocco, a protectorate since 1912; the valleys of the Senegal and Upper Niger; part of the Guinea coast; French Somaliland; and the island of Madagascar. A glance at the map shows that the African possessions of France exceed in area those of any other power, but they include the Sahara Desert.

Great Britain has secured, if not the lion's share, at any rate the most valuable share of Africa. Besides extensive possessions on the Guinea coast, she holds a solid block of territory all the way from the Cape of Good Hope to the Mediterranean. Cape Colony was captured from the Dutch during the Napoleonic wars. Even though small in extent, it had great importance as a half-way station on the route to both India and Australia and also as a convenient basis for expansion northward into the African continent.

The Dutch farmers, or Boers, did not readily take British rule. Many of them, with their families and flocks, moved from Cape Colony into the unknown country beyond. This wholesale emigration—the "Great Trek"—resulted in the formation of the Boer republics of Natal, Orange Free State, and the Transvaal. Natal was soon annexed by Great Britain, but the other two republics remained independent. The discovery of the world's richest gold mines in the Transvaal led to a large influx of English-

1 See pages 87-88 and 213.
men, who, since they paid taxes, demanded a share in the government. The champion of British interests was Cecil Rhodes, an Oxford student who found riches in the Kimberley diamond fields and rose to be prime minister of Cape Colony. The Dutch settlers, under the lead of President Kruger of the Transvaal, were just as determined to keep the government in their own hands. Disputes between the two peoples culminated in the South African War (1899–1902), in which the Boers were overcome by sheer weight of numbers.

The war had a happy outcome. Great Britain showed a wise liberality toward her former foes and granted them self-government. Cape Colony, Natal, Orange Free State, and the Transvaal soon came together in the Union of South Africa. The Union has a governor-general appointed by the British Crown, a common parliament, and a responsible ministry. Cape Town and
Pretoria are the two capitals, and both English and Dutch are
official languages.

The Union will ultimately include other British possessions
in South Africa. Great Britain asserts a protectorate over
Bechuanaland, which is still very sparsely settled
by Europeans. She also controls the imperial
domain acquired by Cecil Rhodes and called after
him Rhodesia. This territory alone is three and one-half
times as large as the British Isles.

The loyalty of the majority of the Boers to Great Britain was
demonstrated during the World War. Under Louis Botha,
who had been the best Boer general in the South
African War, they proceeded to conquer German
Southwest Africa. They also coöperated with the
British in the conquest of German East Africa. A glance at the
map shows how extensive are these two former possessions of
Germany. Great Britain has still other territories in East
Africa, one of the most valuable being the Uganda Protectorate.
It contains much fertile land and because of its generally healthy
climate offers a promising field for European colonization.

Uganda forms the connecting link between East Africa and
the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. The British advance southward
from Egypt into the basin of the Upper Nile
causeth many unrest among its semi-civilized and
Moslem inhabitants. A man called the Mahdi
(Leader), who claimed to be a kind of Messiah, stirred up a
holy war against the invaders. The British and Egyptian
troops, commanded by General Charles Gordon, who had pre-
viously distinguished himself in China, were shut up in Khart-
tum. After inexcusable delay Gladstone's ministry, then in
power, sent out a relief expedition. It arrived at Khartum two
days after the Mahdi had captured the place and massacred
Gordon and eleven thousand of his men (1885). More than a
decade passed before Great Britain wiped off this stain upon her
arms. Finally another expedition was dispatched under General
Herbert Kitchener. He annihilated the "dervishes," as the
fanatical followers of the Mahdi were called, at the battle of
Omdurman, and retook Khartum (1898). Since then the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan has remained quiet.

The Egyptians have been subject to foreigners for over twenty-four hundred years. The Persians came to Egypt in the sixth century B.C.; then the Macedonians under Alexander the Great; then the Romans under Julius Caesar; and subsequently the Arabs and the Ottoman Turks. Turkish sultans controlled the country until the early part of the nineteenth century, when the able pasha, Mehemet Ali, made himself almost an independent sovereign. His successors assumed the title of khedive, or ruler. Their misgovernment gave Great Britain and France an excuse for setting up a Dual Control over Egypt, in the interest of European bankers who had purchased the securities of that country. Financial intervention soon passed into military occupation, as the result of a revolt against the khedive. It was suppressed by Great Britain alone in 1882, France having refused her coöperation. The British now had a free hand in Egypt. In 1914, upon the outbreak of the war between Great Britain and Turkey, Egypt became a British protectorate.

Once established in Egypt, the British began to make it over. They restored order, purified the courts, levied taxes fairly, reorganized the finances, paid the public debt, abolished forced labor, and took measures to improve sanitary conditions. British engineers built a railroad along the Nile, together with the famous Assuan Dam and other irrigation works which reclaimed millions of acres from the
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desert. For the first time in centuries, the peasants were assured of peace, justice, and an opportunity to make a decent living. Nevertheless, economic prosperity has not reconciled the people to foreign rule. The slogan "Egypt for the Egyptians" expresses their nationalist aspirations. Great Britain declares that she cannot possibly accord complete independence to Egypt, on the ground that the country is still incapable of maintaining a stable government or of protecting its own frontiers against foreign aggression. Control of Egypt is therefore vital to the security of the British possessions, both in Africa and Asia. The British government, however, has set up an Egyptian representative assembly and has promised to grant a constitution conferring upon the Egyptians large privileges of self-government.

The strategic importance of Egypt as the doorway to Africa will be much increased by the completion of the Cape-to-Cairo Railway. This transcontinental line starts from Cape Town, crosses Bechuanaland and Rhodesia, and will ultimately link up with the railway already in operation between Khartum, Cairo, and Alexandria on the Mediterranean. The unfinished part is in the Congo region, where the Belgian government has ceded a strip of land to Great Britain, thus making it possible for the road to traverse British territory throughout its entire length of 6944 miles, or 7074 miles, if we include the distance between Cairo and Alexandria. As a result of the British acquisition of German East Africa, an alternative route may be chosen through this former colony of Germany.
The Cape-to-Cairo Railway owes its inspiration to Cecil Rhodes, who dreamed of an "all red" route across Africa, and then with characteristic pluck and energy set out to make his dream come true.

The completion of the Suez Canal has likewise put Egypt on the main oceanic highway to the Far East. The canal is a monument to the great French engineer, Ferdinand de Lesseps. It was opened to traffic in 1869. The money for the undertaking came chiefly from European investors. Some years later, the bankrupt khedive offered for sale a large block of his shares in the Suez Canal Company. Disraeli, who was prime minister of Great Britain at the time, did not neglect this opportunity to advance British imperialism and bought the stock. Great Britain thus secured a controlling interest in the enterprise. The canal, however, may be freely used by the ships of all nations. More than half of the voyages from Europe to the Far East are now made through
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the canal rather than round the Cape of Good Hope. Its commercial importance is also indicated by the fact that it accommodates every year an amount of shipping approximately equal to that entering the port of New York from foreign countries.

129. The Opening-up and Partition of Asia

The Europeanization of Asia was not far advanced at the beginning of the nineteenth century. Europe knew only Siberia, which Russia had appropriated, and those parts of Europe and Asia which had been annexed by Great Britain. All western Asia, including Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, and Arabia, belonged to the Ottoman Empire and remained unaffected by European influence. On the eastern side of the continent lay China and Japan, old and civilized but stagnant countries, whose backs were turned upon the rest of the world. Within the past hundred years, however, European traders, missionaries, and soldiers have broken through the barriers raised by Oriental peoples, and now almost the whole of Asia is either politically or economically dependent upon Europe.

The Russians were established in Siberia before the close of the seventeenth century. Their advance over this enormous but thinly peopled region was facilitated by its magnificent rivers, which furnished highways for explorers and fur traders. Northern Siberia is a waste of swamp and tundra, where the terrible climate blocks the mouths of the streams with ice and even in summer keeps the ground frozen beneath the surface. Farther south comes a great belt of forest, the finest timbered area still intact on the face of the earth, and still farther south extend treeless steppes, adapted in part to agriculture and in part to herding. The country also contains much mineral wealth. In order to secure an outlet for Siberian products, Russia compelled China to cede the lower Amur Valley with the adjoining seacoast. The Russians in their newly acquired territory founded Vladivostok in 1858 as a naval base.

1 See page 56.
Vladivostok is also the eastern terminus of the Trans-Siberian Railway. The western terminus is Petrograd, three thousand miles distant. The railway was completed in 1900 by the imperial government, partly to facilitate the movement of troops and military supplies in Siberia and partly to develop that region as a home for Russian emigrants and a market for Russian manufactures. A branch line extends to Port Arthur in Manchuria and another branch to Tientsin and Peking in China.

Russia also widened her boundaries in central Asia by absorbing Turkestan east of the Caspian and south of Lake Balkash and the Aral Sea. Alarmed by the steady progress southward of the Russian colossus, Great Britain began to extend the northern and northwestern frontiers of India, in order to secure a mountain barrier for her Indian possessions. Half a century of feverish fears and restless advances on both sides was ended by the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907. It dealt with Persia, Afghanistan, and Tibet.

The Persian kingdom became a buffer state between Russia and Great Britain. The northern part of Persia was recognized as a Russian sphere of influence, the southern part as a British sphere, and the central part as a neutral zone where the two powers pledged themselves not to interfere except by mutual consent. The unsettled conditions arising out of the World War enabled Persia to rid herself of Russian control. With Great Britain she concluded a new agreement in 1919, by which the former power guarantees the security of the Persian frontiers and promises assistance in developing Persian trade and industries. Persia enjoys a constitutional government. Ahmad, the present shah, or king, is a well-educated and liberal-minded ruler.

The kingdom of Afghanistan also became a buffer state. Great Britain engaged not to annex any of its territory, while Russia, on her side, agreed to regard it as within the British sphere of influence and under British protection. Though a very mountainous region, Afghanistan
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The Dalai Lama, the supreme head of Tibetan Buddhists, occupies an enormous palace on the Potala hill at Lhasa. Its massive walls, terraces, and bastions present an imposing appearance.
contains numerous passes, over which in historic times con-
quering peoples have repeatedly descended into India.

The Chinese dependency of Tibet was little known until 1904, when a British military expedition penetrated to the sacred city of Lhasa and obtained some concessions for trade within the country. Russia also professed to be interested in Tibet. By the Anglo-Russian Con-
tervention both nations promised to respect its territorial integrity and not to interfere with Chinese sovereignty over the country.

Indo-China, except for the nominally independent state of Siam, is now under British and French control. Great Britain holds Burma, annexed as recently as 1885, and the Straits Settlements with the important port of Singapore at the tip of the Malay Penin-
sula. France holds Tonkin, Anam, Laos, Cam-
bodia, and Cochin-China. All these possessions have been acquired at the expense of China, which formerly exercised a vague sovereignty over southeastern Asia.

Siam occupies a position comparable to that of Persia. By an agreement between Great Britain and France in 1896, the country was divided into three zones: the eastern to be the French sphere of influence; the western the British; and the central, the basin of the Menam River, to be neutral. It will be thus seen that a belt of protected or neutral states — Afghanistan, Persia, Tibet, and Siam — separates the possessions of Russia and France in Asia from those of Great Britain and forms the real frontier of India.

130. India

British expansion in India, begun by Clive during the Seven Years’ War, has proceeded scarcely without interruption to the present day. The conquest of India was almost inevitable. Sometimes the Indian princes attacked the British settlements and had to be overcome; sometimes the lawless condition of their dominions led to inter-
vention; sometimes, again, the need of finding defensible frontiers resulted in annexations. The entire peninsula, covering an area half as large as the United States, is now under the Union Jack.

The East India Company continued to govern India until after the middle of the nineteenth century. In 1857 came the Sepoy Mutiny, a sudden uprising of the native Government of India soldiers in the northern part of the country. Bloodily conducted, it was as bloodily suppressed, some of the ringleaders even being blown to pieces from the mouths of cannon. The mutiny disclosed the weakness of company rule.

and led in 1858 to the transfer of all governmental functions to the Crown. Queen Victoria assumed the title, Empress of India, in 1877. A viceroy, whose seat is the old Mogul capital Delhi, and the officials of the Indian Civil Service administer the affairs of about two-thirds of the country. The remainder is ruled by native princes under British control. Their contributions of both men and money during the World War showed their loyalty to Great Britain.

The fact that a handful of foreigners has been able to subdue and keep in subjection more than three hundred million Indian peoples is sufficiently explained by their disunion. The census report of 1901 divides the population of India into seven distinct racial types, speaking upwards of fifty distinct languages. The Aryan Hindus dwell in the river valleys of the Indus and the Ganges. Southern India belongs chiefly to the primitive Dravidians, who speak non-Aryan tongues and probably represent the aboriginal inhabitants of the peninsula. The slopes of the Himalayas are occupied by the descendents of Turkish (Mogul) and other invaders. On the northeast, reaching down into Burma, are Mongolian peoples allied to the Chinese. All these elements, however, have become...
inextricably mingled, and their representatives are found in every province and native state.

Religion likewise acts as a divisive force. The Hindus accept Brahmanism, a name derived from Brahma, the Supreme Being or First Cause. In its original form, three Religions of India thousand years ago, Brahmanism appears to have been an elevated faith, but it has now so far declined that its adherents generally worship a multitude of gods, venerate idols, revere the cow as a sacred animal, and indulge in many debasing rites. The Dravidians are only nominal Brahmanists; their real worship is that of countless village deities. Islam prevails especially in the northern fringe of provinces, but Moslem missionaries have penetrated almost every part of the country. Buddhism, which arose in India during the fifth
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century B.C., is now practically extinct there, though Ceylon and Burma are strongholds of this ancient faith.¹

Nor are the Hindus themselves united. The all-pervading caste system splits them up into several thousand distinct groups, headed by the Brahmans or priests. Members of a given caste may not marry outside it; may not eat with any one who does not belong to it; and may not do work of any sort unrecognized by it. Caste, in fact, regulates a man’s actions from the cradle to the grave. It has lasted in India for ages.

The spread of European civilization in India promises to remove, or at least to lower, the barriers of race, religion, and caste. Great Britain enforces peace throughout the peninsula, builds railways and canals linking every part of it together, stamps out the famines and plagues which used to decimate the inhabitants, and has begun their education in schools of many grades. All this work tends to foster a sense of nationality, something hitherto lacking in India. Educated Hindus, familiar with the national and democratic movements of the past century in Europe, now demand self-government for their own country. This may come in time, but a united Indian nation must necessarily be of slow development.

While Great Britain will doubtless go further than she has yet gone in the direction of home rule for India, there is little reason to believe that she will ever voluntarily concede Indian independence. For British political supremacy in India insures British economic supremacy throughout that vast peninsula. Great Britain looks to India as one of the foremost sources of her food supply, finds in India a market for enormous quantities of cotton and iron manufactures, and possesses almost a monopoly of India’s sea-borne trade. The capitalists of Great Britain have also invested heavily in Indian railways, factories, and mines, as well as in the securities of the Indian government. India is a rich jewel, indeed, in the British imperial crown.

¹ See the map on page 526.
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131. China

Between Russian Asia and British and French Asia lies China, with a larger area than Europe and probably quite as populous. China proper consists of eighteen provinces in the fertile valleys of the Yangtse and the Hoangho, or Yellow River. The great length of the country accounts for the variety of its productions, which range from hardy grains in the north to camphor and mulberry trees, tea, and cotton in the south. The mineral wealth includes deposits of copper, tin, lead, and iron, much oil, and coal fields said to be the most extensive in the world.

The traditions of the Chinese throw no light on their origin. They may have come from the west in prehistoric times, but more probably developed out of the Mongolian stock inhabiting China proper. In the course of centuries they have pushed into Manchuria, Mongolia, Chinese Turkestan (Sinkiang), and Tibet. Chinese farmers, laborers, and traders are also numerous in Indo-China, the Malay Peninsula, and the Malay Islands. The enterprising spirit of the people is further shown by their recent emigration in large numbers to the United States and other distant lands.

The Chinese boast a civilization already old when Rome was young. They are famous for artistic work in wood and metal, the manufacture of silk, and the production of porcelain or chinaware. Rudimentary forms of such inventions as the compass, gunpowder, paper, and movable type were early known to them. Though hampered by a cumbersome, nonalphabetic system of writing, the Chinese have managed to produce an extensive literature. One of their encyclopedias fills over five thousand volumes.

The government of China, until recently, had always been a monarchy. The emperor, in theory absolute, was really under the thumb of the office-holding or mandarin class, which took the place of a hereditary nobility. Any one, high or low, could enter its ranks by passing a rigid examination in the sacred books. These were
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in part collected and edited by Confucius (551–478 B.C.), the reformer who did so much to make reverence for ancestors and imitation of their ways the Chinaman’s cardinal virtues. Confucianism is a code of morals rather than a religion. It has not supplanted among uneducated people a lively belief in many spirits, good and bad. Buddhism has spread so widely over China and the adjoining countries that to-day it forms the creed of about one-third of mankind. Christianity and Islam are also making some headway in China.

The rugged mountains and trackless deserts which bound three sides of China long shut it off from much intercourse with the western world. The proud disposition of its people, to whom foreigners were only barbarians (“foreign devils”), likewise tended to keep them isolated. Before the nineteenth century the only Europeans who gained an entrance into the “Celestial Empire” were a few missionaries and traders. The merchants of Portugal established themselves at Macao, and those of Holland and Great Britain at Canton. There was also some traffic overland between Russia and China. Foreign trade, however, had no attraction for the Chinese, who discouraged it as far as possible.

The difficulties experienced by merchants in China led at length to hostilities between that country and Great Britain. The British, with their modern fleet and army, had an easy victory and in 1842 compelled the Chinese government to open additional ports and cede the island of Hongkong. Other nations now hastened to secure commercial concessions in China. Many more ports were opened to foreign merchants, Europeans were granted the right to travel in China, and Christian missionaries were to be protected in their work among the inhabitants. But all this made little impression upon perhaps the most conservative people in the world. The Chinese remained absolutely hostile to the western civilization so rudely thrust upon them.

Foreign aggression soon took the form of annexations of outlying portions of Chinese territory. We have seen how Great Britain appropriated Burma; France, Indo-China; an
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Russia, the Amur district. Meanwhile, Japan, just beginning her national expansion, looked enviously across the sea to Korea, a tributary kingdom of China. The Chino-Japanese War (1894–1895) followed. Completely defeated, the Chinese had not only to renounce all claim to Korea, but also to surrender to Japan the island of Formosa and the Liaotung Peninsula (with Port Arthur) in Manchuria.

Japan’s gains aroused the jealousy of Russia, who saw the road to an ice-free harbor on the Pacific blocked by the Japanese occupation of the Liaotung Peninsula. Russia took her grievance to France and Germany, and together the three powers induced the Japanese to give up their acquisitions on the mainland. The coalition then seized several Chinese harbors and divided much of the country into spheres of influence. The partition of China seemed at hand.

But Europe was not to have its own way in China. A secret society called the “Boxers,” whose members claimed to be in- vulnerable, spread rapidly through the provinces and urged war to the death against the “foreign devils.” Encouraged by the empress-dowager, Tze-hsi, who was

---

1 Russia took Port Arthur, Germany, Kiauchau, and France, Kwangchauwan. Great Britain also acquired Weihaiwei.
regent of China for nearly forty years, the "Boxers" murdered many traders and missionaries. The foreigners in Peking took refuge within the legations, where after a desperate defense they were finally relieved by an international army composed of European, Japanese, and American troops. The allies then made peace with China and promised henceforth to respect her territory. They insisted, however, on the payment of a large indemnity for the outrages committed during the anti-foreign outbreak.

Events now moved rapidly. Educated Chinese, many of whom had studied abroad, saw clearly that their country must adopt western ideas and methods, if it was to remain a great power. The demand for thorough reforms in the government soon became a revolutionary propaganda, directed against the unprogressive Manchu (or Manchurian) dynasty, which had ruled China for nearly three hundred years. The youthful emperor finally abdicated, and the oldest empire in the world became a republic.

This sudden awakening of China from her sleep of centuries is a prodigious event in world history. Already China possesses many thousands of miles of railroads and telegraph lines, besides numerous factories, mills,
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and mines equipped with machinery. She has begun the creation of a modern army. She has abolished long-established customs, such as the torture of criminals and the foot-binding of women. She has prohibited the consumption of opium, a vice which sapped the vitality of her people. Her temples have been turned into schools teaching the sciences and foreign languages, and her students have been sent in large numbers to foreign universities. Such reforms are rapidly bringing China into the fellowship of Occidental nations.

132. Japan

Nippon ("Rising Sun") is the name which the inhabitants give to the six large islands and about four thousand smaller ones stretching crescent-like off the coast of eastern Asia. Because of its generally mountainous character, little more than one-eighth of the archipelago can be cultivated. Rice and tea form the principal crops, but fruit trees of every kind known to temperate climates flourish, and flowers bloom luxuriantly. The deep inlets of the coast provide convenient harbors, and the numerous rivers, though neither large nor long, supply an abundance of water. Below the surface lie considerable deposits of coal and metals.

The Japanese are descended mainly from Koreans and Chinese, who displaced the original inhabitants of the archipelago. The immigrants appear to have reached Japan in the early centuries of the Christian era. Except for their shorter stature, the Japanese closely resemble the Chinese in physique and personal appearance. They are, however, more quick-witted and receptive to new ideas than their neighbors on the mainland. Other qualities possessed by the Japanese in a marked degree include obedience, the result of many centuries of autocratic government; a martial spirit; and an intense patriotism. "Thou shalt honor the gods and love thy country" is the first commandment of the national faith.

¹ Now probably represented by the "hairy Ainu" of the island of Yezo.
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The Japanese naturally patterned their civilization upon that of China. They adopted a simplified form of Chinese writing and took over the literature, learning, and art of the "Celestial Empire." The moral system of Confucius found ready acceptance in Japan, where it strengthened the reverence for parents and the worship of ancestors. Buddhism, introduced from China by way of Korea, brought new ideas of the nature of the soul, of heaven and hell, and of salvation by prayer. It is still the prevailing religion in Japan. Like the Chinese, also, the Japanese had an emperor (the mikado). He became in time only a puppet emperor, and another official (the shogun) usurped the chief functions of government. Neither ruler exerted much authority over the nobles (daimios), who oppressed their serfs and waged private warfare against one another very much as did their contemporaries, the feudal lords of medieval Europe.

The first European visitors to Japan were Portuguese merchants and Jesuit missionaries, who came in the sixteenth century. The Japanese government welcomed them at first, but the growing unpopularity of the foreigners before long resulted in their expulsion from the country. Japan continued to lead a hermit life until the middle of the nineteenth century. Foreign intercourse began in 1853–1854, with the arrival of an American fleet under Commodore M. C. Perry. He induced the shogun to sign a treaty which opened two Japanese ports to American ships. The diplomatic ice being thus broken, various European nations soon negotiated commercial treaties with Japan.

Thoughtful Japanese, however great their dislike of foreigners, could not fail to recognize the superiority of the Western nations in the arts of war and peace. A group of reformers, including many prominent daimios, now carried through an almost bloodless revolution. As the first step, they compelled the shogun to resign his office, thus making the mikado\(^1\) the actual as well as titular sovereign.

\(^1\) The youthful Mutsuhito, who reigned 1867–1912.
(1867). Most of the daimios then voluntarily surrendered their feudal privileges (1871). This patriotic act made possible the abolition of serfdom and the formation of a national army on the basis of compulsory military service. In 1889 Japan secured a written constitution, with a parliament of two houses and a cabinet responsible to the mikado. He is guided in all important matters by a group of influential nobles, called the "Elder Statesmen," who form the real power behind the throne.

The revolutionary movement affected almost every aspect of Japanese society. Codes of civil, commercial, and criminal law were drawn up to accord with those of western Europe. Universities and public schools were established upon Occidental models. Railroads and steamship lines were multiplied. The abundant water power, good harbors, and cheap labor of Japan facilitated the introduction of European methods of manufacturing; factories sprang up on every side; and machine-made goods began to displace the artistic productions of handworkers. Japan thus became a modern industrial nation and a competitor of Europe for Asiatic trade.

Once in possession of European arts, sciences, and industries, Japan entered upon a career of territorial expansion in eastern Asia. Her merchants and capitalists wanted expansion of Japan opportunities for money-making abroad; above all, her rapidly increasing population required new regions suitable for colonization beyond the narrow limits of the archipelago. As we have learned, the Chino-Japanese War (1894–
1895) brought Korea under Japanese influence and added Formosa to the empire. Just ten years later Japan and Russia clashed over the disposition of Manchuria and the Liaotung Peninsula. The Russo-Japanese War (1904–1905) seemed a conflict between a giant and a pygmy, but the inequality of the Japanese in numbers and resources was more than made up by their preparedness for the conflict, by their irresistible bravery, and by the strategic genius which their generals displayed. After much bloody fighting by land and sea, both sides accepted the suggestion of President Roosevelt to arrange terms of peace. The treaty, as signed at Portsmouth, New Hampshire, recognized the claims of Japan in Korea, gave to Japan a lease of the Liaotung Peninsula, including Port Arthur, and provided for the evacuation of Manchuria by both contestants. Russia also ceded to Japan the southern half of the island of Sakhalin. No indemnity was paid by either country.

The Russo-Japanese War raised Japan to the position of a world power. Great Britain first recognized this fact and hastened to conclude an offensive and defensive alliance with the "Island Empire." Each contracting party pledged itself to come to the other’s assistance,

1 Known as Chosen since its formal annexation by Japan in 1910. Though now Japanese subjects, the Koreans continue to agitate for the restoration of their ancient kingdom.
in case the possessions of either in eastern Asia and India were attacked by another state. Both France and Russia also entered into a friendly understanding with Japan for the preservation of peace in the Far East. How loyalty Japan observed these agreements was soon shown upon the outbreak of the World War.

133. The Opening-up and Partition of Oceania

The term Oceania, or Oceanica, in its widest sense applies to all the Pacific Islands. The continental group includes, in addition to the Japanese Archipelago and Formosa, the Philippines, the Malay Archipelago, Australia, and Tasmania. Many of these islands appear to have been connected at a remote period, and still more remotely to have been joined to the Asiatic mainland. The oceanic group includes, besides New Zealand, a vast number of islands and islets either volcanic or coralline in formation. They fall into the three divisions named Melanesia, Micronesia, and Polynesia.

The natives of Oceania exhibit a wide variety of culture, ranging from the savage aborigines of Australia to the semi-civilized Filipinos, Malays, and Polynesians. The first emigrants to the continental islands doubtless came from Asia and walked dryshod from one archipelago to another. On the other hand, the oceanic islands could only have been reached by water. Their inhabitants, at the time of European discovery, were remarkable navigators, who sailed up and down the Pacific and even ventured into the icy Antarctic. No evidence exists, however, that they even once sighted the coast of America.

Magellan discovered the Philippines on his voyage of circumnavigation in 1521, and for the next three hundred and fifty years they belonged to Spain. The conquest of the islands was essentially a peaceful missionary enterprise. Spanish friars accomplished a remarkable work in carrying Christianity to the natives. These converted Filipinos are the only large mass of Asiatics who have adopted the

Spain in the Philippines

Oceania

Oceanic peoples
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Christian religion in modern times. The missionary era drew to an end in the nineteenth century, especially after the opening of the Suez Canal and the establishment of direct steamer communication between the Philippines and Spain. Many educated Filipinos took advantage of the increased facilities for travel to visit Europe, thus coming into contact with the progressive peoples of the West. They came back to their country full of enthusiasm for “westernizing” it, only to meet the opposition both of the friars and of the grasping and corrupt Spanish officials. The result was much discontent, which found expression in secret conspiracies and armed revolts against the government.

Admiral Dewey’s victory in the battle of Manila Bay not only destroyed the Spanish fleet, but also gave the death-blow to the prestige of Spain throughout the Philippines. Insurrections started immediately in nearly every province. The Filipinos under Aguinaldo at first coöperated with the Americans in campaigning against the Spaniards, but after the cession of the islands to the United States in 1898, hostilities broke out between the former companions-in-arms. It required over two years of continuous fighting to break down the native resistance and to capture Aguinaldo.

The American people at once adopted a very liberal policy toward their eight million Filipino subjects. Under the direction of Judge W. H. Taft, the first governor-general, an amnesty was extended to all rebels who would take the oath of allegiance to the United States. A constabulary or police force, made up of native soldiers and officered by white men, was organized to maintain order. The agricultural lands belonging to the friars were purchased for the benefit of the people. Hundreds of American school teachers were introduced to train Filipino teachers in English and modern methods of instruction. Large appropriations were made for roads, harbors, and other improvements. True to democratic traditions, the United States also set up a Filipino legislature, which at the present
time is entirely elected by the natives. But home rule does not satisfy them; they want complete independence. The separation movement has gained ground rapidly since the World War, which stirred the nationalist longings of the Filipinos as of the Koreans, Hindus, and Egyptians. American public opinion seems to favor withdrawal from the islands, as soon as the inhabitants have clearly shown themselves capable of maintaining a stable government.

The Malay Archipelago,\(^1\) in which the Philippines are often included, forms the largest group of islands in the world. The equator passes through the middle of the archipelago, giving it a tropical climate. The majority of the inhabitants are Malays, a branch of the Yellow race. Ruder, more primitive peoples occupy the interior of Sumatra, Borneo, and New Guinea. Hindus, Mohammedan Arabs, and Chinese have been the principal immigrants into the islands within historic times.

The possessions which Portugal acquired in the Malay Archipelago were seized by Holland in the seventeenth century. All the islands, except British North Borneo, the Portuguese part of Timor, and the eastern half of New Guinea, belong to the Dutch. They were transferred in 1798 from the Dutch East India Company to the royal government. Their total population is estimated at about 40,000,000; of these less than 100,000 are whites. The Dutch have met the usual difficulties of Europeans ruling subject peoples, but their authority seems to be now thoroughly established throughout the archipelago. The government is fairly enlightened, and much progress has been made (particularly in Java) in educating the natives and in raising their economic condition. Although Holland freely opens her possessions to traders of other nations, Dutch merchants continue to control the lucrative commerce of the islands.

Geographical knowledge of the Pacific islands dates from Captain Cook's discoveries in the eighteenth century, but their partition among European powers has been completed only in

\(^1\) Also called Malaysia, Indonesia, the East Indies. See the map on page 87.
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the twentieth century. Great Britain has raised the Union Jack over the Solomons, the Fiji Islands, and many smaller archipelagoes. France possesses New Caledonia, Tahiti, and the Marquesas group. The United States controls Guam, part of Samoa, and Hawaii. The German possessions in the Pacific were surrendered to the Allies shortly after the opening of the World War.

134. Australia and New Zealand

The term Australasia, in a restricted sense, applies to that division of Oceania comprising Australia, Tasmania, and New Zealand. Australia deserves its rank as a separate continent. In area it equals three-fourths of Europe, one-third of North America, and one-fourth of the British Empire. The characteristic features of Australian geography are the slightly indented coast, the lack of navigable rivers communicating with the interior, the central desert, the absence of active volcanoes or snow-capped mountains, the generally level surface, and the low altitude. Australia is the most isolated of all inhabited continents, while the two large islands of New Zealand, twelve hundred miles to the southeast, are still more remote from the center of the world’s activities.

Much of Australia lies in the temperate zone and therefore offers a favorable field for white settlement. Captain Cook, on the first of his celebrated voyages, raised the British flag over the island continent. Colonization began in 1787, with the foundation of Sidney on the coast of New South Wales. For many years Australia served as a penal station, to which the British transported the convicts who had been previously sent to America. More substantial colonists followed, especially after the introduction of sheep-farming and the discovery of gold in the nineteenth century. They settled chiefly on the eastern and southern coasts, where the climate is cool and there is plenty of water and rich pasture land.
Australia and New Zealand

New South Wales, the original colony, had two daughter colonies, Victoria and Queensland. Two other colonies — South Australia and Western Australia — were founded directly by emigrants from Great Britain. All these states, together with Tasmania, have now united into the Australian Commonwealth. This federation follows American models in its written constitution, its senate and house of representatives, and its high (or supreme) court. A governor-general, sent from England, represents the British Crown. The Commonwealth, however, is entirely self-governing except in foreign affairs.

Great Britain annexed New Zealand in 1839. Its temperate climate, abundant rainfall, and luxuriant vegetation soon attracted settlers, who now number more than a million. In 1907 New Zealand was raised from the rank of a colony to that of a dominion, thus taking a place beside Canada, South Africa, and Australia among the self-governing divisions of the British Empire.
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135. Inter-racial Problems

The number of people on the earth is estimated to exceed 1,600,000,000. Asia has perhaps 900,000,000; Europe, Population of 800,000,000; America, 150,000,000; Africa, 140,000,000; and Oceania, 10,000,000. These figures are only approximate, since many countries either do not take a census or take it quite inaccurately.

The world's inhabitants are distributed in three great races, each of which occupies, roughly speaking, distinct geographical areas. The Yellow or Mongolian race holds the north, east, and center of Asia. The so-called Brown race (Malays, Polynesians) and the so-called Red race (American Indians) must be considered branches of the Yellow race. The Black or Negro race holds most of Africa south of the Sahara. The Dravidians of India, the aborigines of Australia, and the Papuans of New Guinea and the adjacent islands, are negroid (negro-like) peoples. The White or Caucasian race is found in Europe, northern and eastern Africa, and southwestern Asia. It also forms the bulk of the population of the New World, as well as of South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand.

The wonderful expansion of the White race during the last four centuries has been largely confined to the temperate regions of the globe. The few whites settling in tropical and sub-tropical parts of Africa, Asia, Oceania, and America go as soldiers, officials, clerks, salesmen, and agents sent out for a term of years. They seek, not new homes, but the profits of trade or rule over subject peoples. Such are the seventy-five thousand Englishmen in India and the still fewer Dutch who control the East India dependencies of Holland. Now, however, that so little free or cheap agricultural land remains in the temperate zone, the white man who wants to establish himself in a new country is looking more and more to the tropics. Here he finds an abundance of rich land that has never been tilled, virgin forests that await the woodsman's ax, and mineral wealth yet to be
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exploited. Europeans and Americans have not gone to the tropics in large numbers, principally because they feared the climate and the tropical diseases. Our experience in Panama and that of the British in India seems to prove that yellow fever, malaria, and other plagues can be conquered by scientific sanitation and medicine. Even so, it is still not certain that the white man, and especially the white man's wife and children, can long thrive in the hot, moist climate of equatorial countries. Englishmen stationed in the hottest parts of India find it necessary to take frequent long vacations in more northerly climes, and their children, unless sent back to England at an early age, languish, often die, and still more often grow up as nervous wrecks. There are, of course, tropical lands (Mexico, Ecuador, Peru, part of Uganda) which, by reason of their great elevation, reach literally out of the tropics, and other tropical lands (Hawaii) so tempered by sea breezes that their climate is not really tropical at all. In such regions the white man may adjust himself to a tropical environment, not only without injury, but often with positive benefit to his health.

The Black and Yellow races have not remained within their continents of origin during the past four hundred years. The forced migration of Africans practically ended with the abolition of negro slavery and the slave trade in the nineteenth century, but the voluntary migration of Asiatics shows a marked tendency to increase. The overflow of the teeming populations of India, Indo-China, China, and Japan on to the Philippines, the Malay Archipelago, Australia, the islands of the Pacific, South Africa, and the North and South American coasts seems destined to raise race questions of tremendous import in the future.

The growing contact of Europeans and non-Europeans throughout the Old World will make it necessary for them to associate more and more in the common work of civilization. Coöperation between the races can only be secured in proportion as each race learns to appreciate
the others. Racial prejudices must give way to a decent regard for the value of human beings everywhere.

Studies

1. "Europe to-day is no more than a portion of the European world." Comment on this statement. 2. What parts of the Old World are occupied or colonized by Anglo-Saxon peoples? By Latin peoples? By Slavic peoples? 3. What is the origin of the names Liberia, Rhodesia, Philippines, Tasmania, and New Zealand? 4. Distinguish between the Near East and the Far East, as these expressions are commonly used. 5. Trace the routes followed by the Cape-to-Cairo and Trans-Siberian railways. 6. Account for the long delay in the partition of Africa. 7. Show how Africa has become an "annex of Europe." 8. What European powers have secured the former Turkish possessions in North Africa? 9. Look up in an encyclopedia accounts of the negro republic of Liberia and of the "empire" of Abyssinia. 10. Why has the Suez Canal been called the "spinal cord" of the British Empire? 11. What possessions in India are still kept by Portugal and France? 12. Look up in an encyclopedia an account of the life and teachings of the Buddha. 13. Do the Chinese form a genuine nation? How is it with the Japanese? 14. Show that the Chino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars contributed to the awakening of China. 15. Compare the Europeanization of Japan in the nineteenth century with that of Russia in the eighteenth century. 16. Why are the Hawaiian Islands called the "crossroads of the Pacific"? 17. Discuss the question of tropical acclimatization.
CHAPTER XIX

EXPANSION OF EUROPE IN THE NEW WORLD

136. South America

European expansion in America differs markedly from European expansion in Africa and Asia. Africa has been subjected and partitioned by Europe, but its savage and barbarous peoples have not been Europeanized either in blood, language, or institutions. Asia has accepted certain features of Occidental civilization, but nothing indicates that Hindus, Chinese, Japanese, and other Orientals will allow their ancient civilization to be extinguished by that of Europe. America, however, is largely European in blood and completely European in language, laws, customs, and political and social life. Between the New World of 1492 and the New World of 1920 how great the contrast!

Eighteen independent countries in the New World have developed from Spanish colonies. Brazil has sprung from Portuguese settlement, and Haiti from French settlement. All these countries inherited Latin or Romance languages (Spanish, Portuguese, and French) and embraced the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. They constitute the Latin America of the present day.

The motives which led to Spanish colonization in America may be summed up in the three words “gospel, glory, and gold.” Missionaries sought convents in Spanish America; warriors sought conquests; and adventurers sought wealth.

Together, they created for Spain an empire greater in extent than any that the world had ever known before. After the middle of the sixteenth century homeseekers also came to the colonies, but never in such numbers as to crowd out the Indian aborigines. Inter-mixture between the races soon became common, resulting in the half-breeds called "mestizos." Although the white element remained dominant in public affairs, the racial foundation of most of Spanish America was and continues to be Indian. The fact is important, for the large proportion of imperfectly civilized Indians and half-breeds, together with the negroes who were soon introduced as slaves, operated to retard the progress of the Spanish colonies.

Spain governed her colonies in the New World for her own benefit. She crippled their trade by requiring the inhabitants to buy only Spanish goods and to sell only to Spaniards. She prohibited such colonial manufactures as might compete with those at home. Furthermore, she filled all the offices in Church and State with Spaniards born in the mother country, to the exclusion of those born in the colonies, the creoles. This restrictive system made the colonists long for freedom, especially after they heard the stirring story of the revolutions which had created the United States and republican France. When Napoleon invaded Spain, forced the abdication of Ferdinand VII, and gave the crown to his own brother Joseph, the colonists set up practically independent states throughout Spanish America. For six years — 1808–1814 — they enjoyed liberty.

Ferdinand VII, who returned to his throne after Napoleon's overthrow, was a genuine Bourbon, incapable of learning anything or of forgetting anything. His refusal to satisfy the demands of the colonists for equal rights with the mother country precipitated the revolt against Spain. Its greatest hero is Simón de Bolívar, who, in addition to freeing his native Venezuela, helped to free the countries

1 See page 200.
2 See page 212.
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now known as Colombia, Ecuador, Bolivia, and Peru. One by one all the colonies in South America, together with Central America and Mexico, threw off the Spanish yoke. The United States followed the movement with sympathetic eyes, and as early as 1817 sent commissioners to establish commercial relations with the revolting colonies. Great Britain also took an interest in their struggle for liberty and helped them with money, ships, and munitions of war. In 1826 the Spanish flag was finally lowered on the American continents.

The people of Brazil also severed the ties uniting them to the mother country. They set up an independent empire in 1822, with Dom Pedro, the oldest son of the Portuguese king, as its first ruler. He abdicated nine years later in favor of his infant son. Brazil prospered under the benevolent sway of the second Dom Pedro, who was the last monarch to occupy an American throne. A peaceful revolution in 1889 overthrew the imperial government and transformed Brazil into a republic.

The revolts from Spain and Portugal produced seven independent states in South America. These were subsequently increased to ten by the secession of Uruguay from Brazil (1828) and the break-up of the Great Colombia, established by Bolívar, into the three states of Venezuela (1829), Ecuador (1830), and Colombia. All the South American republics possess constitutions and
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the forms of democracy. Frequent revolutions and civil wars characterized their history during most of the nineteenth century. Nothing else could have been looked for, considering that the masses of semi-civilized Indians, half-breeds, and negroes lacked all political experience. They were easily swayed by ambitious politicians and generals, who often became dictators with well-nigh absolute power. But the South Americans have now served their apprenticeship to liberty. They are learning to rule themselves, and the several states seem to be entering upon a period of settled, orderly government.

South America has almost limitless resources. It produces a greater variety of plants useful to man than any other quarter of the globe. Tropical fruits grow abundantly in the equatorial regions, together with cotton, sugar-cane, coffee, cacao, and tobacco. Cereals of every description flourish in the sub-tropical and temperate areas, and cattle, sheep, and horses thrive on the boundless pampas of Argentina. Rubber, medicinal products (cocoa, cinchona bark), dye-woods, and timber of extraordinary hardness and durability come from the forests of Brazil and adjacent countries. Many valuable minerals are found in the lofty Cordilleran range, besides asphalt in Venezuela and extensive deposits of nitrate of soda in Chile.

The exploitation of this wealth in mines, forests, and soil must for a long time engross the energies of South American peoples. Their economic progress has been slow for several
reasons. Owing to the scanty population, surplus labor which might be employed in factories is altogether lacking. There is a similar lack of capital, for wealth takes chiefly the form of large plantations and cattle ranches. Furthermore, few deposits of coal and iron, those essentials of modern industry, are available. Consequently, South America will doubtless continue, as in the past, to produce mainly raw materials and to import manufactured articles. It offers an ever-expanding market for textiles, iron and steel wares, machinery, and general merchandise, and needs also the services of an army of engineers and business experts to develop its industries.

Large sums have recently been loaned by foreign financiers to South American governments, and still larger sums have been invested in South American railways, banks, mines, and plantations. Thus the remarkable Trans-Andean Railway, linking Buenos Aires in Argentina with Valparaiso and Santiago in Chile, was completed in 1910 only with funds supplied by New York bankers. Such investments may be expected to increase as political conditions in South America become stabilized.

South America is very thinly settled. The population of about half the continent, excluding the most inaccessible regions, scarcely exceeds what it was four centuries ago. Brazil, whose area is greater than that of the United States (exclusive of Alaska), would contain more than all the world's inhabitants, were it as populous as Belgium. Foreign immigrants have neglected South America, as being geographically, climatically, and racially less attractive than North America. Immigration has increased within recent years, especially into Brazil and Argentina. The newcomers from Portugal, Spain, Italy, and France blend readily with peoples, like themselves, of Latin origin. The Germans, a numerous group, tend to form communities where they speak their own language and keep socially aloof from the natives. Englishmen and Americans are comparatively few in number. Japanese have established themselves in Brazil
and other states, and Chinese are found on the northwest
coon of South America.

The most prosperous, best governed, and by all odds the
most important of South American states are Argentina,
Brazil, and Chile. These states, it may be ob-
served, are precisely the ones which have received
the greatest amounts of foreign capital and the
largest number of foreign immigrants. The three "A-B-C"

powers — to use their popular designation — maintain very
friendly relations and generally coöperate in furthering the
interests of South America abroad. Their desire to substitute
arbitration for war was strikingly shown in 1902, when Argent-
tina and Chile bound themselves by treaty to arbitrate all
disputes which might arise between them.

THE CHRIST OF THE ANDES

Erected in 1904 to commemorate the peaceful settlement of a boundary dispute between
Argentina and Chile. The monument stands about three thousand feet above the tunnel
on the Trans-Andean Railroad. The figure of the Christ, twenty-six feet high, was cast
from bronze cannon. A tablet on the pedestal reads:

"Sooner shall these mountains crumble into dust than the people of Argentina and Chile
break the peace which they have sworn to maintain at the feet of Christ the Redeemer."
137. Central America and Mexico

The Spanish dependencies in Central America declared their independence in 1821, and two years later formed a federation. It soon disintegrated into the five diminutive republics of Guatemala, Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Costa Rica. Subsequent attempts to restore federal unity have been unsuccessful. They still maintain a separate existence, often vexed by factional strife and revolutions. The recent secession of Panama from Colombia has added a sixth republic to their number. Its independence was promptly recognized by the United States and later by the European powers. The population of Central America is small, far smaller, apparently, than before the arrival of the Spaniards. The vast majority of the inhabitants are of mixed Indian and Spanish blood, the Indian element predominating everywhere except in Costa Rica. Some of the Indians live under very primitive conditions, although their ancestors, the Mayas, reached in pre-Columbian days the highest level of culture attained by any native people. No part of the New World holds greater interest to the archaeologist than Central America, with its ruins of entire cities now buried in the dense tropical jungle.

Mexico also secured independence in 1821, only to enter upon a long period of disorder. Counting regencies, emperors, presidents, triumvirates, dictators, and other rulers, the "republic" had as many administrations during the first half century of its existence as the colony had viceroys throughout the whole period of Spanish rule. In 1861 Benito Juarez—a full-blooded Indian—became president. He proceeded to confiscate all the property of the Roman Catholic Church in Mexico, to suppress the monasteries, and to repudiate the public debt, which was largely held in Europe. These proceedings gave Napoleon III a pretext for interfering in Mexican affairs, at a time when the United States was in the throes of the Civil War. The French

1 British Honduras is a Crown colony of Great Britain.
quickly overran much of the country and set up the archduke Maximilian, brother of Francis Joseph I, as emperor. The American government protested vigorously, and after the close of the Civil War required Napoleon III, under threat of hostilities, to withdraw his troops. The French empire in Mexico then quickly collapsed. Maximilian was captured and shot by Juarez in 1867.

Ten years later Porfirio Diaz, an able lieutenant of Juarez, made himself supreme in Mexico. His title of president only veiled the real dictatorship which he exercised. It was the policy of Diaz to repress disorder, enforce the law, foster industry and railroad building, encourage immigration, place the national credit on a sound basis, and improve elementary and higher education. Mexico has never had a firmer hand at the helm than that of Porfirio Diaz. He gave the country peace and opened its wondrous resources to the rest of the world, but failed to lighten the burdens resting on the "peons," as farm laborers are called in Mexico. Their successful revolution in 1911 compelled his withdrawal to Spain.

The expulsion of Diaz was followed by civil conflict between rival generals and their followers. It has now died down in much of Mexico, leaving Venustiano Carranza as the recognized president. The problems before him are difficult. Mexico needs not only a stable government, but also land reforms which will raise the "peons" from their condition of practical serfdom on the estates of
great proprietors to that of free men. Whether these problems will be solved remains to be seen. Until they are solved, Mexico is bound to be a land where revolutions are recurrent as the seasons.

138. The West Indies

The islands which Columbus discovered and named the West Indies form the summits of a submerged mountain chain. Their total area scarcely exceeds that of Great Britain. They are exceptionally fertile, and some of them are exceptionally healthy, among tropical regions, for white settlement. The entire archipelago is divided into the Bahamas, the Greater Antilles (Cuba, Jamaica, Haiti, and Porto Rico), and the Lesser Antilles.

The aboriginal West Indians (Caribs) soon disappeared almost completely, in consequence of brutal treatment by the Spaniards. Their place as slaves was taken by Africans, who were imported in great numbers for three hundred years. Negroes still comprise a large majority of the inhabitants. The abolition of slavery and the slave trade in the nineteenth century led to the introduction of Asiatics, including many Chinese and East Indian coolies. English, French, Spaniards, and other Europeans early found their way into the islands, but very few Americans have settled there.

The West Indies fill a conspicuous place in the history of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Their geographical position between two continents made them the scene of sea-fights and land-fights innumerable between the French and British, who were then disputing the supremacy of the New World. The islands were equally prominent in the intervals of peace, for in those days they supplied the world with sugar. The millionaires of the eighteenth century were the owners of West India sugar-cane plantations. A long period of depression followed the abolition of slavery and the slave trade, which cut down the supply of cheap labor, while at the same time beet sugar began to be
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extensively produced in Europe. The completion of the Panama Canal places the West Indies on the world's great trade routes and promises to restore much of their former prosperity.

The Bahamas, Jamaica, and many of the smaller West Indies belong to Great Britain. Holland has five islands, including Curaçao off the coast of Venezuela. France has Guadeloupe and Martinique, the latter the birthplace of the empress Joséphine. The little island of St. Martin is divided between Holland and France. Haiti, once a French possession, declared its independence at the time of the Revolution and successfully resisted Napoleon's efforts at reconquest. The two negro republics of Haiti and Santo Domingo now divide the island between them. Cuba, thanks to American intervention during the Spanish-American War, also forms a republic. The United States took Porto Rico from Spain in 1898 and in 1917 purchased from Denmark the three islands of St. Thomas, St. John, and St. Croix. Their acquisition reflects the increased importance of the West Indies to the American people.

139. The United States

The expansion of the United States beyond the limits fixed by the Treaty of Paris in 1783 began with the purchase of the Louisiana territory between the Mississippi and the Rocky Mountains. This immense region, originally claimed by France in virtue of La Salle's discoveries, had passed to Spain at the close of the Seven Years' War and had been reacquired for France by Napoleon Bonaparte. The French emperor, about to renew his conflict with Great Britain, realized that he could

---

1 Both Haiti and Santo Domingo came under American military occupation and protection in 1915-1916. The United States has indicated its intention of withdrawing from the two countries as soon as they return to a condition of domestic order.

2 See page 127.

3 See page 194.
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not defend Louisiana against the mistress of the seas. Rather than make a forced present of the country to Great Britain, he sold it to the United States for the paltry sum of $15,000,000.

The possession of Louisiana gave the United States an outlet upon the Gulf of Mexico. This was greatly extended by the purchase of Florida from Spain in 1819 and the annexation of Texas in 1845. The settlement of the dispute with Great Britain as to the Oregon country (1846), the Mexican Cession (1848), and the Gadsen Purchase (1853), brought the United States to the Pacific. Every part of this western territory is now linked by transcontinental railroads with the Mississippi Valley and the Atlantic-facing states.

Alaska had been a Russian province since Bering's voyages in the eighteenth century. Russia, however, never realized the value of her distant dependency and in 1867 sold it to the United States for $7,200,000. Since then Americans have taken from Alaska in gold alone many times the original cost of the territory. Its resources in coal, lumber, agricultural land, and fisheries are also very great, though as yet little has been done to exploit them.

In the last decade of the nineteenth century the United States began to secure possessions overseas. The Hawaiian Islands, lying about two thousand miles off the coast of California, were annexed in 1898. This action was taken at the request of the inhabitants. The same year saw the acquisition of the Philippines, Guam, and Porto Rico as the result of the war with Spain. The Samoan island of Tutuila and the Danish West Indies (renamed the Virgin Islands) have also come into American hands.

The United States, though not unwilling to obtain colonies in the New World, denies the right of any European nation to acquire additional territory here. This policy of "America for Americans" is known as the Monroe Doctrine. It was first formulated partly to stave off any attempt of the Old World monarchies, led by Metternich, to aid Spain in the reconquest of her colonies, and
partly to prevent the further extension southward of the Russian province of Alaska. The interests of Great Britain in both these directions coincided with those of the United States. Relying on the support of the British government, President Monroe sent his celebrated message to Congress (1823), in which he declared that the American continents were henceforth "not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers." ¹

The solemn protest of the United States, backed by Great Britain, removed for a time the danger of European interference in America. As we have just seen, Napoleon III subsequently tried to create a Mexican empire for France, but this breach of the Monroe Doctrine was soon repaired. No further assaults upon it have been made. The doctrine was extended by President Grant, who in a message to Congress (1870) asserted the principle that hereafter no American territory "shall be regarded as a subject of transfer to a European power." The principle received an application twenty-five years later, when President Cleveland intervened in a dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela, in order to prevent an alleged encroachment by the former power upon the Venezuelan boundary of British Guiana. Fortunately for all parties concerned, the dispute was settled by arbitration.

The enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine makes it necessary for the United States not only to defend the Latin-American republics against foreign aggression, but also to intervene from time to time in their domestic affairs. Our warships and soldiers have been repeatedly sent to the West Indies, Mexico, and Central America for the purpose of protecting American and European citizens and their property from rioters or revolutionists. Though grateful to her mighty neighbor for help, Latin America has trembled lest our intervention to restore order might pass into downright conquest. The benevolent purposes of this country are now being better understood. It has inaugurated a series of Pan-American

¹ See page 222.
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conferences, composed of delegates from all the independent nations of the New World. With the assistance of the Latin-American republics, it has also established the Pan-American Union at Washington, which seeks to spread information about

![Relief Map of the Panama Canal]

the resources and trade of the different countries and also to cultivate friendly relations between them. The cooperation of most of the Central American and South American nations with the United States, during the World War, cannot
fail to strengthen the bonds between the republics of the New World.

The idea of an artificial waterway at Panama or some other suitable point had been broached almost as soon as the Spanish conquest of Central America and had been repeatedly discussed for more than three centuries. Nothing was done until 1881, when a French company, headed by De Lesseps, began excavations at Panama. Extravagance and corruption characterized the management of the company from the start; it went into bankruptcy before the work was half done. The United States in 1902 bought its property and rights for forty million dollars. Shortly afterwards, the secession of Panama from Colombia enabled the United States to obtain from the new republic occupation and control of a canal zone, ten miles wide, for the purposes of the canal. The work was completed in 1914. The Panama Canal greatly shortens the distance between the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the Pacific coasts of the New World. This means lower freight rates and improvement in the passenger and mail service. Increased commerce, travel, and communication will do much in the future to bring together and keep together the two Americas.

140. Canada

The population of Canada in 1763 was almost entirely French. After the American Revolution Canada received a large influx of "Tories" from the Thirteen Colonies, together with numerous emigrants from Great Britain. The new settlers had so many quarrels with the French Canadians that Parliament in 1791 passed an act dividing the country into Upper Canada for the British and Lower Canada for the French. Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and Newfoundland remained separate provinces.

When Great Britain, in retaliation for Napoleon's Continental System, issued the Orders in Council, the United

1 See page 404.  
2 See page 125.  
3 See page 199.
States, as the chief neutral, was also the chief sufferer. The injury to American trade, coupled with the quarrel over the impressment of seamen, provoked the second war with Great Britain. It seemed to furnish a good opportunity for the conquest of Canada, but British and French Canadians united in defense of their country and drove out the American armies. The treaty of peace left matters as they were before the war, except for a heritage of unfriendly feeling on the part of the contestants. Even this has disappeared in the course of a century unbroken by the clash of arms. The unfortified boundary from the Atlantic to the Pacific is an eloquent testimony to the good relations between Canada and the United States.

Canada had done her duty to the British Empire during the War of 1812-1814, but she waited more than thirty years for her reward in the shape of self-government. Great Britain, after losing the Thirteen Colonies, did not favor any measures which might result in Canadian independence as well. Finally, Parliament sent over a wise statesman, Lord Durham, to investigate the political discontent in Canada. Lord Durham in his Report urged that the only method of keeping distant colonies is to allow them to rule themselves. If the Canadians received freedom to manage their domestic affairs they would be more, and not less, loyal, for they would have fewer causes of complaint against the mother country. The Durham Report produced a lasting effect on British colonial policy. Not only did Great Britain grant parliamentary institutions and self-government to the Canadian
Canada

provinces, but she also bestowed the same privileges upon her Australasian and South African dominions.\textsuperscript{1}

Another of Lord Durham’s recommendations led to the union in 1840 of Upper Canada (Ontario) and Lower Canada (Quebec). In 1867 Ontario and Quebec formed \textit{The Dominion of Canada, 1867} with Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the con-federation known as the Dominion of Canada.

It has a governor-general, representing the British sovereign, a senate whose members hold office for life, and an elective house of commons, to which the cabinet of ministers is res-ponsible. Each Canadian province also maintains a parlia-ment for local legislation. The distinguishing feature of the Canadian constitution is that all powers not definitely assigned by it to the provinces belong to the Dominion. \textsuperscript{*} Consequently, the question of “States’ rights” can never be raised in Canada.

The new Dominion expanded rapidly. It purchased from the Hudson Bay Company the extensive territories out of which the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta have been created. British Columbia and Prince Edward Island soon came into the confederation. All the remainder of British North America, except Newfound-land, which still holds aloof, was annexed in 1878 to the Domin-ion of Canada. One government now holds sway over the whole region from the Great Lakes to the Arctic Circle.

Equally rapid has been the development of the Dominion in wealth and population. The western provinces, formerly left to roving Indian tribes and a few white traders, are attracting numerous foreign immigrants. Two transcontinental railroads — the Canadian Pacific, com-pleted in 1886, and the more recent Canadian Northern — make accessible the agricultural resources of the Dominion, its forests, and its deposits of coal and minerals. Canada now ranks as the largest, richest, and most populous member of the British Empire.

The World War did something to break down the isolation of Canada from the United States. Many American citizens,

\textsuperscript{1} See page 306.
before their country entered the struggle, enlisted in the Canadian army and fought for democracy under a foreign flag. With the return of peace, the closer relations thus established ought to continue. Canada, increasingly industrial in the east but agricultural in the west, faces much the same economic and social problems as confront her southern neighbor. It is worthy of note, in this connection, that the great majority of Canadian trade unions affiliate with the American Federation of Labor and that American farmers are emigrating in large numbers to the prairie provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. While the former agitation for the incorporation of Canada in the United States has quite disappeared on both sides of the boundary line, common experiences, interests, and ideals may be expected to tighten the bonds between the two English-speaking countries of the New World.

141. Close of Geographical Discovery

Half the globe was still unmapped in 1800. Canada, Alaska, and the Louisiana territory were so little known that a geography published at this time omits any reference to the Rocky Mountains. South America, though long settled by white men, continued to be largely unexplored. Scant information existed about the Pacific islands and Australia. Much of Asia remained sealed to Europeans. Accurate knowledge of Africa did not reach beyond the edges of that continent. The larger part of the Arctic realm had not yet been discovered, and the Antarctic realm had barely been touched.

Discoveries and explorations during the nineteenth century carried forward the geographical conquest of the world. The great African rivers were traced to their sources in the heart of what had once been the "Dark Continent." In Asia, the headwaters of the Indus and the Ganges were reached; the Himalayas measured and shown to be the loftiest of mountains; Tibet, the mysterious, penetrated; and the veil of darkness shrouding China, Korea, Farther India, and other Asiatic countries lifted. Travelers
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penetrated the deserts of inner Australia and finally crossed the entire continent from south to north. The journeys of Alexander von Humboldt in the Amazon and Orinoco valleys (1799–1804) inaugurated the systematic exploration of South America, while those of Lewis and Clark (1804–1806) opened up the Louisiana territory. Still later, Alaska, the Northwest Territories of Canada, and Labrador began to emerge from their obscurity. Even Greenland was crossed by Nansen, a Norwegian, and its coast was chartered by Danish geographers and the American Peary.

Voyages in search of the Northwest Passage¹ had already revealed the labyrinth of islands, peninsulas, and ice-bound channels north of the American continent. Many heroic but fruitless attempts had also been made to reach the North Pole. Nansen in 1892–1895 utilized the ice drift to carry his ship, the Fram, across the polar sea. Finding that the drift would not take him to the pole, he left the Fram and with a single companion advanced to $86^\circ 14' \text{ N.}$, or within two hundred and seventy-two miles of the pole. An Italian expedition, a few years later, got still farther north. The honor of actually reaching the pole was carried off by Peary in 1909. He traveled the last stages of the journey by sledge over the ice and reached his goal in company with a colored servant and several Eskimos. Nansen’s and Peary’s journeys showed that no land exists in the north polar basin, only a sea of great but unknown depth.

The south polar region, on the other hand, is a land mass of

¹ The Northwest Passage was first completely navigated by the Norwegian Amundsen between 1903 and 1906.
continental dimensions. First approached by Cook on his second voyage, it has since been visited by many explorers. They have traced the course of the great ice barrier, discovered extensive mountain ranges, and even found two volcanoes belching forth lava amidst the snows. In 1907-1909 a British expedition under Sir Ernest Shackleton attained 88° 23' S., or within ninety-seven miles of the pole. Amundsen, who reached the pole in 1911, was soon followed by Captain R. F. Scott, but this gallant Englishman and his four companions died of cold and starvation on the return journey. The records of polar exploration are, indeed, full of tragedies.

Considerable spaces of the earth's surface still await scientific investigation. The Antarctic continent and Greenland offer many problems to geographers. The enormous Regions still unmapped basin of the Amazon is still little known. Practically no knowledge exists of the interior of New Guinea, the largest of islands, if Australasia be reckoned as a continent. Australia itself has not been completely explored. In Asia, there is still much information to be gained concerning the great central plateau, the Arctic coast, and inner Arabia. Equatorial Africa affords another promising field for discovery. It thus remains for the twentieth century to complete the geographical conquest of the world.

Studies


1 See page 131.
CHAPTER XX

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

142. Nature of the Industrial Revolution

The year 1776, the year of the Declaration of Independence and of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, also marks, approximately, the commencement of the Industrial Revolution. No other word except "revolution" so well describes those wholesale changes in manufacturing, transportation, and other industries, which, within a century and a half, have transformed modern life. This revolution originated in Great Britain, spread after 1815 to the Continent and the United States, and now extends throughout the civilized world.

The rapid expansion of European peoples over Africa, Asia, Oceania, and America, as described in the two preceding chapters, was itself largely an outcome of the Industrial Revolution. Improvements in means of transportation — railroads, canals, steam navigation — by facilitating travel permitted an extensive emigration from Europe into other continents. Improved communication — the telegraph and the telephone — by annihilating distance made easier the occupation and government of remote dependencies. The growth of manufacturing in Europe also gave increased importance to colonies as sources of supply for raw materials and foodstuffs, as markets for finished goods, and as places of investment for the surplus wealth accumulated by the capitalists whom the Industrial Revolution created.

The Industrial Revolution also created a numerous body of wage-earners, who moved from rural districts and villages
into the factories, sweatshops, and tenements of the great cities. There, in spite of a crowded, miserable existence they gradually learned the value of organization. They formed trade unions in order to secure higher wages and shorter hours. They read newspapers and pamphlets, listened to speeches by agitators, and began to agitate for laws which would improve their lot. Then they went further and demanded the right to vote, to hold office, to enjoy all the liberty and equality which the bourgeoisie, or middle class, had won from monarchs and aristocrats. The Industrial Revolution furnished much of the driving power for the revolutionary outbreaks of 1830 and 1848, and especially for that democratic movement which has been so marked in Europe since 1871. It thus reinforced the new ideas of democracy introduced into the world by the American and French revolutions.

The Industrial Revolution likewise fostered the national movement in Europe during the last century. Railroads, canals, steamboats, telegraphs, and telephones have been compared to a network of veins and arteries carrying the blood of the nation from the capital to the remotest province. Such increased facilities for travel and communication inevitably caused the disappearance of local prejudices and provincial limitations. It was now far easier for the people of each country to realize their common interests than when they lived isolated in small rural communities. Old nations, like Great Britain and France, became more closely knit; new nations, like Italy and Germany, arose; and the "submerged nationalities" of Europe started an agitation for self-government or for complete independence.

Great Britain took the lead in the Industrial Revolution. Her damp climate proved to be very favorable to the manufacture of textiles, her swift streams supplied abundant water power for machinery, and beneath her soil lay stores of coal and iron ore. There were other favoring circumstances. Industry in Great Britain was less fettered by guild restrictions than on the
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Continent. She possessed more surplus capital for investment, more skilled laborers, and a larger merchant marine than any other country. Furthermore, Great Britain had emerged from the Seven Years' War victorious over all her rivals for maritime and commercial supremacy. Her trade in the markets of the world grew by leaps and bounds after 1763. The enormous demand for British goods in its turn stimulated the mechanical genius of British artisans and so produced the era of the great inventions.

143. The Great Inventions

Man has advanced from savagery to civilization chiefly through invention. Beginning in prehistoric times, he slowly discovered how to supplement hands and feet and teeth and nails by the use of tools. From the tool it was a forward step to the machine, which, when supplied with muscular energy, only needed to be directed by man to do his work. The highest type of machine is one driven by natural forces — by wind, waterfall, steam, gas, or electricity. The invention of tools and machinery thus gives man an ever-increasing control over nature. He becomes nature's conqueror, rather than its slave.

A list of prehistoric tools and machines would include many kinds of implements, first of stone and then of metal: levers, rollers, and wedges; bows-and-arrows, slings, and lassos; oars, sails, and rudders; fishing nets, lines, and hooks; the plow and the wheeled cart; the needle, bellows, and potter's wheel; the distaff and spindle for spinning; and the hand loom for weaving. Few important additions were made to this list in antiquity, even by such cultivated peoples as the Egyptians, Babylonians, Greeks, and Romans. The Middle Ages were also singularly barren of inventions. It was only toward the close of the medieval period that gunpowder, the mariner's compass, paper, and movable type reached Europe from Asia. More progress took place during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, which produced the telescope, microscope, thermometer and barometer, clocks and
watches run by weights, sawmills driven by wind or water, an improved form of the windmill, and the useful though humble wheelbarrow. Manufacturing and transportation continued, however, to be carried on in much the same rude way as before the dawn of history.

The revolution in manufacturing began with the textile industry. Old-fashioned spinning formed a slow, laborious process. The wool, flax, or cotton, having been fastened to a stick called the distaff, was twisted by hand into yarn or thread and wound upon a spindle. The spinning wheel — long known in India and not unknown in Europe as early as the fourteenth century — afterwards came into general use. The spinner now no longer held the spindle in her hand, but set it upon a frame and connected it by a belt to the wheel, which, when revolved, turned the spindle. The subsequent addition of a treadle to move the wheel freed both hands of the spinner, so that she could twist two threads instead of one.

Weaving was done on the hand loom, a wooden frame to which vertical threads (the warp) were attached. Horizontal threads (the weft or woof) were then inserted by means of an enlarged needle or shuttle. This primitive method, followed for thousands of years throughout the world, was first improved by the Englishman, John Kay, in 1733. His invention of the “flying shuttle” enabled the operator, by pulling a cord, to jerk the shuttle back and forth without the aid of an assistant and also much more rapidly than by hand. The device thus saved labor and doubled the speed of weaving.
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The demand for thread and yarn quickly outran the supply, for the spinners could not keep up with the weavers. Prizes were then offered for a better machine than the spinning wheel. At length, James Hargreaves, a poor workman of Lancashire in northern England, patented what he named the "spinning jenny," in compliment to his industrious wife. This machine carried a number of spindles turned by cords or belts from the same wheel, and operated by hand. It was a very simple affair, but it spun at first eight threads, then sixteen, and within the inventor's own lifetime eighty, thus doing the work of many spinning wheels.

The thread spun by the "spinning jenny" was so frail that it could be used only for the weft. The spinners needed a machine to produce a hard, strong thread for the warp. Richard Arkwright met this need by the invention of the "water frame," so called because it was run by water power. The machine contained two sets of rollers, one rotating at a higher speed than the
other. The cotton was drawn out by the rollers to the requisite fineness and was then twisted into thread by revolving spindles.

Samuel Crompton soon combined the essential features of the Hargreaves and Arkwright machines into what became known as the "mule," because of its hybrid "mule," origin. 1779

When the mechanism was drawn out on its wheels one way, the strands of cotton were stretched and twisted into threads; when it was run back the other way, the spun threads were wound on spindles. The "mule" quite superseded Hargreaves's device. It

The shuttle was propelled mechanically through the long, trough-shaped form extending out at the sides.
has been steadily improved, and at the present time may carry as many as two thousand spindles.

These three inventions again upset the balance in the textile industry, for now the spinners could produce more thread and yarn than the weavers could convert into cloth. The invention which revolutionized weaving was made by Edward Cartwright, an English clergyman, who had never even seen a weaver at work. He constructed a loom with an automatic shuttle operated by water power. Improvements in this machine enable a single operator to produce more cloth than two hundred men could weave on the old-fashioned hand loom.

Both spinners and weavers required for the new machinery an abundant supply of raw material. They found it in cotton, which previously had been much less used than either wool or flax. Eli Whitney of Connecticut, while visiting a cotton plantation in Georgia, conceived the idea of what he called an

**Cartwright's power loom, 1785**

**Whitney's Cotton Gin**

After the original model.

**James Watt**

After the painting by Sir William Beechey.
engine, or gin, for separating the seeds from the raw cotton more rapidly than negro slaves could do it by hand. His cotton gin, which was first patented in 1794, stimulated enormously American production of cotton for the mills of Great Britain.

What was to furnish motive power for the new machinery? Windmills were obviously too unreliable to be profitably used. Human hands had at first operated Hargreaves's "spinning jenny," and horses had worked Arkwright's original machine. Both inventors, however, soon turned to water power to drive the wheel, and numerous mills were built along the streams of northern England. Then came steam power. The expansive force of steam, though known in antiquity, was first put to practical service at the close of the seventeenth century, when steam pumps were invented for ridding mines of water. The earliest steam engine was a crude affair. After the steam entered the cylinder and pushed the piston upward, cold water had to be sprayed into the cylinder in order to condense the steam. This alternate heating and chilling consumed too much coal and too much time.

James Watt, a Scotchman of mechanical genius, patented an improved steam pump in 1769, a year also memorable for Arkwright's first patent. By providing a separate condenser into which the steam was led after it raised the piston and by enclosing the cylinder in an air-tight jacket to maintain its heat, Watt overcame the two greatest defects of the steam pump. He subsequently patented devices by which the back-and-forth motion of the piston could be made to drive a wheel connected by a belt with machinery, a throttle-valve to regulate the rate of admission of steam into the cylinder, a governor to control the speed of rotation, and
an indicator to record steam pressure. These and other improvements opened up new fields of usefulness for steam power. In 1785, the year of Cartwright’s invention, the Watt engine began to be set up in factories for the operation of spinning machines and looms. Steam power only slowly displaced water power, however, owing to the fact that much capital had already been invested in water-driven cotton mills.

The nineteenth century has been called the age of steam. The steamboat, the steam locomotive, and the steam printing press are some of the children of Watt’s epochal invention. Toward the close of the century electricity began to compete with steam as a motive force, after the invention of that mystic marvel of science, the dynamo, and in the twentieth century the gas engine, as applied to automobiles, airplanes, tractors, and other machines, continued the Industrial Revolution.

The growing use of machinery called for an increased production of iron. Northern and north-central England contained vast deposits of iron ore, but until the latter part of the eighteenth century they had been little worked. Improved methods of smelting with coal and coke, by means of the blast furnace, were then adopted. Steel, a product of iron, whose toughness and hardness had been prized for ages, was not manufactured on a large scale until after 1850. Better methods of manufacture now enable the poorest iron to be converted into excellent steel, thus opening up extensive fields of low-grade ore in France, Germany, and other countries. Used in every form, from building-girders to watch springs, steel is now the mainstay of modern industry.

The manufacture of iron and steel and the operation of the new machinery required an abundant, inexpensive fuel. Coal had long been burned in small quantities for domestic purposes; applied to the steam engine and the blast furnace it was to become an almost boundless source of power and heat. Various improvements in mining cheapened its production, one of the most notable being Sir Humphry Davy’s use of wire gauze to protect miners’ lamps
from the explosion of fire-damp. This simple invention, besides saving thousands of lives, enabled the most dangerous mines to be worked with comparative safety. Great Britain furnished nearly all the coal for manufacturing until the middle of the nineteenth century; later, much of the world's supply has come from the mines of France, Germany, and the United States.

Mineral oil, or petroleum, has become an industrial rival of coal, since the first oil well was sunk in Pennsylvania in 1859. There are now more than three hundred products of petroleum, the most important being kerosene for illumination, gasolene (petrol) for gas engines, and fuel oil for oil-burning ships and locomotives. The United States is still the chief producer of oil, but we now consume even more than we produce. Our national requirements in 1918 amounted to 413 million barrels, equal to the flow of water over Niagara Falls for three hours. Many new sources of supply will have to be opened up throughout the world, if the present consumption of petroleum in the United States, Great Britain, and other countries is to continue indefinitely.

144. Effects of the Great Inventions

The great inventions, besides hastening the transition from hand-labor to machine-labor, also did much to separate labor and capital. No such separation was possible in the Middle Ages. A master who belonged to a craft guild purchased his raw materials at the city market or at a fair, manufactured them in his own house, assisted by the members of his family and usually by a few journeymen and apprentices, and himself sold the finished article to the person who had ordered it. This guild system, as it is called, has not entirely disappeared. One may still have a pair of shoes made by a "custom" shoemaker or a suit of clothes made by a "custom" tailor.

The growing exclusiveness of the craft guilds, toward the close of the medieval period, prevented many apprentices and

---

1 See pages 138–139.
journeymen from ever becoming masters. Consequently, workers often left the cities and settled in the country or in villages where there were no guild restrictions. The movement gave rise to the domestic system, as found, for example, in the British cotton industry. A middleman with some capital would purchase a supply of raw cotton and distribute it to the spinners and weavers to convert into cloth on their own spinning wheels and hand looms. They worked at home and usually eke out their wages by cultivating a small garden plot. Something akin to the domestic system still survives in the sweatshops of modern cities where clothing is made on "commission."

It is clear that under the domestic system the middleman provided the raw materials, took all the risks, and received all the profits. The workers, on the other hand, had to accept such wages and labor upon such conditions as he was willing to offer. The separation of labor and capital, which thus began under the domestic system, became complete under the factory system. Arkwright's, Crompton's, and Cartwright's machines were too expensive for a single family to own; too large and heavy for use in private houses; and they needed water power or steam power to operate them. The consequence was that the domestic laborer abandoned his household industry and went with hundreds of others to work in a mill or factory. The capitalist employer now not only provided the raw materials and disposed of the finished product, but he also owned the machinery and the workshop. The word "manufacturer" ¹ no longer applied to the hand-worker, but to the person who employed others to work for him.

The factory system introduced a minute division of labor into industry. Thus, there are forty operations involved in the manufacture of ready-made clothing; nearly one hundred in the manufacture of shoes; and over a thousand in the construction of a fine watch. Many men, working together, may turn out in a few minutes an article

¹ Latin manu, facere, to make by hand. Manufacture by machinery has been well-named machinofacture.
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which one man in former times required weeks or months to produce. The division of labor, besides saving time, also increased output. A single instance will show this. Adam Smith, writing in 1776, contrasted the one pin which an artisan might make in a day, if he did all the work himself, with the five thousand pins which he could produce each day in a factory. Now, however, when pins are made by automatic machinery, the average daily output for each operative totals over a million.

Machinery, the factory system, and the division of labor made it possible to manufacture on a large scale and in enormous quantities for world-wide markets. For example, the value of British cotton goods rose from one million dollars in 1760 to six hundred times that amount in 1910. Similar increases were registered in other textile manufactures and in the iron industry of Great Britain.

The Industrial Revolution soon changed the face of Great Britain. Instead of farms, hamlets, and an occasional small town, appeared great cities crowded with workers who had left their rural homes to seek employment in factories. The movement of population was especially toward the northern and northwestern counties, where there were many streams to furnish water power and abundant supplies of coal and iron. Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield, and Birmingham sprang up as centers for the manufacture of textiles and hardware, while Liverpool, little more than a village at the opening of the nineteenth century, became a commercial metropolis. Aside from London, it is northern England and southern Scotland which to-day form the chief seat of British trade and industry.¹

The Industrial Revolution began later on the Continent than in Great Britain, partly because of the opposition of the guilds, which feared that the new machinery would deprive workers of employment; partly because Continental manufacturers showed less enterprise than their British rivals; but chiefly because the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars left France and Germany

¹ See page 277.
too exhausted to compete in manufacturing. Great Britain thus became by 1815 the world’s workshop and the richest of European nations. It was only toward the close of the nineteenth century that her industrial primacy began to be seriously threatened by Germany and the United States.

145. Improvements in Transportation

Civilized man until the Industrial Revolution continued to use the conveyances which had been invented by uncivilized man in prehistoric times. Travel and transport were still on horseback, or in litters, wheeled carts, rowboats, and sailboats. Various improvements produced the sedan chair, the stagecoach, and large ocean-going ships, without, however, finding any substitutes for muscles or wind as the motive power.

The roads in western Europe scarcely deserved that name; they were little more than track ways, either deep with mud or dusty and full of ruts. Passengers in stagecoaches seldom made more than fifty miles a day, while heavy goods had to be moved on pack horses. Conditions in Great Britain improved during the latter part of the eighteenth century, or the enormous quantity of goods produced by the new machinery increased the need for cheap and rapid transport. The turnpike system, allowing tolls to be charged for the use of roads, encouraged the investment of capital by private companies in these undertakings; and it was not long before Telford, Macadam, and other engineers covered the country with well-bottomed, well-drained, and well-surfaced highways. The splendid highways which attract the attention

AN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY STAGECOACH

After an old print.
of Americans on the Continent were all built in the nineteenth century, chiefly before the era of railroads.

The expense of transportation by road led people in antiquity and the Middle Ages to send their goods by river routes, whenever possible. Canal-building in Europe began toward the close of the medieval period, especially after the invention of locks for controlling the flow and level of the water. The great era of the canal was between 1775 and 1850, not only in Great Britain and on the Continent, but also in the United States. Canals relieved the highways of a large part of the growing traffic, but the usefulness of both declined after the introduction of railroads. Ship canals, however, have begun to be constructed within recent years, as a result of the general adoption of steam navigation on the ocean.

The earliest successful steamboat appears to have been a tug built in Scotland for towing canal boats. Robert Fulton, an American engineer who had lived in England and France, adapted the steamboat to river navigation. His side-wheeler, the Clermont, equipped with a Watt engine, began in 1807 to make regular trips on the Hudson between New York and Albany. Twelve years later an American vessel, provided with both sails and a steam engine, crossed the Atlantic in twenty-nine days. The first ship to cross without using sails or recoaling on the way was the Great Western in 1838. The trip took her fifteen days.
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Various improvements since the middle of the nineteenth century added greatly to the efficiency of ocean steamers. Iron, and later steel, replaced wood in their construction, with a resulting gain in strength and buoyancy. Screw propellers were substituted for clumsy paddle wheels, and turbine engines, which apply the energy of a jet of steam to secure the rotation of a shaft, were introduced. The size of steamers, also, has so increased that the Great Western, a boat of 1378 tons and 212 feet in length, would appear a pygmy by the side of the fifty-thousand ton "leviathans" which now cross the Atlantic in less than six days.

Wooden or iron rails had long been used in mines and quarries to enable the steam locomotive to draw heavy loads with ease, and as early as 1803 a horse-car line was opened to general traffic in the suburbs of London. George Stephenson, who profited by the experiments of other inventors, produced in 1814 a successful locomotive for hauling coal from the mine to tide-water. He improved his model and eleven years later secured its adoption.
on the Stockton and Darlington Railway, the first line over which passengers and freight were carried by steam power. Stephenson also built the Liverpool and Manchester Railway,

![Image of the "Rocket"](image)

**The "Rocket," 1830**

Built by Stephenson to compete in a trial of locomotive engines for the Liverpool and Manchester Railway. The greatest speed it attained in the trial was 29 miles an hour, but some years later it ran at the rate of 33 miles an hour. The total weight of the engine and tender was only about 7½ tons.

which was opened in 1830 and on which his famous engine, the *Rocket*, made its maiden trip.

Many technical improvements — the increased size of locomotives and cars, air brakes, and the use of steel rails in place of iron rails which supported only light loads and wore out rapidly — have extended the usefulness of the railroad far beyond the dreams of its earlier promoters. The greatest development of railroad transportation came in the latter part of the nineteenth century, with the construction of great "trunk" lines and branches ("feeders") radiating into the remotest districts. The year 1869 saw the first transcontinental line in the United States (the Union Pacific and Central Pacific); 1900, the Trans-Siberian line; and 1910 the Trans-Andean line. Western Europe and the United States are now covered with a network of railroads, and these are being extended rapidly to all civilized and even semi-civilized lands.
Early Passenger Trains

Views on the Liverpool and Manchester Railway in 1825-1829. The upper picture shows a train with first-class carriages and the lower picture shows second and third-class carriages.
Modern electric traction dates from the early 'eighties of the last century, when the overhead trolley began to supplant horse cars and cable cars in cities. The development of the electric locomotive promises to bring about a partial substitution of electricity for steam on railroads through tunnels and over heavy grades.

The earliest application of steam power to transportation was neither the railway nor the steam boat but the road engine. As far back as 1801 an English inventor constructed a steam carriage for passengers. Repeated efforts were made during the next forty years to popularize the new mode of travel in England, but bad roads and an unsympathetic public discouraged inventors. The automobile had to wait for the gas or "internal combustion" engine (as patented in the last decade of the nineteenth century) to become a commercial success. There are now more than six million pleasure automobiles and half a million motor trucks operated in the United States alone.

The gas engine is likewise responsible for the airplane. Its history illustrates the truth that great inventions do not spring fully developed from the brain of one man, but, on the con-
trary, represent the long and patient experimentation of many men. An American scientist, S. P. Langley, who himself owed much to the work of others, produced in 1903 a heavier-than-air machine which was driven by steam. The accidents attending its first trials caused it to be abandoned. Eleven years later the same machine was successfully flown by Mr. G. H. Curtiss, thus showing that Langley had solved the problem of mechanical flight. The Wright Brothers followed where Langley had led the way, and in 1908 they made their first public flights, using an airplane fitted with a gas engine. As every one knows, the exigencies of the World War resulted in an extraordinarily rapid development of the airplane. Its powers were most strikingly revealed by two British aviators, Alcock and Brown, who in June, 1919, made a non-stop flight across the Atlantic from Newfoundland to Ireland, covering the distance in less than sixteen hours. Since then there have been air races across the United States, and air-flights from England to Australia and from Cairo to the Cape of Good Hope.

Two Frenchmen, the Montgolfier Brothers, invented the balloon in the latter part of the eighteenth century. Experiments in balloon navigation continued throughout the nineteenth century, and finally Count Zeppelin, an officer in the German army, produced an airship which consisted, not of one balloon, but of a row of bags enclosed in an enormous shell of aluminium trellis work. It carried two cars, each provided with a gas motor. The trial of this Zeppelin in 1900 showed how nearly the problem of a dirigible balloon had been solved. Other successful airships were soon constructed in France and England. The World War stimulated their development, as was the case with the airplane. To the British dirigible, the R-34, belongs the renown of having been the first to cross the Atlantic (July 2-6, 1919). The R-34 carried a crew and passengers from Scotland to Long Island, covering the distance of 3200 miles in a trifle more than 108 hours. The return trip took only three days.
As far back as the Revolutionary War, an American inventor constructed a tiny submarine and tried, without success, to sink a British warship. Robert Fulton, encouraged by Napoleon, made several submarines. In one of them he descended to a depth of twenty-five feet, remained below for four hours, and succeeded in blowing up a small vessel with a torpedo. Under-water boats, propelled by steam power, were used by the Confederates in the Civil War. From about this time inventors in several countries worked on the problem of the submarine. One of the most successful was an Irish-American, J. P. Holland, who sold the boat named after him to the United States in 1898. The improvement of the submarine from this time is a familiar story. Thus, in the course of about a century, man has completed the conquest of land and air and sea.

146. Improved Communications

Scientists of the eighteenth century, familiar with the Leyden jar, often discussed the idea of using electricity to communicate at a distance, but a practicable apparatus for converting the electric current into intelligible signs did not appear until the 'thirties of the nineteenth century. Samuel F. B. Morse, an American, deserves perhaps the greatest credit for the invention. He also devised the "Morse alphabet." The telegraph found an immediate application on the railroads and

Morse's First Telegraph Instrument (1837)

In the U. S. National Museum, Washington.
in the transmission of government messages. Later, it made its way into the business world.

Hardly any one at first believed that a telegraph line could be carried across the ocean. Experiments soon showed, however, that wire cords, protected by wrappers of guttapercha, would conduct the electric current under water. The first cable was laid from Dover to Calais in 1851. A group of American promoters, including Cyrus W. Field, then took up the project of an Atlantic cable which should “moor the new world alongside the old.” Discouraging failures marked the enterprise. The first cables were broken by the ocean, and the line which was finally laid in 1858 soon became useless, owing to the failure of its electrical insulation. After the Civil War Field renewed his efforts, and in 1866 a cable two thousand miles long was successfully laid and communication perfected. No less than fourteen lines now stretch across the Atlantic, while all the other oceans have been electrically bridged.

Experimentation with rude forms of the telephone began in the same decade which produced the telegraph. Little progress took place until 1875, when Alexander Graham Bell, a native of Edinburgh but
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later a resident of Boston, patented his first instrument. Many improvements have since been made in it by Bell himself, Thomas A. Edison, and others.

The invention of wireless telegraphy by the Italian, Guglielmo Marconi, may be said to date from 1899, when wireless messages were sent between France and England across the Channel. A trans-Atlantic service by "wireless" began eight years later, and since then the range of Marconi's apparatus has been greatly extended. The still more recent introduction of wireless telephony promises to work another revolution in long-distance communication. Already speech without wires is possible between Paris and New York.

A regular postal service under government management existed in Europe as early as the seventeenth century, but it was slow, expensive, and little used. Stamps were unknown, prepayment of postage was considered an insult, and rates increased according to distance. The modern postal service began in Great Britain in 1840, with the adoption of a uniform charge irrespective of distance (penny postage), prepayment, and the use of stamps. These reforms soon spread to other countries and everywhere resulted in greatly increased use of the mails. The International Postal Union (1874), with a central office at Berne, Switzerland, makes arrangements for common rates of foreign postage and for coöperation in carrying the mails from country to
country. The development of aviation has led some governments to establish an aërial post for first-class matter. The first instance of the sort in the United States is the service established in 1918 between Washington and New York.

Weekly and daily newspapers also began to appear in the seventeenth century, but they were luxuries reserved for subscribers of the middle and upper classes. The cheap newspaper for the masses is a product of the Industrial Revolution. The London *Times* installed the first steam printing press in 1814. A paper-making machine, which produced wide sheets of unlimited length, came into use soon after. To these inventions must be added the linotype machine. In newspaper offices, where rapid composition is necessary, it has largely superseded hand-work in setting type. European governments for a long time endeavored to keep newspapers from reaching the common people, first by stamp duties and then by taxes on paper and advertisements. A cheap press was feared as a medium of democratic ideas which would undermine the authority of the upper classes. This system of "taxing knowledge" has disappeared in all progressive countries. The circulation of dailies and weeklies, instead of being restricted, is now fostered by the grant of low postal rates to newspapers.

Many inventions in communication — the instantaneous camera, the cinematograph or motion picture, the phonograph,
the automatic piano — are so new that we have scarcely as yet begun to realize their possibilities. Properly directed, they will furnish the common people in civilized countries with an education in art, music, and the drama which in former days could be secured only by persons of wealth and leisure. Their great service promises to be that of democratizing culture, as cheap newspapers and books have democratized knowledge.

147. Modern Industrialism

The most important consequence of the Industrial Revolution is the increased population of the leading nations. The figures for Europe show an increase from about 175,000,000 to over 400,000,000 during the nineteenth century, and for the United States from about 5,000,000 in 1800 to nearly 92,000,000 in 1910. The number of people who can be supported in a given region now depends less on the food which they raise, than on their production of raw materials and manufactured goods to exchange for food. Thus Belgium and Great Britain, with only a limited agriculture, support more inhabitants to the square mile than any other countries; while the population of such industrial states as New York, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts far exceeds that of the agricultural commonwealths of the Middle West. There are, of course, certain agricultural countries (Egypt, the Ganges valley and delta in India, part of China) where the exceptionally rich soil, coupled with a very low standard of living on the part of the inhabitants, has also made possible an enormous growth of population within the last century. Little of the world is now entirely uninhabited; still less is permanently uninhabitable and unlikely to receive a considerable population in the future. Even sandy and alkaline deserts can be rendered productive through irrigation, while vast tracts of fertile territory, in both the temperate and tropical zones, can support many more people than at present. Europe as a whole has 106 inhabitants to the square mile, Asia 58, Africa 11, America 9, and Oceania only 2.
The increased population of the leading industrial nations has been largely concentrated in cities. The rise of the factory system and the improvement of facilities for travel and transportation soon led to an unprecedented urban development. Old cities grew with marvelous rapidity, while former villages and towns became transformed into new cities. At the opening of the nineteenth century western Europe was still mainly rural, as eastern Europe is to-day. Europe, as a whole, had fourteen cities of more than one hundred thousand inhabitants in 1800; in 1900 it had one hundred and forty such cities. London, which in 1800 contained under a million inhabitants, now counts seven millions within its borders; Paris contains five times as many people as shortly before the French Revolution; and Berlin has grown ten-fold since the reign of Frederick the Great. The development of provincial centers within the past century has been equally remarkable. Turning to the United States, it is enough to contrast the six cities of over eight thousand inhabitants in 1800 with the six hundred cities which, according to the census of 1910, had a population of ten thousand or more. About half of the American people are now city dwellers.

The Industrial Revolution is further chiefly responsible for the enormous emigration of Europeans during the past hundred years to lands beyond the seas. The United States received over 27,000,000 immigrants between 1800 and 1910, nearly all coming from Europe. Millions more went to the British colonies and to South America. The migration movement has been most marked since the middle of the nineteenth century, when the improvements in steam navigation so greatly multiplied and cheapened facilities for travel on the ocean.

The increased wealth of the leading nations is another consequence of the Industrial Revolution. Modern machines are really non-human slaves working without wages and without fatigue. One writer estimates that in the textile industries alone they accomplish what it would
require fifty billion men and women to do without them. Statistics of government revenues and expenditures, imports and exports, income tax returns, deposits in savings banks, and assets of life insurance companies show how wealth has multiplied, especially within recent years. Other indications are furnished by the increase in the annual production of coal, in the amount of iron ore mined annually, in railway construction, and in the tonnage of merchant vessels. The enormous public loans, successfully floated during the World War, also reveal the resources now at the command of industrial peoples.

Notwithstanding the creation of huge individual fortunes as the result of the Industrial Revolution, the general standard of living has been raised by the addition of innumerable things—sugar, coffee, linen, cotton goods, glass, chinaware, wall paper, ready-made clothing, books, newspapers, pictures—which were once enjoyed only by a few wealthy persons. If the rich are undoubtedly getting richer, the poor are not getting poorer in western Europe and the United States. As a matter of fact, poverty is most acute in such thickly populated countries as Russia, India, and China, which modern industrialism has only begun to penetrate.

The map of the occupations of mankind affords a summary view of the progress of the Industrial Revolution throughout the world. As far as Europe is concerned, we see that the western part of the continent has been pretty thoroughly industrialized, except for such areas as western Ireland, northern Scotland, central Spain, southern Italy, the Alpine region, and the Scandinavian peninsula. The industrial development of Russia is limited to the western and southern parts of the country; that of the Balkan states is negligible. Large and growing manufacturing districts exist in India, China, Japan, on the eastern coast of Australia, and in New Zealand. The manufactures of Africa and South America are too slight for representation on a small-scale map. In North America both Mexico and Canada have begun to
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share with the United States in the benefits of the Industrial Revolution.

Studies

1. Using material in encyclopedias, prepare reports for class presentation upon the following inventions and discoveries: (a) the bicycle; (b) the typewriter; (c) lucifer matches; (d) illuminating gas; (e) electric lighting; (f) dynamite; and (g) photography. 2. For what are the following persons famous: Arkwright; Cartwright; Watt; Stephenson; Whitney; Fulton; Howe; Morse; Bell; Langley; and Marconi? 3. Explain what is meant by the following: (a) capital; (b) capitalism; (c) domestic system; (d) factory system; and (e) division of labor. 4. "Since the middle of the eighteenth century changes have come to pass which have made civilized man rather nature's conqueror than its drudge and prey." Comment on this statement. 5. What is the difference between a tool and a machine? 6. Name in order the early inventions in the textile industry and explain the changes which each one produced. 7. Describe the construction and operation of (a) the "spinning jenny"; (b) the "mule"; and (c) the "flying shuttle." 8. Has division of labor any disadvantages from the point of view of the worker? 9. What are Telford blocks? What is a macadamized road? 10. Enumerate some of the social and economic consequences of the wide use of the automobile in the United States. 11. "Of all inventions, the alphabet and the printing press alone excepted, those inventions which abridge distance have done most for the civilization of our species." Comment on this statement. 12. "Next to steam-locomotion, the telegraph is probably the most powerful mechanical agent invented for promoting the unification of the world." Comment on this statement. 13. On the map facing page 474, indicate the principal uninhabited regions of the globe. 14. On the map facing this page locate the chief mining areas of the world.
CHAPTER XXI

ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

148. Commerce

A tremendous expansion of commerce followed the improvements in transportation and communication. Macadamized commercial roads, inland and ship canals, ocean steamships, and railroads reduced freight rates to a mere fraction of those once charged, while the telegraph, telephone, cheap postage, and newspapers made possible the rapid spread of information relating to crops and markets. It is estimated that the commerce of the world (including even backward countries) increased over twelve hundred per cent in the nineteenth century. Rapid as was the growth of the world's population during this period, commerce grew much faster; so that the average share of each human being in international trade amounted in 1900 to a sum six times that in 1800. During the first two decades of the twentieth century commercial expansion has been on a still more colossal scale.

Great Britain has long stood first among commercial countries. This is not surprising, in view of the fact that the Industrial Revolution began in Great Britain and that for many years she alone had large quantities of manufactured goods for export. Great Britain's success as a colonial power likewise fostered her commerce; the bulk of the trade of British colonies and dependencies is with the mother country. The British Empire, as a whole, controls a half of the gold, a third of the wool, a third of the coal, a fourth of the cotton, a fifth of the wheat, and a sixth of the pig iron annually produced throughout the world. It should be noted, also, that the

1 Webster, Historical Source Book, No. 24, "Communist Manifesto, 1848"; No. 25, "Declaration of Paris, 1856."
The maritime supremacy of Great Britain has protected her seaborne trade in time of war, besides furnishing ample facilities in ships, docks, and sailors for trade at all times. Great Britain imports most of her foodstuffs and raw materials and exports chiefly manufactures, including textiles (cottons, woollens, linens), machinery, leather goods, chemicals, and pottery.

The three-fold increase of Germany's foreign trade between 1871 and 1914 was part and parcel of the astounding industrial development which followed her unification. Germany on the eve of the World War ranked next to Great Britain among commercial nations. German imports were mostly foodstuffs to supply the rapidly growing population and raw materials for the expanding factories of the empire. The exports were mainly manufactures, coal, and beet sugar.

France in 1914 stood third among European countries in volume of foreign trade. The French people excel in the creation of such artistic luxuries as millinery, laces, gloves, perfumes, and fine china, and these, together with silks and wines, comprise the bulk of their exports. The low, flat coast and few harbors of France have not encouraged the growth of a merchant marine. The French are obliged to depend largely upon the British, Norwegians, and other neighbors for shipping.

The foreign trade of the United States during the nineteenth century remained small in proportion to the wealth and population of the country. So great and so varied were the resources of the United States that the American people could obtain by internal trade nearly everything they needed. Were our commerce interrupted, we should lack coffee, tea, sugar, and tropical fruits, but neither the necessaries of life nor the raw materials for our principal industries. The United States is more nearly independent, industrially, than any other leading country. Nevertheless, as the American people approach economic maturity, commerce becomes increasingly important as supplying a foreign market for the surplus products of our mines,
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farms, and factories. The growth of American commerce has therefore been exceptionally rapid within recent decades, especially the increase in the exports of manufactures. Before 1914 only 10 per cent of our commerce was carried under our own flag, Great Britain, Germany, and other European countries supplying ships for all the rest. The recent development of American shipping to repair the losses wrought by the German submarine campaign is one of the most significant economic consequences of the World War.

149. Commercial Organization

The organization of commerce shows wonderful changes since the Middle Ages. There is now so steady a flow of commodities from producers through wholesalers and retailers to consumers that the old system of weekly markets and annual fairs is all but obsolete. Distinctively modern are produce exchanges for trade in the great staples (wheat, cotton, wool, sugar, etc.) and stock exchanges for buying and selling the stocks and bonds of corporations. Speculation on the exchanges confers a benefit upon commerce by safeguarding producers against the risks of sharp fluctuations in prices. When, however, it results in an artificial scarcity of commodities or securities through "corners" and "squeezes," it becomes an economic evil. The difficulty in practice is to draw the line between legitimate speculation and simple gambling.

The system of insurance is altogether an economic benefit, in view of the risks involved in most commercial undertakings. For a small payment the farmer insures his growing crop against hail or windstorm; the merchant, his stock against fire; the shipowner, his vessel against loss at sea. Marine insurance arose in medieval Italy, but for centuries it has centered at Lloyds in London. The first fire insurance

1 Lloyd's was originally a coffee house of seventeenth-century London, where shipowners and insurance brokers gathered for business or gossip. The name now applies to an association which not only writes marine insurance, but also collects and publishes information with respect to shipping throughout the world.
policies were written in London after the Great Fire in the reign of Charles II. Other forms of business insurance originated much more recently. The present tendency seems to be to insure against every possible contingency which can be foreseen.

A commercial bank, as distinguished from a savings bank or a trust company, may be defined as an institution which deals in money and credit. It attracts the deposits of many persons, thus gaining control of enormous sums available for loans to manufacturers and merchants. Banks do not increase the amount of capital (factory buildings, machinery, raw materials, etc.) in a community, but they help to put it at the disposal of active business men; in other words, banks make capital fluid. Furthermore, bank checks, drafts, and foreign bills of exchange provide a cheap and elastic substitute for money. It is possible through their use to discharge a large volume of indebtedness without the transfer of cash.

The earliest medieval banks were the private establishments of moneyed men in Italian cities. Venice and Genoa subsequently founded public or state banks, and during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries similar institutions arose in many European capitals. The Bank of England received its charter from the government as late as 1694. The Bank of France was the creation of Napoleon Bonaparte.
The Imperial Bank of Germany (Reichsbank) came into existence only in 1876. All these great European banks, as well as the national banks of the United States, have the privilege of issuing redeemable notes which circulate in place of gold.

In spite of the extensive use of checks and bank notes, the growth of commerce continues to absorb immense quantities of gold, the money metal. The supply has kept pace with the demand. The mines of California, Australia, South Africa, Alaska, and other countries produced in the second half of the nineteenth century nine times as much gold as had been produced between 1800 and 1850.

The supply of silver increased during the nineteenth century far in excess of the demand. Its declining value led the principal commercial states to diminish or suspend silver coinage. Great Britain in 1816 abandoned the double or bimetallic standard and adopted the single gold standard. Her example has since been followed by the Continental nations, the British colonies, Japan, the South American republics, and, in 1900, the United States. China and Mexico are the only important countries which remain on a silver basis.

Economists believe that the great output of gold in the 'fifties and 'sixties of the last century resulted in an average increase of the prices of commodities equal to at least twenty per cent. The prodigious enlargement of the gold supply within recent years has also been a cause of the steadily rising price level since about 1896 in the United States, Great Britain, Germany, and other countries. It is therefore important to note just how new supplies of gold operate on prices. Gold converted into money constitutes purchasing power. Additional supplies of it in circulation mean an increased demand for goods, which in turn causes a rise of prices. Wages also tend to advance, because more labor is required to produce the additional commodities demanded. Since salaries usually rise more slowly than wages, the salaried class suffers during a period of rapidly increasing

1 See page 190.  
2 See page 346.
prices. The same is true of all persons having fixed incomes from bonds and similar investments.

The almost universal use of gold as the standard of value facilitates the creation of a world market for money. Capitalists and bankers in progressive countries are thus enabled to supply funds for investment in less progressive countries. Statisticians estimate that up to 1914 not less than twenty billion dollars had been invested abroad by Great Britain, about half of it in her colonies and about half in foreign lands. French investments in Russia and other countries totaled about ten billion dollars, while those of Germany abroad also reached an impressively high figure. All through the nineteenth century the United States was a debtor nation, owing to the immense sums borrowed for the development of American railroads, mines, farms, and factories. This situation changed with startling suddenness during the World War, when the Allied nations purchased in the United States enormous amounts of food, raw materials and munitions. Not only has the United States wiped off its indebtedness to Europe; it has now made Europe its debtor. Consequently, New York, rather than London or Paris, tends to become the world’s money market and center of international finance.

Commercial progress has been frequently interrupted during the past century by periods of depression called crises. They are a product of the Industrial Revolution. Arising in one country, perhaps as a result of bad banking, over-issue of paper money, speculation, unwise investments, or failure of crops, they tend to spread widely until all civilized countries are involved. For instance, the crisis of 1857 started in the United States and that of 1873, in Austria.

What happens during a crisis is familiar to every one. Capitalists refuse to invest in new railroads, factories, and other undertakings; bankers will not lend money; merchants, unable to borrow, go into bankruptcy; and manufacturers, receiving fewer orders, either reduce their output or shut down their plants. Then ensues a period of
"hard times," with low prices, low wages, much unemployment, and widespread destitution. The wave of prosperity sets in again, eventually, and times again become "good." Crises have occurred at intervals of about ten or eleven years since 1800, but recently with lessening severity. They may cease altogether as modern commerce becomes still more efficient.

150. Commercial Policies

Many obstacles impeding the exchange of goods in the Middle Ages disappeared in modern times, especially after the French Revolution. The state police, which was commercial freedom everywhere organized on the model of the French gendarmerie, suppressed highway robbery. Piracy, once so common, became obsolete in the era of modern steam navigation. The burdensome tolls imposed by feudal lords on transportation and travel were no longer exacted, now that feudalism itself had died out. A movement also began to reduce the high duties levied by every European nation on imports and exports.

One nation went still further in the nineteenth century and adopted free trade. Great Britain, we have learned, enjoyed by 1815 a virtual monopoly in most lines of industry. Having no reason to fear the competition of foreign manufacturers, it was to her advantage to lower or abolish the duties on imports, especially those on raw materials. The Younger Pitt, influenced by the writings of Adam Smith, began the work of tariff reform; Sir Robert Peel continued it in the 'forties; and Gladstone completed it. Since 1860 Great Britain has been
a free-trade nation. She imposes no restrictions whatever on exports and levies import duties only on a few articles, including coffee, tea, tobacco, alcoholic liquors, and sugar. Even these are for revenue not for protection. They do not encourage the production at home of anything which can be produced more cheaply abroad. "To buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest" is the British policy.

Another feature of the free-trade movement in Great Britain was the repeal of the Corn Laws. These laws restricted or entirely prohibited the importation of wheat or other grains, in the interest of British farmers and landlords. Manufacturers, on the other hand, objected to legislation which made food dear for the working classes. In 1838 an Anti-Corn Law League was organized at Manchester, under the able leadership of Richard Cobden and John Bright. The success of its agitation was hastened by a partial failure of crops in England and the Potato Famine in Ireland, occurrences which raised food prices enormously and caused acute

\footnote{1 "Corn" to an Englishman means wheat; to a Scotsman or an Irishman, oats; and to an American, maize, or Indian corn.}

\footnote{2 See page 297.}
distress in both countries. The Corn Laws were finally repealed in 1846. Since then Great Britain has secured the bulk of her food abroad, from the fertile wheat areas of the United States and the British colonies, and has paid for it with the products of her mines and factories.

The Navigation Acts\(^1\) were repealed three years later, after having been in operation for nearly two centuries. Foreign ships were henceforth allowed to compete with those of Great Britain in the carrying trade. Competition has resulted in lower freight rates and consequently in cheaper food for the British people.

The free-trade movement spread to the Continent, where it led at first to a general lowering of tariff walls. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, however, Protection on the Continent France, Germany, and other countries returned to the policy of protection. Rightly or wrongly, they saw in protection the means of building up their own "infant industries," in order to supply the home market and even to compete with Great Britain in the markets of the world. The triumph of protectionism thus formed a sequel to the intense nationalism which had developed in Europe. The economic coöperation of the Allies during the World War and their continued coöperation under the League of Nations may lead to a reaction in favor of freer commercial intercourse between them.

The first American tariff was framed in 1789. It levied a few small protective duties. The United States adopted protection on an extensive scale only in 1816, as a means of keeping alive the industries which had sprung up in the country when the second war with England stopped all imports of foreign goods. Later tariffs have generally raised duties, except for a few decades before the Civil War. In following a protective policy, the United States thus ranges itself with the Continental nations rather than with Great Britain.

Much progress has been made during the past century in

\(^1\) See page 122.
the internationalization of important rivers which separate or traverse two or more countries. The Congress of Vienna in 1815 decided that the Rhine should be freely open to the commerce of all nations. The Congress of Paris in 1856 made a similar stipulation concerning the Danube. A few years later Holland renounced her former privilege of levying tolls on the Scheldt, an arrangement which had fettered Belgian commerce through Antwerp. The Peace Conference in 1919 internationalized the Elbe and Oder rivers, both of which rise in the new state of Czecho-Slovakia and provide outlets for its foreign trade. The principle of free navigation has also been extended to inland seas such as the Black Sea and the Baltic. Before the World War Germany treated the Kiel Canal as an inland waterway, denying to other nations its free and equal use. This gave her an advantage over her competitors, since the canal affords the shortest route between the North Sea and the Baltic. The peace treaty with Germany provides that the canal shall henceforth be opened without restriction to the mercantile marine of every country. The same rule has always applied to the Suez and Panama canals.

We saw above that one of the causes of the War of 1812–1814 was the irritation felt in the United States at the action of Great Britain in searching American ships for deserters from the royal navy. The peace treaty between the two countries said nothing about the right of search and impressment of deserting seamen, but the protest of the United States proved to be none the less effective. It is now an accepted principle of international law that in time of peace a merchant vessel remains under the jurisdiction of the country to which it belongs and whose flag it carries; consequently any visitation, molestation, or detention of such a ship by force, or by threat of force, constitutes an unfriendly act. The general acknowledgment of this principle by maritime nations makes the seas really free to all commerce in time of peace.

1 See page 444.
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Much has been done, also, to protect commerce in time of war. The great powers assembled at Paris in 1856 to conclude the Crimean War took the opportunity to put forth the following Declaration: 1 "Privateering is, and remains abolished; 2. The neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the exception of contraband of war; 3. Neutral goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not liable to capture under the enemy's flag; 4. Blockades, in order to be binding, must be effective, that is to say, maintained by a force sufficient really to prevent access to the coast of the enemy." All maritime countries of any importance, except the United States, adhered to this momentous Declaration. The United States declined to concur, unless enemy property (save contraband of war) were also exempted from capture at sea. The adoption of such a rule would put private property at sea on a level with private property on the land, in case of war. The question has been much discussed during recent years, without, however, obtaining recognition in international law.

151. Agriculture and Land Tenure

The agricultural system of the Middle Ages, with its wasteful "open fields" and fallow lands, its backward methods, and its scanty yield, began to be revolutionized with the approach of modern times. The Dutch were the first scientific farmers, and from them English farmers learned many secrets of tillage. Deeper plowing, more thorough pulverization of the ground, more diligent manuring, the shifting or rotation of crops from field to field, so that the soil would not have to lie fallow every third year, and the introduction of new crops, including turnips, clover, and rye, were some of the improvements which doubled the yield of agricultural land. The weight of cattle and sheep was also increased by half through careful selection in breeding. It is significant of the revived interest in agriculture at the close of the eighteenth century that George III contributed articles

1 Hertalet, Map of Europe by Treaty, vol. ii, No. 271.
to a farm journal and that Washington, in his quiet retreat at Mount Vernon, invented a plow and a rotary seed drill.

The improvements in agriculture since 1800 have extended to every progressive country. Machinery now replaces the ancient scythe, sickle, flail, and other implements. One machine, of American invention, not only reaps the grain, but threshes it, winnows it, and delivers it into sacks at a single operation. According to a conservative estimate, farm machinery enables fifty men to accomplish what would require the labor of five hundred men using hand tools only. The introduction of cheap artificial fertilizers makes profitable the cultivation of poor lands formerly allowed to lie idle. The advance of engineering science leads to the reclamation of marshes and arid wastes. Finally, steam navigation allows a country to draw supplies of wheat, meat, and other foodstuffs from the most distant regions, with the result that the specter of famine, so common in the Middle Ages, has well-nigh disappeared from the modern world.

The "open-field" system of cultivation, whereby the same person tilled many small strips in different parts of the manor, was so wasteful of time and labor that medieval farmers began to surrender their scattered strips for compact holdings which could be inclosed with hedges or fences and cultivated independently. This inclosure move-
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ment continued in western Europe all through the modern period, until in the nineteenth century the old "open fields" had been practically abandoned in favor of separate farms and individual tillage.

Inclosures meant better farming everywhere, but in Great Britain they also helped to create the large estates so characteristic of that country. The lord of the manor, not satisfied with inclosing his demesne lands, often managed to inclose the meadows, which had been previously enjoyed by the peasants in common, as pasturage for their livestock. It was consequently harder than ever for the small farmer to support his family on his petty holding. Moreover, he did not have sufficient capital to invest in necessary improvements and the new agricultural machinery rapidly coming into use, while the decay of the domestic system \(^1\) deprived him of a supplementary income from household manufacturing. Under such circumstances he was often forced to sell out to a large landowner. Many of the dispossessed farmers drifted to neighboring towns and became factory operatives; many went abroad to the British colonies or the United States; still others remained on the land as agricultural laborers working for a daily wage. The result was the almost complete disappearance, by the middle of the nineteenth century, of the old British yeomanry, the class of peasant proprietors who for hundreds of years had been the strength of the state.

Ten thousand persons own two-thirds of all England and Wales; seventeen thousand persons own nine-tenths of Scotland. Each landlord parcels out his property among a number of tenant "farmers," who work the soil themselves, with the aid of the agricultural day laborers above mentioned. Much good farming land is devoted to game preserves, parks, lawns, and gardens. These open spaces, with the stately mansions of the nobles and country gentry, give to rural England a charm which no other country knows.

\(^1\) See page 460.
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Nevertheless, British economists and statesmen have long felt that, as a mere matter of national safety, Great Britain ought to raise more of her own food supply. Were the country effectively blockaded in time of war, the starvation of its crowded industrial population would soon result. As a result of the World War, millions of acres formerly withdrawn from cultivation were put under the plow. It is not likely that they will be allowed to return to unproductive uses. Efforts have also begun to break up the large estates by such heavy taxes that it will be no longer profitable to hold them. Mr. Lloyd George, as Chancellor of the Exchequer, began a war on landlordism before 1914, and since then the enormous increase of taxation caused by the war has resulted in many of the great properties being broken up and placed upon the market. There seems reason to believe that Great Britain may yet become what Ireland under the Land Purchase Acts has already become—a country of small farmers.

A considerable part of the agricultural land belonged to the French peasants even before the Revolution. Their possessions increased in the revolutionary era, as the result of legislation confiscating the estates of the Crown, the Church, and the emigrant nobles. Three million persons own farms under twenty-five acres in extent; seven hundred and fifty thousand persons own the rest of the agricultural land in holdings running up to four hundred acres. About eighty per cent of all holdings are cultivated by their owners. These statistics show that little farm tenancy exists in France. It is emphatically a country of small but prosperous and contented farmers. In no European state would a socialistic revolution, involving the abolition of private ownership of land, have fewer chances of success.

The agrarian reforms of the French Revolution spread to Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, western Germany, and northern Italy, where peasant proprietorships are common. They are rare in much of Spain and in southern Italy and Sicily.

---

1 See page 298.  
2 See page 139.  
3 See pages 168 and 190.
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Central and eastern Europe remained under the medieval manorial system throughout the nineteenth century. The land was owned by a few noble families and was worked by peasants, either as tenants or day laborers. Outside of Russia proper, there were five of these landed aristocracies in 1914: in eastern Germany (Brandenburg, Pomerania, West Prussia, East Prussia), where serfdom disappeared only in the Napoleonic era; in Austria-Hungary, where it disappeared during the disorders of 1848–1849; in the Baltic provinces controlled by nobles of German origin called Baltic barons; in Poland and Lithuania; and in Rumania. The revolutionary movements since 1914 promise to destroy the land monopoly of the aristocrats in all these countries. There will arise, instead, a new democratic society of peasant proprietors. This triumph of the small land owner in central and eastern Europe must be accounted one of the most important economic results of the World War.

The abolition of Russian serfdom by Alexander II in 1858–1861 was followed by measures establishing a new system of land tenure. The nobles were required to sell a portion of their estates to the peasants, about half of the agricultural area of European Russia thus changing hands. Except in certain districts where individual ownership prevailed, the farming land was intrusted to the entire village (mir) for redistribution at intervals among the inhabitants. All that the peasant really possessed in his own right was a house and a garden plot. The Russian Revolution of 1917 broke up the mir economy and also enabled the peasants to appropriate the estates of the nobles. It appears that the Bolsheviki have been obliged to countenance this procedure, in order to win the support of the peasantry. If Russia adopts complete individual ownership of land, it will mark a significant step in the progress of that country, where about nine-tenths of the population live wholly or mainly by agriculture. Russia may develop into one of the most stable of nations because its people have their feet on the ground, their own ground.

1 See page 366.
152. The Labor Movement

The craft guilds, which modern Europe inherited from the Middle Ages, gradually became obsolete after the Industrial Revolution. They were out of place in a world of whirling machinery, crowded factories, free competition, and the separation of labor and capital. Few of them in Great Britain survived the eighteenth century. In France it required a decree of the National Assembly to end their existence. Those in Germany did not completely disappear until late in the nineteenth century.

As contrasted with craft guilds, trade unions are combinations of wage-earners to maintain or improve the conditions under which they labor. These associations began to appear in Great Britain between 1700 and 1800, especially after the domestic system gave way to the factory system. Under the new conditions of industry, an employer could not know many of his employees personally; their relations, henceforth, tended to become cold-blooded and impersonal. At the same time, the workers in any one establishment or trade, being thrown more closely together, came to realize their common interests and to appreciate the need for organization.

The unions immediately encountered opposition. The Common Law treated them as conspiracies in restraint of trade and hence as illegal. Moreover, the employers used their influence in Parliament to secure the passage of a long series of acts designed to prevent what were styled "unlawful combinations of workmen." The last of these acts, passed in 1800, even provided the penalty of imprisonment at hard labor for persons who combined with others to raise wages, shorten hours, or in any way control the conditions of industry.

Agitation by trade-union leaders induced Parliament in 1825 to repeal all the Combination Acts and to replace them by a new and more liberal statute. Laborers might now lawfully meet together for the purpose of agreeing on the rate of wages or the number of hours which
they would work, as long as the agreement concerned only those who were present at the meeting. This qualification was removed a number of years later. Finally, the Trade Union Act of 1875 declared that nothing done by a group of laborers should be considered illegal unless it was also illegal when done by a single person. The act thus gave the working classes the full right of combination for which they had long been striving. It has been called the Magna Carta of trade unionism.

The trade unions of Great Britain have made much progress within recent years. In 1914 they enrolled nearly four million members, including factory operatives, railway workers, coal miners, and agricultural laborers. They send their representatives to Parliament and exercise great influence on labor legislation. Their officers also frequently serve as factory inspectors. Many unions enjoy a considerable income, which goes to support members who are temporarily out of work, sick, disabled, or infirm. Where the unions control an industry and can dictate terms of employment, they often practice limitation of output, that is, restrict what each worker does to less than he is capable of doing. The purpose of this is to prevent overdriving by employers and at the same time to create as many jobs as possible for trade unionists.

Trade unions exist in France, Germany, Austria, Italy, and other Continental countries. They are modeled upon the British organizations, but do not equal them in numbers, wealth, or influence. Many have a political character, being closely connected with socialist parties. In general, Continental workingmen rely for improvement in their condition rather upon State action than upon collective bargaining with their employers.

The organization of American trade unions began early in the nineteenth century, but their great and rapid growth has taken place since the Civil War. Probably about fifteen per cent of the male wage-earners belong to them. While this may seem a small proportion, it must be remembered that their membership consists chiefly
of skilled laborers. Most of the trade unions are affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, which was founded in 1886.

The coöperative movement also started in Great Britain. There are in that country a large number of societies, open to workingmen on the payment of a small fee, and selling goods to members at prices considerably lower than those charged by private concerns. Members share in the profits in accordance with the amount of their purchases. The success of coöperation in retailing has brought about its extension to wholesaling and even to manufacturing and banking. Similar societies are numerous on the Continent. They have made little headway in the United States, with such conspicuous exceptions as mutual life insurance companies and building and loan associations.

153. Government Regulation of Industry

Improvement in the lot of the working classes has taken place not only through the activities of trade unions, coöperative societies, and other voluntary associations, but also by legislation. The need for government regulation of industry very soon became apparent. The crowded factories were unsanitary. Hours of labor were too long. Wages were on the starvation level. Furthermore, the use of machinery encouraged the employment of women and children, for whose labor there had been previously little demand outside the home. Their excessive toil amid unhealthy surroundings often developed disease and deformity or brought premature death. Much excuse existed for the passionate words of one reformer that the slave trade was "mercy compared to the factory system."

These evils were naturally most prominent in Great Britain, where the Industrial Revolution began. Little effort was made at first to remedy them. The working classes exercised no political influence; indeed, by the Combination Acts they had been prohibited from forming trade unions for their protection. Statesmen, instead of meeting the situation by remedial legislation, adopted the
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laissez-faire, or "let-alone" policy. The government, they declared, should keep its hands off industry. The greatest good to the greatest number could only be secured when "economic laws" of supply and demand were allowed to determine the wages and conditions of employment, just as they determined the prices, quantity, and quality of commodities produced.

"Let alone" naturally became the watchword of selfish employers, to whose avarice and cruelty it gave full rein. Yet there were also humane employers who felt that the State ought to protect those who could not protect themselves. One was Sir Robert Peel, father of the distinguished statesman of the same name. He succeeded in securing the enactment of the first British factory act (1802). It prohibited the binding-out for labor of pauper children under nine years of age, restricted their working hours to twelve a day, and forbade night work. This measure applied only to cotton factories. Little more was done for thirty-one years. During this time several philanthropists, among whom Lord Ashley, afterwards earl of Shaftesbury, had the greatest influence, took up the cause of the oppressed workers and on the floor of Parliament, on the platform, in the pulpit, and in the newspapers waged a campaign to arouse the public to the need for additional legislation. The result was the passage in 1833 of an act which applied to all textile factories and provided for their regular inspection by public officials. In 1842 Lord

---

1 See pages 143-144.
2 See page 483.
3 Read Mrs. Browning's *The Cry of the Children*. 
Ashley, whose life was devoted to philanthropy and social reform, carried through Parliament an act forbidding the employment in mines of women and children. Five years later Parliament took the still more radical step of passing the Ten-Hour Act, which limited the labor of women and children in textile factories to ten hours a day. This measure became a law only after the fiercest opposition on the part of manufacturers, but it proved so beneficial that henceforth the desirability of factory legislation was generally admitted.

Government regulation of industry now began to become a reality. Mines, bakeries, laundries, docks, retail and wholesale shops, and many other establishments were gradually brought under control. At the present time the State restricts the employment of children so that they may not be deprived of an education. It limits the hours of labor, not only of children and women in most industries, but also of men in mines and factories. It requires employers to install safety appliances in their plants and to take all other precautions necessary for the preservation of the lives, limbs, and health of their employees. Recent legislation provides for the establishment of wage boards in certain "sweated" trades, where men and women work long hours for starvation pay. These boards, representing employees, employers, and the government, have power to fix a minimum wage — the lowest wage consistent with health and efficiency — and to forbid the payment of anything less, except to apprentices. The principle of the minimum wage has also been extended to miners and agricultural laborers. The government supports employment bureaus or labor exchanges, in order that the idle may find work. A national insurance act, effective since 1912, provides for the compulsory insurance of nearly all employees against sickness and loss of employment. An old-age pension law passed in 1908 gives British subjects who have reached seventy years of age and who receive an income not exceeding £31, 10d. (about $150) a year, a maximum pension of 5s. (about $1.25) weekly. It is now proposed that every citizen of the United Kingdom, irrespective of his income,
shall be qualified to draw a pension of 10s. a week, upon reaching the required age.

The labor legislation of France, Belgium, Holland, Austria, and the Scandinavian states compares favorably with that of Great Britain. In no Continental country has it gone farther than in Germany. Bismarck gave it his powerful support, in order to check the spread of socialism. Germany has laws establishing a maximum number of working hours, limiting child and female labor, and providing a system of workingmen's insurance against accidents, sickness, incapacity, and old age. These laws now affect as many as twenty million people, or a third of the German population.

The need for labor legislation has been felt less acutely in the United States than in Europe. One reason for this is the fact that American workingmen enjoy higher wages and better conditions of employment than workingmen abroad. Another reason is found in the comparatively late development of the factory system in the United States. Labor laws, when passed, are often declared unconstitutional by state and federal courts, as interfering with freedom of contract or as being class legislation. In spite of this obstacle, the movement for the legal protection of labor has made much progress within recent years, especially in New England and the states of the Middle West.

The youthful commonwealths of Australia and New Zealand, unhampered by tradition, are trying a number of interesting experiments in government regulation of industry. Both countries give compensation to workingmen injured by accidents and old-age pensions to poor people. New Zealand, in addition, provides fire, life, and accident insurance, conducts postal savings banks, rents model homes to workingmen, and makes arbitration of labor disputes compulsory, in order to do away with strikes. If it turns out that under such paternalism more people are free and happy than under the individualism which prevails in the United States and even in Great Britain, then Australia and New
Zealand will have set an example to the rest of the world; if it is found that too much public regulation cramps private enterprise and takes away the incentive to industry, they will have warned the rest of the world off a dangerous course. But all this legislation is too recent for final judgment to be pronounced upon it.

There has been a growing movement within recent years to secure concerted action by the various nations in the interest of the working classes. The movement received official recognition at the Peace Conference in 1919. The Peace Treaty with Germany establishes a permanent International Labor Office, under the League of Nations, and provides for annual international labor conferences to discuss needed legislation and recommend it to the different governments. The first conference met at Washington in 1919; the second will meet at Geneva in 1920. Like the League of Nations of which it forms a part, this new labor machinery has only begun to function, but it promises to become an agency of enormous usefulness.

The Peace Conference also incorporated in the Peace Treaty a set of nine principles for regulating labor conditions. The principles may be summarized as follows:

1. Labor not to be regarded merely as a commodity or article of commerce; (2) Right of association for all purposes by the employed as well as by the employers; (3) Payment of a wage adequate to maintain a reasonable standard of life; (4) Adoption of an eight-hour day or a forty-eight hour week; (5) Adoption of a weekly day of rest, which should include Sunday wherever practicable; (6) Abolition of child labor, and such restrictions on the labor of young persons as shall insure their education and proper physical development; (7) Equal remuneration of men and women for work of equal value; (8) Equitable treatment of all workers in each country; (9) Enforcement of all laws and regulations for the protection of the employed. "Without claiming that these methods and principles are either complete or final, the High Contracting Parties are of opinion that they are well
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fitted to guide the policy of the League of Nations; and that, if adopted by the industrial communities who are members of the League, and safeguarded in practice by an adequate system of inspection, they will confer lasting benefits upon the wage earners of the world."

164. Public Ownership

The modern State, in all civilized countries, does many things which private individuals themselves did during the Middle Ages. The State maintains an army and navy, administers justice, provides a police system, and furnishes public education. No one now questions either the need or the desirability of such activities. As we have just learned, the State also subjects private industry to ever-increasing regulation for the benefit of the less fortunate members of society. Furthermore, it engages in a variety of industrial undertakings.

Governments sometimes monopolize different branches of business for financial reasons—to raise a revenue. Examples are the tobacco monopoly of France and the salt monopoly of Saxony. Moral considerations may combine with financial reasons, as illustrated by the public monopoly of the manufacture of alcoholic liquors in Switzerland and in Russia (before 1914). The post office is always in government hands, not so much for revenue as for the furtherance of cheap communication between different parts of the country. In Great Britain and on the Continent telegraphs and telephones are managed by the government in connection with the post office, and the government parcel post does all the business which in the United States is partly absorbed by private express companies. Coinage is everywhere a public function, as well as banking in most European countries. In the United States banks are private institutions under state or national regulation. Germany and Russia have public forests; Prussia has public mines; and France has a number of canals belonging to the government.
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On the Continent (Belgium, Switzerland, Italy, Germany, Austria, Russia) railroads are mostly State-owned and State-managed. Nearly all the French lines are privately owned, but they will revert to the government upon the expiration of their franchises. Great Britain and the United States took over their railroads for military purposes during the World War. The American lines, together with the express companies, were returned to private ownership in 1920. In Australia the government built the principal railroads and now owns and operates all of them.

Both British and Continental cities generally own and operate such public utilities as street railways, gas and electric lighting plants, and waterworks. Markets, slaughter houses, baths, pawn shops, docks, and harbor improvements are likewise often municipal monopolies. In the United States municipal ownership has been common in the case of waterworks, somewhat less common in the case of electric lighting plants, rare in that of gas plants, and scarcely known in that of street railways. Since free competition cannot prevail in these industries, the only choice is between municipal ownership or private ownership subject to municipal regulation of charges and service.

It must now be obvious that the laissez-faire policy finds few adherents at the present time. The modern State assumes vastly more duties than the three to which Adam Smith proposed to limit it. Defense against external aggression, preservation of internal order, and the maintenance of a few public institutions do not exhaust the responsibilities of the State, as these are conceived to-day. The reaction against laissez-faire has been very marked since 1871, one reason being the success of Germany in public regulation and ownership. Continental countries go further in the way of "socialistic" legislation than either Great Britain or the United States, because the Continental peoples have been accustomed to paternal rule for centuries. But as Australia and New Zealand show, even English-speaking peoples.

1 See page 144.
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tend to abandon that system of "natural liberty" which, in Adam Smith's words, leaves every man "perfectly free to pursue his own interest in his own way, and to bring both his industry and capital into competition with those of any other man or order of men."

155. Socialism

Contemporary socialists unite in making the following demands. First, the State shall own and operate the instruments of production, that is, land and capital. Under this arrangement rent, interest, and profits, as sources of personal income, would disappear, and private property would consist simply of one's own clothing, household goods, money, and perhaps a house and a garden plot. Second, the leisure class shall be eliminated by requiring everybody to perform useful labor, either physical or mental. Third, the income of the State shall be distributed as wages and salaries among the workers, according to some fairer principle than obtains at present.

Socialism, thus explained, is not identical with public ownership of railroads, telegraphs, telephones, the postal service, and other utilities. There is still a leisure class and there are still personal incomes in those countries which have gone farthest in the direction of public ownership. Similarly, labor legislation is not properly described as socialistic, since it fails to abolish private property, the factory system, and rent, interest, and profits.

Socialism is, in part, an outcome of the Industrial Revolution, which completed the separation of capital and labor. The gulf between the capitalists and the landless, propertyless, wage-earning proletariat became wider, the contrasts between rich and poor became sharper, than ever before. Vastly more wealth was now produced than in earlier ages, but it was still unequally distributed. The few had too much; the many had too little. Radical reformers, distressed by these inequalities and dissatisfied with the slow progress of the labor movement and
government regulation of industry, began to proclaim the necessity of a wholesale reconstruction of society.

In Great Britain the most prominent of these early radicals was Robert Owen, a rich manufacturer and philanthropist, who did much to improve the conditions of life for his employees. Among his innovations were coöperative shops, where workmen could buy good things cheaply and divide the profits between them. This principle of coöperative distribution has subsequently attained great success in England, and Owen deserves credit as its originator. He also advocated coöperation in production. His special remedy for social ills was the establishment of small coöperative communities, each one living by itself on a tract of land and producing in common everything needed for its support. He thought that this arrangement would retain the economic advantages of the great inventions without introducing the factory system. Owen's experiments in coöperation all failed, including the one which he established at New Harmony, Indiana, in 1825. Owen thus belongs in the class of Utopian socialists, men who dreamed of ideal social systems which were never realized.

Socialism is also, in part, an outcome of the French Revolution. That upheaval destroyed so many time-hallowed institutions and created so many new ones that it gave a great impetus to schemes for the regeneration of society.

1 See page 404.

2 A name derived from Sir Thomas More's Utopia. The word "socialism" was probably coined by Owen.
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French radical thinkers soon set out to purge the world of capitalism as their fathers had purged it of feudalism. Their ideas began to become popular with workingmen after the factory system, with its attendant evils, gained an entrance into France.

The workers found a leader in Louis Blanc, a journalist and author of wide popularity. The revolution of 1789, he declared, had benefited the peasants; that of 1830 the capitalists or bourgeoisie; the next must be for the benefit of the proletariat. Blanc believed that every man had an inalienable right to remunerative employment — the droit au travail. To provide it, he proposed that the State should furnish the capital for national workshops. These were to be managed by the operatives themselves, who would divide the profits of the industry between them and thus eliminate capitalists altogether. Blanc's ideas triumphed for a time in the "February Revolution" of 1848, which had been brought about by the Parisian proletariat. The second French Republic expressly recognized the "right to labor," set up the national workshops, and promised two francs a day to every registered workingman. Crowds came from every part of France to take advantage of the offer, and before long there were 120,000 additional laborers in the capital, with nothing to do but plant "trees of liberty" in rows. The drain upon the treasury and the demoralization of the people by this State charity soon led the government to abandon the entire scheme. The result was a popular uprising only crushed by military force. It should be said in justice to Blanc that the government appears to have purposely mismanaged the national workshops, in order to discredit the socialistic movement in France.

Meanwhile, a new socialism, more systematic and practical than the old, began to be developed by German thinkers. Its chief representative was Karl Marx. His parents were well-to-do Jews who had embraced Christianity. Marx as a young man studied at several German universities and received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.
Becoming interested in economic subjects, he founded a socialist newspaper to advocate the cause of the working classes. The government suppressed it, after the failure of the revolutionary movement of 1848–1849, and expelled Marx from Germany. He went to London and lived there in exile for the rest of his days, finding time, in the midst of a hard struggle for existence, to write his famous work, *Das Kapital*. It has a place beside Rousseau’s *Social Contract* and Smith’s *Wealth of Nations* among the books which have profoundly influenced human thought and action.

Marx felt little sympathy with Utopian schemes to make over society and described them sarcastically as “duodecimo editions of the New Jerusalem.” In opposition to Owen, Blanc, and other earlier socialists, he sought to build up a system of socialism based on economic principles. Put in its simplest form, Marxism asserts that, while labor is the source of all value, laborers receive, in fact, only a fraction of what they produce. All the rest goes to the capitalistic bourgeoisie, or middle class, who produce nothing. Capitalism, however, is the inevitable result of the factory system. Like feudalism, it forms a stage, a necessary stage, in the development of mankind. It is fated to disappear with the progress of democracy, which, by giving the proletariat the vote, will enable them to displace the bourgeoisie, take production into their own hands, and peacefully inaugurate the socialist state.

---

1 The first volume of *Das Kapital* appeared in 1867. The second and third volumes were not published until after Marx’s death.
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The socialistic ideas of Marx are more briefly and popularly set forth in the *Communist Manifesto*, which he and his associate Friedrich Engels put forth in the revolutionary year of 1848. It demanded, among other things, abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes, a heavy, progressive income tax, abolition of the right of inheritance, centralization of credit in the hands of the State by means of a national bank with an exclusive monopoly, State ownership of the means of communication and transport, State ownership of factories and other instruments of production, national cultivation of the soil, and compulsory labor for all. The conclusion of the *Communist Manifesto* is frequently quoted by socialists: "The proletarians have nothing to lose except their chains. They have a world to gain. Workingmen of all lands, unite!"

During the 'seventies of the last century the co-workers of Marx in Germany founded the Social Democratic Party.\(^1\) The government, under Bismarck's leadership, tried to repress it by prohibiting meetings of socialists and the circulation of socialist literature. Any effort to propagate socialist doctrine was made punishable by fines and imprisonment. The police were also authorized to deport all suspected persons. Persecution failed to check the socialist movement, which has grown phenomenally in recent years. The socialist vote for members of the Reichstag reached a total of 4,250,000 in 1912. Three-fourths of these votes were not cast by members of the Social Democratic Party, however, but by German liberals who wanted to protest as effectively as possible against autocracy and militarism.

The Social Democratic Party provided a model for similar organizations of Marxian socialists in Great Britain, France, Italy, Austria, Russia, and the other European countries, as well as in the United States, Australia, and Japan. Congresses of delegates from the national parties have been held from time to time, in order

\(^1\) See page 348.
to bring together the working classes of every land. In 1914
the socialists throughout the world polled about eleven million
votes and elected over seven hundred representatives to the
various parliaments.

Not all contemporary socialists rely on orderly and legal
means to abolish capitalism. A large group of extreme social-
ists would use violence and terrorism in the sup-
posed interest of the proletariat. France has re-
cently had to cope with the movement called syndicalism.¹
Its adherents contend that the road to the socialist millenium
does not lie in parliamentary activity, necessarily slow and
uncertain, but in “direct action,” by which they mean coercion
of employers. The syndicalists aim to combine all the small
labor unions, each representing a single craft, into one big
union, which would comprise both skilled and unskilled workers.
For example, all the men engaged in railroad transport would
form a single body; similarly, all those in the building trade,
from carpenters and painters to iron-workers and steam-
fitters. A mammoth organization of this sort could then
carry on the war between labor and capital by means of general
strikes embracing the entire industry. The syndicalists also
propose to continue the class struggle by means of “sabotage,”²
or the practice of injuring machinery, spoiling materials, and
loafing on the job. “Poor work for poor pay” is a syndicalist
motto. The methods of the syndicalists have been advocated
and adopted in the United States by the Industrial Workers
of the World.

156. Poverty and Progress

No one conversant with social conditions in large cities can
deny the existence there of very many people below or scarcely
above the poverty line. An English investigator
found thirty per cent of the inhabitants of London
so wretchedly housed, clothed, warmed, and fed that their
health and physical efficiency as workers was seriously impaired.

¹ From the French syndicat, a trade union.
² From the French sabot, a wooden shoe.
The results showed themselves in the high death rate of young and old and their marked inferiority in height, weight, and physical condition. What is true of London is doubtless true of other industrial centers in Europe, and, to a less extent, in the United States. Despite all the wonderful inventions and scientific discoveries which have so increased the productive powers of man, there are still millions of human beings in the Christian world who lead lives of grinding toil, without an income sufficient for their barest needs.

Socialists allege that poverty is caused by the unequal and inequitable distribution of wealth under the present economic organization of society. The truth is that no single condition — over-population, property in land, competition, the factory system — explains poverty, for each one has been absent in previous social stages. No people live more poorly than savages, who are few in numbers and ignorant of property in land. And, as previously noticed,¹ such industrially backward countries as Russia, India, and China are the countries where poverty is most bitter and widespread. It is quite certain, furthermore, that poverty in the older industrial regions of western Europe has steadily declined during the last one hundred and fifty years. Some socialists now recognize this fact, though still maintaining that the workman fails to secure his fair share of the increased wealth of the world. The causes of poverty are as complex as modern life, some being due to faults of personal character or physical and mental defects, and others being produced by lack of education, bad surroundings, corrupt or inefficient government, and economic conditions which result in lack of employment, high cost of living, monopolies, and the like.

Since there is no single cause of poverty, there can be no single remedy for it. Putting aside socialism as impracticable, one may still look forward confidently to the prevention of much poverty by trade-union activity, by government regulation of industry (including old-age pensions, State insurance against sickness and disability,

¹ See page 475.
protection against non-employment, and the minimum wage), by education of the unskilled, by improved housing, and by all the agencies and methods of private philanthropy.

The progress of the so-called "lower classes" since the Industrial Revolution leads modern economists and statesmen to anticipate the complete abolition of poverty, at least all suffering from hunger, cold, and nakedness, in those countries which have already abolished slavery and serfdom. Indeed, with the increase of wages, the growing demand for intelligent work, and the spread of popular education, skilled laborers have multiplied so rapidly as to outnumber those whose labor is entirely unskilled; they belong no longer to the "lower classes," but already live better than did the majority of the upper classes before the Industrial Revolution. As Mr. Lloyd George has said, the time draws near "when poverty with its wretchedness and squalor will be as remote from the people as the wolves which once infested the forests."

The evils of modern industrialism, though real, have been exaggerated. They are and were the evils accompanying the transition from one stage of society to another. Few would wish now to retrace their steps to an age when there were no factories, no railroads, and no great mechanical inventions. Machinery now does much of the roughest and hardest work and, by saving human labor, makes it possible to shorten hours of toil. The world's workers, in consequence, have opportunities for recreation and education previously denied them. After one hundred and fifty years of modern industrialism, we begin to see that, besides helping to produce political democracy, it is also creating economic democracy. It is gradually diffusing the necessaries and comforts, and even many of the luxuries of life, among all peoples in all lands.

Studies

1. Explain what is meant by the following: (a) bimetallism; (b) crises; (c) protectionism; (d) contraband of war; (e) peasant proprietorships; (f) minimum wage; and (g) capitalism. 2. Show how modern commerce has been facilitated by the submarine cable, wireless telegraphy, the postal system, and marine insurance, or underwriting. 3. Mention some of the most important articles of commerce and
the countries where they are chiefly produced. 4. Why should there be an international or world price for such commodities as wheat and cotton? 5. How has the construction of the Suez and Panama canals affected oceanic trade routes? 6. Mention all the kinds of insurance (other than life insurance) familiar to you. 7. Distinguish a commercial bank from a savings bank and from a trust company. 8. When and why was there a "free silver" agitation in the United States? 9. Why did Great Britain adopt a free-trade policy? Why does she maintain it, when other nations follow a policy of protection? 10. What are the effects of smuggling or evasion of customs duties, on (a) the public revenue, (b) honest merchants, and (c) consumers? 11. Enumerate the clauses of the Declaration of Paris and explain their significance. 12. Account for the development of landlordism in Great Britain. 13. Comment on some of the social effects of peasant proprietorships. 14. Compare the modern trade union with the medieval craft guild. 15. What criticisms are sometimes leveled at trade unions? Discuss their justification. 16. Why must labor legislation, to become entirely effective, be international in scope? 17. What instances of state and municipal ownership in this country are familiar to you? 18. Distinguish (a) between socialism and anarchism and (b) between socialism and democracy. 19. Is it true, as Marx asserted, that labor is the source of all value? 20. Mention some of the probable advantages and some of the probable disadvantages of the socialist state. 21. Compare as to purposes and results the charity of the Middle Ages with the organized charity of to-day. 22. "The growth of large cities constitutes perhaps the greatest of all the problems of modern civilization." Comment on this statement.
CHAPTER XXII
MODERN CIVILIZATION

157. Internationalism

The world, which seemed so large to our forefathers, to us seems very small and compact. Railroads, steamships, and airplanes bind the nations together, and the telegraph, the submarine cable, and the "wireless" keep them in constant communication. The oceans, no longer barriers, serve as highways uniting East and West, Orient and Occident. Commerce and finance are international; capital finds investment in foreign countries as readily as at home; and trade unionism, labor legislation, and socialism become common to all the world. National isolation disappears as ideas and ideals tour the globe.

Everywhere people build the same houses, use the same furniture, and eat the same food. Everywhere they enjoy the same amusements and distractions: concerts, "moving pictures," the theater, clubs, magazines, automobiles. They also dress alike. Powder, gold lace, wigs, pigtails, three-cornered hats, knee breeches, silk stockings, and silver-buckled shoes passed away in revolutionary France with the other follies of the Old Régime, and the loose coat and long trousers of the working classes became the accepted style for men’s apparel, not only in France, but eventually in all civilized countries. Women’s apparel still changes year by year, but the new fashions, emanating from Paris, London, or New York, are speedily copied in Petrograd, Melbourne, and Tokio.

The inconveniences resulting from the diversity of languages were never greater than to-day, when travel is a general habit and when nations read one another’s books and profit by one
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another's discoveries and inventions. The internationalism of modern literature, science, philosophy, and art demands an international medium of expression. Latin was the speech of learned men in Europe throughout the Middle Ages, and French has been the speech of polite society and diplomacy for more than two centuries. What is needed, however, is a universal language, which can be readily mastered by any one. Crude attempts at such a language have already appeared in Volapük and Esperanto, but a really satisfactory artificial idiom remains to be created.

Meanwhile, the spread of English-speaking peoples throughout the globe seems destined to make English, in some sort, a universal language. It is now used by 175 million people, either as their mother language or as an acquired tongue. Those using Russian are estimated at 100 millions, German, 80 millions, Spanish, 50 millions, and French, 40 millions. The simple grammar and cosmopolitan vocabulary of English adapt it to an international rôle. In spite of an often arbitrary spelling and pronunciation, it is more easily learned than any other of the great languages of the world.

The idea of a universal exposition, to which all countries should send their art treasures or the marvels of their industry, first took shape in the Crystal Palace Exhibition (London, 1851). Since then European expositions have been numerous, each one larger than its predecessor. The Universal Exhibition (Paris, 1900) attracted 51,000,000 visitors. The United States began with the Philadelphia Centennial of 1876. This was followed by the World's Fair at Chicago in 1893 and by the more recent expositions at St. Louis and San Francisco.

World congresses are constantly being held to deal with such matters of common interest as the metric system of weights and measures, monetary standards, protection of patents and copyrights, improvement in the condition of the working

1 United Kingdom, 45,000,000; Canada and Australia, 12,000,000; British Africa, 5,000,000; British India and other possessions, 3,000,000; the United States, 110,000,000
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classes, advancement of social reform, woman's suffrage, and the establishment of universal peace. Two thousand such gatherings took place in the half century immediately preceding the World War. Some of them have resulted in the formation of permanent organizations such as the Red Cross Society (1864)\(^1\) and the Postal Union (1874).\(^2\) Frequent meetings of distinguished scholars and men of letters from the different countries also help to produce what has been well called the "international mind."

Increased intercourse between civilized peoples not only broadens their outlook but also widens their sympathies. Feelings of human brotherhood, once limited to the members of one's clan, tribe, city, or state, expand to include all mankind. There develops an "international conscience," which emphasizes the obligations of the strong toward the weak and protests against the oppression of any members of the world community by any others. Let us consider some of its manifestations during the past century.

158. Social Betterment

Little more than one hundred years ago the slave trade was generally regarded as a legitimate business. Hardly any one thought it wrong to kidnap or purchase African negroes, pack them on shipboard, where many died in the stifling holds, and carry them to the West Indies or the American mainland to be sold as slaves. No voice was raised in protest when Great Britain, by the Peace of Utrecht, secured the right to ship annually for thirty years forty-eight hundred slaves to the Spanish colonies in America, thus becoming the chief slave-trading nation in the world. It is estimated that by the close of the eighteenth century more than three million negroes were brought to the New World and that at least a quarter of a million more perished on the way thither. The Quakers early opposed this shameful

\(^{1}\) See page 517.  \(^{2}\) See page 471.
practice, and after the great religious revival of Wesley\(^1\) they were joined by the Methodists, and, indeed, by all enlightened and humane people. Finally, in 1807, Parliament prohibited Englishmen from engaging in the slave trade.\(^2\) The Congress of Vienna, to its credit, pronounced against the traffic which had so long desolated Africa and degraded Europe, and in subsequent years the Continental nations, one after another, agreed that it should no longer enjoy the protection of their flags. Since the last decade of the nineteenth century the European powers have also taken concerted measures to stamp out what remains of the slave trade in the interior of the Dark Continent.

Slavery had all but died out in Christian lands by the close of the Middle Ages. It revived, on a much larger scale, after the era of geographical discovery, which opened Abolition up Africa as a source of slaves and America as a field for their profitable employment. The French revolutionists abolished slavery in the colonies of France, but Napoleon restored it. Great Britain in 1833 passed an act to free the slaves in the British West Indies, paying one hundred million dollars to their former masters as compensation. This abolition of slavery, as well as of the slave trade, is a monument to the humanitarian labors of William Wilberforce, who for nearly half a century devoted his wealth, his energies, and his powerful oratory to the cause of the oppressed negroes. Within the next thirty years slavery peacefully disappeared in the colonial possessions of France, Portugal, and Holland, but in the United States only at the cost of civil war. Brazil, in 1888, was the last Christian state to put an end to slavery.

The penal code of eighteenth-century Europe must be described as barbarous. Torture of an accused person, in order to obtain a confession, usually preceded his trial. The old penal code forbade its use. Prisons were private property, and the in-

---

1 See page 141.
2 The United States, under one of the clauses of the Constitution (Article I, Section 9) tolerated the importation of negro slaves until 1808.
mates, whether innocent or guilty, had to pay their keeper for food and other necessaries. Men, women, and children were herded together, the hardened criminals with the first offenders. Branding, flogging, and exposure in the pillory formed common punishments. Death was the punishment for murder, arson, burglary, horse-stealing, theft, forgery, counterfeiting, and many other crimes. The British code included over two hundred capital offenses. A man (or a woman) might be hanged for stealing as little as five shillings from a shop or for picking a pocket to the value of a single shilling. Transportation to America or to Australia was often substituted, however, for the death penalty. Executions took place in public, on the mistaken theory that to see them would deter from crime.

The great name in penal reform is that of the Italian Beccaria, whose *Essay on Crimes and Punishments* appeared in 1764. It bore early fruit in the general abolition of torture and of such ferocious punishments as burning alive, breaking on the wheel, and drawing and quartering. Penal reform in France was hastened by the
Revolution. Great Britain from about 1815 began to reduce the number of capital offenses, until only high treason, piracy, and murder remained. One consequence of the reform was a striking diminution of crime, though judges and other conservative persons had predicted just the reverse. Capital punishment has now been abolished by several European countries, including Italy, Portugal, Holland, Norway, and Rumania. A few American states do not inflict the death penalty.

Prison reform accompanied the reform of the criminal code. One of the leaders of this humanitarian movement was a Quakeress, Mrs. Elizabeth Fry. Not content with Great Britain as a field for labor, she extended her efforts to all the principal European countries. Much has been done within the past century to improve sanitary conditions in prisons, to abolish the lock-step, striped clothing, and other humiliating practices in the treatment of prisoners, and, by means of juvenile courts and reformatories, to separate first offenders from hardened criminals. Even as regards the latter, the idea is now to make confinement less a punishment than a means of developing the convict’s self-respect and manhood, so that he may return to free life a useful member of society. Prison reform in the various countries has been much advanced by international congresses. The last took place in 1910, twenty-eight states being represented at the meeting.

The modern attitude toward the feeble-minded and the insane contrasts sharply with earlier ideas concerning them. Mentally defective persons are no longer regarded with amusement or contempt, but are rather considered as pitiful victims of heredity or of circumstances for which they were not responsible. Every civilized country now
provides asylums for their proper care under medical supervision. There are also special schools for the benefit of the blind and of the deaf and dumb.

An increasing sympathy with the brute creation also characterizes our age. The British Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was founded only in 1824. Ten years later Parliament did away with bull baiting and cock fighting, which had long been favorite amusements of the lower classes, and prohibited cruelty to all domestic animals. Similar legislation has been enacted on the Continent, as well as in the United States.

The crusade against alcoholism further illustrates humanitarian progress. The use of intoxicants, formerly uncondemned, more and more comes under moral reprobation, as it is realized that they form one of the most potent agencies of man's degeneration. The World War led Russia to abolish the government monopoly of vodka and other countries to restrict the consumption of alcoholic liquors. In 1919 Norway and Belgium adopted partial prohibition (excluding beer and light wines), while Finland declared for unlimited prohibition. Abolition of the liquor traffic in the United States was long agitated by private organizations, such as the Women's Christian Temperance Union (under the presidency of Miss Frances E. Willard) and more recently by the Anti-Saloon League. Maine adopted legal prohibition in 1884. Many states in the Middle West and the South subsequently took the same action. Prohibition sentiment became at length so strong that a constitutional amendment, forbidding the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors throughout the country, was ratified by more than three-fourths of the state legisla-
tures by January 16, 1919. This Eighteenth Amendment went into effect one year after ratification.

Efforts to relieve poverty and suffering have given rise to charity organization societies, Philanthropic agencies for improving the condition of the poor, dispensaries, anti-tuberculosis leagues, fresh-air funds, and numerous other philanthropic agencies in both Europe and America. The Salvation Army was started in Great Britain by William Booth, a Methodist minister, with the idea of bettering both the physical and spiritual condition of those who are not reached by other religious bodies. Since its foundation in 1878 the Salvation Army has spread to the United States and other countries. The Young Men's Christian Association also arose in Great Britain, but the Y. M. C. A. is now well known all over the world.

The Red Cross owes its inspiration to a young Swiss, Henri Dunant, The Red Cross who had witnessed the bloody battle of Solferino in the Austro-Sardinian War,¹ and whose experience prompted him to urge the formation of relief societies for the care of sick and wounded soldiers. The result was an international gathering at Geneva in

¹ See page 258.
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1864 and the framing of an agreement to alleviate the horrors of modern warfare. The ten states which originally ratified the Geneva Convention have since been joined by practically all civilized powers. To carry out the convention the International Red Cross Society was formed, with headquarters at Geneva and branches in the various countries. Henri Dunant's name is scarcely known to-day, but the organization which he did most to found has now become a world-wide institution for the relief of all suffering, whether caused by war or by pestilence, floods, fire, or other calamities. It is the greatest single agency at work for the amelioration of mankind.

159. Emancipation of Women and Children

Woman's position in Europe a century ago was what it had been in the Middle Ages—a position of dependence on man. She received little or no education, seldom engaged in anything but housework, and for support relied on husband, father, or brother. After marriage she became subject to her husband. In Great Britain she could neither make a will nor enter into a contract without his consent. All her possessions belonged to him. Any money that she earned or inherited was his and might be taken to pay his debts. The law even deprived her of control over her own children. Similar disabilities rested upon Continental women.

The humanitarian sentiment evoked by the French Revolution began by freeing slave and serf, but presently demanded the emancipation of woman also. The demand received a powerful impetus from the Industrial Revolution, which opened new employments to woman outside the home and thus lessened her economic dependence on man. The agitation for woman's rights has so far succeeded that most civilized countries now permit her to own property, engage in business, and enter the professions on her own account. Her educational opportunities have also steadily widened.
Mary Lyon, who in 1837 opened the Mount Holyoke Female Seminary near South Hadley, Massachusetts, became the pioneer of higher education for women in this country. Oberlin College (1833) was the first private institution and the University of Iowa (1856) was the first state university to adopt co-education. The higher educational institutions of Great Britain, France, Italy, and most other European countries permit women to hear lectures and to receive degrees on the same terms as men.

Woman suffrage scored its first victories in Scandinavia. During the decade before the World War, both Finland and Norway permitted women to vote at general elections. Denmark and Sweden extended voting privileges to women shortly after the outbreak of the war. The women of Holland received full suffrage in 1918, and those of Belgium partial suffrage in 1919. Republican Germany, Austria, Czechoslovakia, and Poland give women the vote. The Equal Franchise Act, passed by the British Parliament in

\[1\] See page 288.
1918, has practically doubled the electorate of the United Kingdom. Australia and New Zealand also have woman suffrage.

As far back as 1869, when the Fifteenth Amendment to the Constitution, granting suffrage to negroes, was before Congress, Miss Susan B. Anthony and her associates appealed to the legislators for the recognition of women as well. The appeal was denied. The women then organized the National Woman Suffrage Association and began a campaign of education to convince thinking people of the justice of their cause. Years passed without much apparent progress being made. Wyoming, when admitted to statehood in 1892, gave the ballot to women, and by 1918 fourteen other states had done the same. Finally, the constitutional amendment for woman suffrage (sometimes called the "Susan B. Anthony Amendment"), which had been constantly before Congress for forty years, received the approval of that body and went to the country, with every prospect of speedy ratification by three-fourths of the states. With its ratification the United States will have established complete political democracy.

The divorce laws of the Christian world exhibit a bewildering variety. Roman Catholic countries, including Italy and Spain (and Portugal until the recent revolution there), preserve the medieval conception of marriage as a sacrament and therefore do not allow divorce under any circumstances. The same is true of most Latin American states. Countries adhering to the Greek Church allow divorce. Those governed or influenced by the Code Napoléon, in particular, France, Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and Germany, do the same. Divorce was allowed by English law only as late as 1857. It is rare in Great Britain, as well as in Canada. The laws of the United States present no uniformity, some states granting divorce on much easier terms than others. The result has been a very marked annual increase in the number of divorces. In general, modern legislation tends to treat marriage as a civil contract and to permit its dissolution for
immorality, cruelty, desertion, habitual drunkenness, and serious crime, that is, for such behavior of one party to the contract as makes married life impossible or unbearable to the other party.

The decline of the husband's power over his wife has been accompanied by a decline of the father's authority over his children. Among early peoples, the ancient Romans for example, the father's control of his offspring was absolute, and their liberty was often sacrificed to his despotic rule. The Roman idea of family obligations survived in Europe through the Middle Ages and still lingers in Latin countries at the present time. In Anglo-Saxon countries, on the other hand, both law and custom regard the grown-up child as independent of the father. Even his authority over minors is considered mainly in the light of guardianship. This liberal conception of paternal rights bids fair to prevail among all civilized peoples.

160. Popular Education and the Higher Learning

The schools of the Middle Ages were neither public nor free nor secular. All were private schools where pupils paid fees for their tuition, and almost all were founded and conducted by the clergy. As we will remember,¹ the beginnings of popular education reach back to the Reformation era, when elementary schools, supported by general taxation, began to spring up in Germany, Holland, Scotland, and Puritan New England. This free common school system, which it is the glory of the reformers to have established, gradually spread throughout the United States during the nineteenth century and became entirely secular in character. Secondary education was also democratized by the founding of free high schools for both boys and girls. The advance of democratic ideas in Europe has produced a similar movement there in favor of popular education.

British statesmen for a long time looked with disfavor upon

¹ See page 107.
projects for public schools. Education, they thought, unfits
the people for manual labor and nourishes revolutionary ideas.

"If a horse knew as much as a man, I should
not like to be its rider," declared a peer in Parlia-
ment, when voting against an appropriation
for educational purposes. In 1870, after the
passage of the Second Reform Act, which enfranchised the
working classes, the government set up for the first time a
national system of instruction. "We must educate our mas-
ters," it was said. Elementary education in Great Britain is
now free, compulsory, and secular. Many parents, however,
prefers to send their children to private institutions under the
control of the Established Church. The public and private
schools together have well-nigh abolished illiteracy. An im-
portant Education Act, which Parliament passed in 1918,
obligates the government to bear one-half of the total budget
for educational purposes of every local community. All teachers
are put on the civil service pension list. Medical inspection and
treatment, together with careful physical training, are pro-
vided for every child from the time of entering school until
the age of eighteen. This measure also places all private schools
under the control of the State.

The French revolutionists believed with Danton that "next
to bread, education is the first need of the people." They pre-
pared an elaborate scheme for public schools, but
never carried it into effect. Napoleon also aimed
to set up a State system of education through
primary and grammar grades to the lycées, or high schools.
Lack of funds and of experienced lay teachers handicapped the
emperor's efforts, and at the close of the Napoleonic era the
majority of French children still attended private schools con-
ducted by the Church. France waited until the 'eighties of
the last century before securing a truly national system of edu-
cation. This was largely the work of Jules Ferry, one of Gam-
betta's disciples. In recent decades the government has ap-
propriated large sums for educational purposes, and illiteracy is
to-day practically nonexistent.
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Prussia began to reorganize elementary education along modern lines as early as the reign of Frederick the Great and carried the work further after her crushing defeat by Napoleon. The public school movement has made much progress in other Continental countries during recent years. The percentage of illiteracy is still high in Italy and higher still in Spain, Portugal, and the Balkan states, while in Russia most of the peasants are too ignorant to sign their names. With such exceptions, however, Europe now agrees with the United States that at least the rudiments of an education should be the birthright of every child, that common schools are the pillars of democracy.

The United States has done much more than Europe in popularizing the higher learning. The American state university, with its wide curriculum of both liberal and practical subjects, is another nineteenth-century innovation. Previous to its establishment private denominational institutions prepared men for the ministry and a few other learned professions. Several southern states (notably Virginia in 1817) were the first to found universities, but the movement really began with the chartering of the University of Michigan in 1837. State universities, admitting both men and women, are now found in all the American commonwealths south and west of Pennsylvania. Their work is supplemented not only by private colleges and universities, but also by the splendid benefactions associated with the names of Rockefeller and Carnegie. A university education in Europe is still commonly restricted to people of means. There is a growing tendency, especially in Great Britain, to make the higher learning more accessible to poor but ambitious students.

161. Religious Development

Few of us realize how gradually the principle of religious toleration has won acceptance in modern times. At first only certain Protestant sects, such as the Lutherans in Germany

---

1 See page 203.
2 See pages 141–142.
after the Peace of Augsburg and the Huguenots in France after the Edict of Nantes, enjoyed liberty of conscience and worship. Next, the same privileges were granted to all Protestant sects, as in Holland, in England by the Toleration Act, and in the American colonies. Finally, toleration was extended to every one, whether Protestant or Roman Catholic, Christian or non-Christian. The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States provides that Congress shall make no law prohibiting the “free exercise of religion.” The French revolutionists in the Declaration of the Rights of Man also announced that no one should be disturbed on account of his religious opinions, provided he did not thereby trouble public order. The Great Elector and Frederick the Great established toleration in Prussia. It was secured in the rest of Germany and in Austria-Hungary and Italy only during the latter part of the nineteenth century. While Roman Catholicism is the prevailing faith in all the Latin American republics, freedom of worship is commonly permitted by them. It may be said, broadly, that throughout the Christian world the various churches have now abandoned the practice of compulsion in religion. Men of different beliefs have found that they can live peaceably side by side with one another in the same country.

The Church in the Middle Ages controlled, or tried to control, the State, upon the theory that temporal as well as spiritual authority is derived from the pope. The Reformation, in those countries where it succeeded, merely substituted a number of separate national churches for the one Church of Rome. To Roger Williams and William Penn in the seventeenth century belongs the honor of having founded in Rhode Island and Pennsylvania, respectively, the first political communities where religious matters were taken entirely out of the hands of the civil government. The ideas of Williams and Penn found expression in the First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Congress is forbidden to make any law “respecting an establishment of religion.” This means that the
Religious Development

federal government cannot appropriate money for the support of any church. No such restriction binds the several states, but most of their constitutions repeat the federal prohibition. Church and State are absolutely separate in Canada, as well as in Mexico, Brazil, and some of the smaller Latin American countries.

The separation of Church and State prevails in Australia, South Africa, and other parts of the British Empire. The Liberal Party under Gladstone disestablished the Anglican Church in Ireland (1869) and under Lloyd George disestablished it in Wales (1914). The French revolutionists, by the Constitution of 1795, separated Church and State, but a few years later Napoleon's Concordat with the pope again made Roman Catholicism the official religion. The Concordat was abrogated as recently as 1905, and both Catholic and Protestant bodies in France now depend entirely upon voluntary contributions for support. The Portuguese revolutionists, when founding a republic in 1910, disestablished the Roman Church, and the Russian revolutionists in 1917 disestablished the Orthodox Church. The new constitution of republican Germany practically disestablishes the Prussian Protestant Church, whose head was the kaiser. This action has considerable significance, for before the German Revolution the Protestant Church in Prussia formed a leading prop of divine-right monarchy; altar and throne justified and blessed each other. The constitutions of Czecho-Slovakia and Poland also provide for the separation of Church and State.

The pontificate of Pius IX was marked by the meeting of the Vatican Council (1869–1870), the first general council of the Roman Catholic Church since that at Trent, three centuries previously. Nearly eight hundred prelates from all parts of the world were present. They adopted the dogma of papal infallibility, declaring that when the pope speaks ex cathedra,¹ or by virtue of his apostolic authority, on matters of faith and morals, he cannot err. His decisions, therefore, bind the whole Church. It is curious that this exaltation

¹ Literally, "from the throne."
of the pope's spiritual position occurred at the very moment when he lost what remained of his temporal power in Italy.\footnote{1}

The liberal movement in religion has carried further that multiplication of sects which began with the Reformation. Sects Baptists, Quakers, and Methodists arose in Great Britain during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.\footnote{2} Other sects, including the Adventists, Universalists, and Disciples of Christ, and even new religions, such as Mormonism, Spiritualism, and Christian Science, have originated in the United States.

Both Freemasonry and Oddfellowship took their present form in Great Britain about two centuries ago. They now have thousands of lodges and several millions of members throughout the world. Their insistence upon religious toleration makes it possible for them to admit votaries of even non-Christian faiths, as in India.

Considerably over a third of the earth's peoples are Christians. The adherents of Roman Catholicism number perhaps 275,000,000; those of the Protestant denominations, perhaps 175,000,000; and those of the Greek Church, perhaps 125,000,000. The Jews are estimated at 10,000,000. For the other world religions the following figures must be considered merely rough approximations: Moslems, 225,000,000; Brahmanists (in India), 225,000,000; Buddhists (China, Japan, Tibet, Mongolia, Indo-China), 450,000,000. In this estimate the entire populations of China and Japan are counted as Buddhists, owing to the difficulty of separating Buddhism in those countries from the national faiths.

The conversion of the non-Christian world, including perhaps 150,000,000 heathen in Africa, Asia, Oceania, and America, is the stupendous task to which Christian peoples have addressed themselves since the Middle Ages. The work of Roman Catholic missionaries in christianizing most of the Filipinos and the Indians of Latin

\footnote{1}{See page 327.} \footnote{2}{See page 141.}
America and Canada has already been noticed. Several Protestant denominations founded missionary societies in the eighteenth century, and by the middle of the nineteenth century almost every branch of Protestantism, both in Europe and America, had representatives throughout the non-Christian world. The number of Christians attached to missions is reckoned at 10,000,000, about equally divided between Catholic and Protestant converts.

But the results of Christian missions cannot be expressed statistically. Missionaries have been well called the advance-guard of modern civilization. They establish schools and colleges, build hospitals, introduce scientific medicine and sanitation, familiarize the natives with inventions and discoveries, and often succeed in stamping out cruel superstitions, together with such practices as cannibalism and human sacrifice. Native converts become, in turn, the means of extending the benefits of modern civilization among their countrymen. The effect of missionary enterprise is therefore enormous, even when conversions are relatively few. We may safely include Christian missions among the most important of all agencies for bringing backward peoples into the common brotherhood of mankind.

162. Science

A hundred years ago, science enjoyed only a limited recognition in universities and none at all in secondary and elementary schools. The marvelous achievements of scientific men fixed public attention on their work, and courses in science began to displace the older "classical" studies. At the same time science has become an international force which recognizes no national boundaries, no distinctions of race or religion. Scientists in every land follow one another's researches; they carry on their labor in common.

Many pages would be needed merely to enumerate the

1 See pages 114 and 421.
scientific discoveries of our age. The astronomer found a new planet, Neptune;¹ measured the distances of the fixed stars; and began the enormous task of photographing the heavens and cataloguing the five hundred to one thousand billion suns which form our universe. The physicist determined the velocity of light and showed that light, radiant heat, electricity, and magnetism are due to waves or undulations of the ether; are, in fact, interconvertible forms of cosmic energy. The chemist proved that matter exists in a solid, liquid, or gaseous state according to the degree of heat to which it is subjected; that it is composed of one or more of eighty-odd elements; and that these elements combine with one another in fixed proportions by weight, as when one pound of hydrogen unites with eight pounds of oxygen to form nine pounds of water. The biologist discovered that all plants and animals, from the lowest to the highest, are made up of cells containing the transparent jelly or protoplasm which is the basis of life.

New conceptions of the earth were set forth by Sir Charles Lyell in his *Principles of Geology* (1830–1833). He explained the changes which have produced mountains, valleys, plains, lakes, sea-coasts, and other natural features, not as the result of convulsions or catastrophes, as had been previously supposed, but as due to erosion by water, the action of frost and snow, and other forces working gradually over immense periods of time. The acceptance of

¹ Uranus had been discovered in the eighteenth century.
Lyell's uniformitarian theory, coupled with the discovery of fossils in the rocks, made it necessary to reckon the age of the earth by untold millions, instead of a few thousands, of years. The further discovery in western Europe of rude stone implements and human bones associated with the remains of extinct animals, such as the mammoth, woolly rhinoceros, and cave bear, indicated the existence of man himself at a remote period.

Even before Charles Darwin published the *Origin of Species* (1859), naturalists argued that existing plants and animals, instead of being separately created, had evolved from a few ancestral types. Darwin was first to show how evolution might have occurred by means of "natural selection." He pointed out that many more individuals of each species are born than can possibly live to rear their offspring; that, in consequence, there is a constant "struggle for existence" between them; and that the fittest who survive are the strongest, the swiftest, the most cunning, the most adaptable,—in other words, those who possess characteristics that give them a superiority over their competitors. Such characteristics, transmitted by heredity, tend to become more and more marked in succeeding generations, until at length entirely new species arise. Investigators since Darwin have made important additions to the evolutionary theory, especially the Dutch naturalist Hugo de Vries, who assumes that new species are produced from existing forms by sudden leaps, instead of by the slow accumulation of slight successive variations. Evolution is now a scientific commonplace, like
gravitation, but we have still much to learn about the origin and development of life on the earth.

The practical applications of science are innumerable. Applied physics gave us the telegraph, telephone, electric lighting, and electric motive force. More recently, wireless telegraphy and telephony have developed from the discovery in 1887 of the "Hertzian waves," or electro-magnetic vibrations in the ether. In 1895 the German Röntgen discovered the X-rays, and in 1898 the French professor Curie, assisted by his Polish wife, obtained from the mineral called pitchblende the mysterious radium. It is a more intense producer of the X-rays than any other substance, yet wastes away with incredible slowness. Physicists have now found many other radioactive bodies and have proved that radioactivity is due to the breaking-up of atoms, which are not the indivisible entities they were once supposed to be. This revelation of vast atomic energy leads to the belief that long before our supplies of coal and oil are exhausted, a source of unlimited power may be found in the disintegration of the atom. Applied chemistry gave us illuminating gas, friction matches, such powerful explosives as dynamite and nitroglycerine, which are produced from animal or vegetable fats, artificial fertilizers, beet sugar, aluminum, and various derivatives of coal tar, including the aniline dyes, carbolic acid, naphtha, and saccharine. The chemist now creates in his laboratory many organic substances which had previously been produced only by plants or in the bodies of animals.

The practical applications of biology are seen in the germ theory of disease. The researches of the Frenchman, Louis
Pasteur, upon vegetable micro-organisms (bacteria) proved that the harmful kinds are responsible for definite diseases in both plants and animals. Dr. Robert Koch of Berlin soon isolated the germs which produce tuberculosis and cholera, and since 1880 those producing diphtheria, typhoid fever, influenza, pneumonia, lockjaw, bubonic plague, and other dread scourges have been identified. In some cases remedies called antitoxins are now administered to counteract the bacterial toxins or poisons. Another step in medicine is the discovery that certain diseases are spread in some one particular way. The bite of one species of mosquito causes malaria and that of another yellow fever; lice transmit typhus; the tsetse-fly carries the sleeping sickness; and fleas on rats convey the bubonic plague to man. All this new knowledge enables us to look forward with confidence to a time when contagious and infectious diseases will be eliminated from civilized countries. Meanwhile, surgery has been revolutionized by the use of anaesthetics and the introduction of antisepsis and asepsis.

The advance of both pure and applied science is due, in the first place, to improved methods of investigation. Lord Bacon, the great English thinker, statesman, and author, who flourished during the reign of James I, severely criticized the scholasticism of the Middle Ages, with its exaggerated veneration for the written word, and proposed, instead, that we gather our knowledge from the book of Nature. According to Bacon, the scientist should collect, tabulate, and analyze as many facts as possible, with a view to detecting the relations between them and of discovering what are "causes"
and what are “effects.” This is the method of observation and experiment, or induction. But no modern scientist relies exclusively upon it; he also makes use of deduction. He frames some hypothesis to explain the phenomena under investigation, deduces the consequences which logically follow from the hypothesis, and then compares them with the facts as learned by observation or experiment. If agreement is found, then the hypothesis will be so far confirmed; if non-agreement, then the hypothesis may require modification or perhaps may have to be abandoned altogether. Darwin’s theory of “natural selection” is a conspicuous instance of a scientific hypothesis in biology. In astronomy a good example is the nebular hypothesis, according to which our own and other solar systems have been produced by the condensation of nebulous matter once diffused through space. It will be seen that patient, plodding investigation does not form the whole of science; a place exists in it for the widest flights of the scientific imagination.

In the second place, scientific advance is due to the improvement of apparatus. The giant telescope enables the astronomer to measure the movements of stars so incredibly remote that their light rays, which we now see, started earthwards before the dawn of the Christian era. The spectroscope analyzes the constituents of the most distant heavenly bodies and proves that they are composed of the same kinds of matter as our planet. The compound microscope reveals the existence of a hitherto unsuspected realm of minute life in earth and air and water. The scientific possibilities of the photographic camera, especially in the form of moving pictures, have only recently been revealed. Science now depends on the use of precise instruments of research as much as industry depends on machinery.

183. Philosophy and Literature

Since the beginning of the nineteenth century man has become more and more interested in himself; he has resolved

---

1 Especially associated with the French astronomer Laplace (1749–1827).
to learn what he is, whence he came, and what he shall be. These are the old questions of philosophy. Herbert Spencer (1820–1903), the close friend of Darwin, sought to answer them with the aid of evolutionary principles. The ten volumes of his *Synthetic Philosophy* form an ambitious attempt to explain the development of the universe as a whole, from the atom to the star, from the one-celled organism to man. Spencer was a pioneer in the study of psychology, that branch of philosophy dealing with the mental processes of both man and the lower animals.

Spencer also broke fresh ground in the study of sociology. He carried over the principle of evolution into human society, with the purpose of showing how languages, laws, religions, customs, and all other institutions naturally arise and develop among mankind. "Sociology," as the name for this new subject, had been previously introduced by the French philosopher, Auguste Comte.

The study of history has been transformed under the influence of the sociologists. It is no longer merely a narrative in chronological order of political and military events, but rather an account of the entire culture of a people. The historian wants to learn about their houses, furniture, costumes, and food; how they made their living; what buildings they raised, what books they read; what schools they supported; what beliefs and superstitions they held; what amusements and festivals they enjoyed. Some historical students do not limit inquiry to civilized man, but also investigate the culture of savage and barbarous peoples as found to-day or
once found in remote ages. History, so considered, is closely related to anthropology, one of the most fascinating of the newer branches of learning.

Public schools, public libraries, and cheap books, magazines, and newspapers have multiplied readers. Literature, in consequence, is now a profession, and the successful novelist or poet may secure a world-wide audience. Sir Walter Scott did much to give the novel popularity through his historical tales. Dickens, Thackeray, and other English writers made it a presentation of contemporary life. On the Continent almost all the celebrated authors of the past century have been novelists. It is sufficient to mention four only, whose fame has gone out into many lands: the Frenchman Victor Hugo; the Italian Manzoni; the Russian Tolstoy; and the Pole Sienkiewicz.

The drama rivals the novel in popularity among all classes. It presents either a picture of bygone ages or scenes from everyday life. In no country does it assume more importance than in France, where the theater is considered a branch of public instruction. Much dramatic poetry, however, is written to be read, rather than for acting on the stage. Lyric poetry has been produced in all countries, notably in Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy and the
United States, and has become the favorite style of poetic expression.

164. Music and the Fine Arts

Music now takes almost as large a place as literature in modern life. Even more than literature, it ranks as an international force, for the musician, whatever his nationality, uses a language which needs no translation to be intelligible.

During medieval times music was chiefly used in the services of the Church. The Renaissance began to secularize music, so that it might express all human joy, sadness, passion, and aspiration. The secular art thus includes operas, chamber music (for rendition in a small apartment instead of in a theater or concert hall), compositions for soloists, and orchestral symphonies.

The Middle Ages knew the pipe-organ, harp, flute, drum, orchestra, trumpet, and many other instruments. These were often played together, but with no other purpose than to increase the volume of sound. There was not the slightest idea of orchestration. After the Renaissance new instruments began to appear, including the violin, viols of all sizes, the slide trombone, and the clarinet. Percussion action, applied to the old-fashioned spinet and harpsichord, produced in the eighteenth century the pianoforte. The symphony, a tone poem combining all musical sounds into a harmonious whole, now began to assume its present form. The great symphonists—Haydn, Mozart,
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that supreme genius Beethoven (1770–1827), and their successors in the nineteenth century — thus created a new art to enrich the higher life of mankind.

Another master of music, Richard Wagner (1813–1883), created the musical drama, which unites music, poetry, and acting. Wagner believed that the singer should also be an actor and should adapt both song and gesture to the orchestra. He also gave much attention to the scenery and stagesetting in order to heighten the dramatic effect. Wagner’s most famous work, The Ring of the Nibelung, consists of four complete dramas based on old Teutonic legend.

A new source of music has been opened up in the melodies of the European peasantry — their folk songs. Almost every country in Europe is rich in these musical wild flowers, and they are now being gathered by trained collectors. Lullabies, marriage ditties, funeral dirges, and ballads are some of the varieties of folk songs.

Like music, sculpture illustrates the internationalism of art. The three greatest sculptors of the nineteenth century were Canova, an Italian, Thorwaldsen, a Dane, and Rodin, a Frenchman. The first two found inspiration mainly in classic statuary, which seeks ideal beauty of form; the third expressed in marble the utmost realism and naturalism. Much fine work has also been done in bronze, for instance, the Chicago statue of Abraham Lincoln by St. Gaudens, who is rightly considered the most eminent sculptor produced by America.
Modern Civilization

No century has witnessed more activity in the construction of churches, town halls, court houses, theaters, schools, and other public edifices than the nineteenth, but these have usually been reproductions of earlier buildings. Architects either went to Greece and Rome for models or imitated the Romanesque and Gothic styles. The extensive use of structural steel has now begun to produce an entirely new architectural style, more appropriate to modern needs, in the "skyscraper" of American cities. It is sometimes criticized as being "not architecture, but engineering with a stone veneer." The criticism seems hardly just in all cases. Such a structure as the Woolworth Building in New York has a beauty of its own and truly expresses the spirit of our industrial age.

Modern painters, no longer restricted to religious pictures, often choose their subjects from history or contemporary life. They excel in portraiture, and their landscape paintings unquestionably surpass the best which even the "old masters" of the Renaissance could produce.
Painting flourishes especially in France, where the leading artists receive their training and exhibit their pictures at an annual exposition, the Salon at Paris.

165. Historic and Artistic Paris

The capitals of France and Great Britain represent much that is best in modern civilization. Paris and London are the largest cities in the Old World. Their civic life reaches back without a break to Roman times. They contain more monuments and edifices of historic or artistic interest than any other places in Europe, except Athens, Rome, and possibly Venice. To visit either of them is a liberal education.

Paris, the ancient Lutetia, first appears in history as a small settlement of the Gallic tribe of the Parisii on an island in the Seine (Île de la Cité). This was for centuries the entire site. Conquered by the Romans under Julius Cæsar, Paris formed a place of some importance in the Roman Empire and after the introduction of Christianity became the see of a bishopric. It repelled the assaults of Attila the Hun in the fifth century, but surrendered to Clovis, who made it the official residence of the Merovingian kings.

Charlemagne and the later Carolingians seldom visited Paris, which did not again become the seat of government until the accession of Hugh Capet. The great Capetian rulers of the Middle Ages showed their affection for the city by extending its walls and paving its streets, founding its university, the most famous in Christendom, and building numerous abbeys and churches in the Gothic style.

The French monarchs of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries, above all, Louis XIV, continued the embellishment of Paris. Here the first Napoleon erected his principal monuments. Still more noteworthy was the transforming work of the third Napoleon, who cleared away the maze of narrow winding streets and substituted for them broad avenues and noble squares. Paris suffered terribly at the hands of the “communards” of 1871. The
ARC DE TRIOMPHE

In the center of the Place de l'Étoile, from which twelve broad avenues radiate in all directions. Commenced by Napoleon in 1805, but not completed until the reign of Louis Philippe. It is the largest triumphal arch in the world, being 162 feet high and 147 feet wide. The monument is adorned with groups of sculpture representing the military triumphs of the revolutionary and Napoleonic armies.
city soon recovered from their depredations, however, and during the last half century completed the great public works which make it the most spacious and imposing of modern capitals.

The Seine runs through Paris from east to west in a broad curve for nearly eight miles. Rising from the river are the two islands — Île de la Cité and Île St. Louis — both covered with buildings. Thirty-one handsome bridges span the Seine, and wide embankments, or quays, line its sides. The principal shops, cafés, and theaters are found on the north or right bank of the Seine, while many public buildings, schools, and museums occupy the south or left bank of the stream.

No uniformity marks the street plan of Paris. A few of the four thousand-odd thoroughfares are shown on the map. Of these, a number are the exceptionally wide avenues and boulevards which Napoleon III constructed, as much to put an end to barricade fighting as to beautify the city.

The squares (places) of Paris form one of its chief attractions. The finest is the Place de la Concorde, laid out under Louis XV and noted as the scene of the execution of Louis XVI, Marie Antoinette, and many other victims of the Terror. An Egyptian obelisk occupies the center of the square. The Place de la Concorde connects by the splendid Avenue des Champs Élysées ("Elysian Fields") with the Place de l'Étoile ("Square of the Star"), containing the Arc de Triomphe. The Place Vendôme has a column surmounted by a statue of Napoleon I. The Place de la Bastille, on the former site of that prison, is marked by a memorial column in honor of those who fell in the "July Revolution" of 1830.

Not less attractive are the promenades and parks of Paris. The Jardin des Tuileries, now wholly given over to trees, flowers, fountains, and statues, formerly contained the Tuileries Palace, which was burned by the "communards." Across the Seine lies the Jardin du Luxembourg, with a palace used by the French Senate. The Champ de Mars

1 See the illustration, page 312.
2 See the illustration, page 314.
3 See the illustration, page 230.
4 See the illustration, page 166.
NOTRE DAME

The present structure, begun in 1163 and completed about 1240, suffered severely during the French Revolution, when it was converted into a Temple of Reason. Extensive restorations and alterations were made during the nineteenth century. Two massive square towers, originally intended to support spires, crown the principal or western façade. In three doors are surrounded by elaborate sculptures and surmounted by a row of figures representing twenty-eight kings of Israel and Judah. Above the central door is a rose window of stained glass and above this a graceful gallery of painted arches supported by slender columns.
Historic and Artistic Paris

(‘Field of Mars’) is a parade ground. Here stands the Tour Eiffel, a graceful structure of iron lattice-work nearly a thousand feet high. The tower was built for the Paris Exposition of 1889.

Hôtel des Invalides

Notre Dame Cathedral, the most important of Parisian churches and one of the finest examples of Gothic architecture in Europe, occupies part of the island called La Cité. Churches The present building has had several predecessors, for already in the fourth century a church stood on this site. The French revolutionists converted Notre Dame into a Temple of Reason, but under Napoleon I it went back to religious use. The same emperor built the exquisite Madeleine.1

1 See the illustration, page 191.
Modern Civilization

The Louvre,¹ impressive both for extent and noble architecture, was the chief royal palace until Louis XIV built Versailles. It is now a wonderful museum of the fine arts, ancient, medieval, and modern. Among the priceless treasures to be seen here are the "Aphrodite of Melos," the "Winged Victory of Samothrace," and Leonardo da Vinci’s "Mona Lisa." The Palais de Justice (law courts) forms a huge assemblage of buildings on the site of the palace.

¹ See the illustration, page 166.
of Merovingian and Capetian kings. The Hôtel des Invalides, on the left bank of the Seine, dates from the reign of Louis XIV, who founded it as a home for infirm or disabled soldiers. But no one thinks of the "Grand Monarch" in the Invalides; it is dedicated rather to Napoleon, whose relics crowd its rooms and who himself lies in a huge sarcophagus under the gilded dome.¹ The Panthéon, another imposing domed building, served originally as a church, but the revolutionists in 1791 secularized it as a sepulcher for great Frenchmen. Voltaire, Rousseau, and Victor Hugo are entombed here. The Chamber of Deputies meets in the Palais Bourbon,² built in the eighteenth century, and the president of the French republic occupies the Palais de l'Élysée, another eighteenth-century structure.

Besides the Louvre, Paris has many other museums. The most interesting, historically, is the Musée de Cluny, installed in a Gothic mansion built by the abbot of Cluny during the fifteenth century. It stands on the site of a Roman palace, the ruins of whose baths still remain. Among the libraries of Paris the Bibliothèque Nationale, which occupies Cardinal Mazarin's residence, has first place. This immense collection of manuscripts, books, prints, and maps originated in the Middle Ages as a royal library, but since the Revolution it has been a state in titution.

Paris is naturally a leading educational center. The fame of the École des Beaux-Arts as an art school attracts students of architecture, sculpture, and painting from all countries. In the Latin Quarter, where many of them live and maintain their studios, stands the Sorbonne, founded in the thirteenth century and until the Revolution celebrated as a theological seminary. The French revolutionists suppressed the institution, together with all other colleges and universities throughout France. Napoleon renewed it, however, and in its magnificent new building the Sorbonne has become the chief seat of learning in France. Not far away is the Palais de l'Institut, a seventeenth-century structure.

¹ See the illustration on page 208. ² See the illustration on page 319.
which houses the Institut de France, an association of the five French academies of letters and science.

The drama has a large part in Parisian life, and several of the important theaters receive annual subsidies from the government. The Opéra\(^1\) is the largest and most splendid playhouse in the world. The Théâtre Français, the home of the best French drama, was founded by Molière in the seventeenth century, and here his comedies are still played.

The tourist in Paris seldom omits a visit to the cemetery named after Père la Chaise, the confessor of Louis XIV. It covers over a hundred acres and contains the tombs of many famous Frenchmen. Paris has always been a fortress. The present wall, replacing

\(^1\) See the illustration on page 538.
earlier ramparts, completely surrounds the city. Through its gates run the main highways into the charming suburbs. One may visit Fontainebleau, Napoleon’s favorite residence, where he abdicated in 1814, and the château of Malmaison, which he presented to Joséphine after the divorce. Then there are St.-Denis, with its abbey-church, the burial place of the French kings; Sèvres, with its manufactory of exquisite porcelain; and St.-Germain, once the dwelling of royalty and now a national museum. Above all there is Versailles, twelve miles distant from Paris.\footnote{See the illustration, page 39.} Here the Estates-General met in 1789 and began the Revolution; here William I of Prussia was proclaimed German emperor in 1871; and here in 1919 was signed the treaty which brought peace to a warring world.

166. Historic and Artistic London

London, the ancient Londinium, seems to have been a British settlement before the Roman occupation of Britain in the first century A.D. Under the Romans it was a place of some importance, to judge from the abundant remains which we possess. Ruins of the walls, of villas, and of a basilica are still to be seen, while thousands of coins have been found in the bed of the Thames.

After the departure of the Romans from Britain, London came under the rule of the Anglo-Saxons and subsequently of the Danes. It had grown to be the metropolis of England by the time of the Norman Conquest. Both Norman and Plantagenet kings recognized the importance of London by granting charters of liberty to its inhabitants, and Magna Carta expressly stipulated that the city should continue to enjoy all its old privileges.

The chief event in the history of London under the Tudors was the suppression of the monasteries and nunneries by Henry VIII. More than half the area of the city had been occupied by these establishments, which were now adapted to secular uses. The Great Fire of 1666, early
HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT, LONDON

Designed by Sir Charles Barry; begun in 1840; completed in 1857. The edifice is in the richest style of Tudor Gothic architecture. It occupies an area of eight acres, contains eleven courts or quadrangles, and cost £15,000,000. The principal façade, overlooking the Thames, measures 940 feet in length. There are three towers: the Clock Tower, containing the famous bell Big Ben, whose resonant note may be heard over the greater part of London; the Central Tower, used as a ventilating shaft; and the great Victoria Tower, 336 feet high. When Parliament is in session, a light is shown in the Clock Tower by night, and a flag flies from the Victoria Tower by day.
in the reign of Charles II, continued three days and licked up thirteen thousand houses — practically all that remained of the medieval city. Since the middle of the nineteenth century London has been much improved by rebuilding, the laying out of new streets and parks, and the erection of monuments. It still lacks the spaciousness, the elegance and charm, of Paris, but in historic interest, at least for English-speaking peoples, even surpasses the French capital.

There are really three Londons. First comes the City proper, the commercial and financial heart of the metropolis. It stretches for about a mile along the north bank of the Thames and occupies the site of the Roman town. Beyond the City spreads Metropolitan London, which is a circle with a radius of approximately twelve miles from its center at Charing Cross. Lastly, comes "Greater London," reaching out into several English counties and containing, with the City and the metropolitan boroughs, more than seven million inhabitants.

The streets of London are innumerable. Straightened out and laid end to end, they would reach across the United States. The principal continuous thoroughfares, though each bears a succession of names, coincide with the main roads converging upon the capital from all parts of England. The Thames follows a devious course through London. Its sides are lined with embankments used as promenades. Fourteen road bridges cross the river, including famous London Bridge, which replaces a thirteenth-century structure.

The parks are a notable feature in the topography of London. St. James's Park was laid out by Charles II. At its western end rises Buckingham Palace, the London residence of royalty. Green Park extends between the Mall and Piccadilly. Hyde Park, which Henry VIII took over on the dissolution of the monasteries, forms a resort of fashionable society and often also the scene of popular demonstrations. Kensington Gardens and Regent's Park are other open spaces.
Historic and Artistic London

The principal places of interest to the tourist lie along the Thames from the Tower of London to Westminster Abbey. Among secular buildings none is more venerable than the Tower, which stands at the eastern boundary of the City. William the Conqueror raised the great central keep or White Tower, so called because it was once whitewashed. The inner wall, with its thirteen turrets, was added by William Rufus, the Conqueror’s son, the moat by Richard I, and the outer wall by Henry III. The Tower has been a fortress, a palace, and a prison; it now serves as a government arsenal, historical museum, and repository for the crown jewels.

From the Tower a short walk brings one to the Bank of England, a low, massive building without external windows and almost wholly unadorned. The Guildhall, nearby, is used for meetings and entertainments of the City Corporation.

London’s most prominent building, St. Paul’s Cathedral, stands in the center of the City, upon a site dedicated to religion since Anglo-Saxon times. The present edifice, replacing the cathedral destroyed by the Great Fire, is the work of Sir Christopher Wren, who lies in the crypt, together with the duke of Wellington, Lord Nelson, and other famous Englishmen. In general appearance St. Paul’s resembles St. Peter’s at Rome, but it is much smaller. The style of architecture unites Gothic and classical features. The great dome, both from within and without, forms the most imposing feature of the cathedral.

From St. Paul’s one may proceed along Fleet Street with its newspaper offices, and the Strand, with its hotels, shops, and theaters, to Trafalgar Square. The lofty monument in the center commemorates Nelson’s victory over the combined fleets of France and Spain.

The National Gallery, containing magnificent art collections, is on the north side of Trafalgar Square. Some distance away

1 See the illustration on page 430.
is the British Museum, the most celebrated institution of its kind in the world. A single great building houses the collections of books, manuscripts, coins, and antiquities which have accumulated since the museum was founded in the eighteenth century.

The short street called Whitehall, containing the Admiralty, Houses of Parliament, and other government offices, leads from Trafalgar Square to the Houses of Parliament. These buildings, as beautiful and impressive outside as they are luxurious inside, were erected during the nineteenth century in the richest style of Tudor Gothic. They cover eight acres and include eleven hundred rooms. The east front opens directly upon the Thames. Historic Westminster Hall, belonging to the former royal palace on the site, is incorporated in the Parliament buildings. There are three towers: the Clock Tower, with the famous bell Big Ben, whose resonant note may be heard over the greater part of London; the Central Tower, used as a ventilating shaft; and

1 See the illustration on page 21.
the Victoria Tower. When Parliament is in session a light is shown in the Clock Tower by night and a flag flies from the Victoria Tower by day.

The church formerly attached to the Benedictine abbey of St. Peter in Westminster was built in the thirteenth century, upon the site of an earlier church raised by Edward the Confessor. Since the Norman Conquest all but one of the English sovereigns have been crowned here, and

until the time of George III it served as their last resting place. The abbey is now England's Hall of Fame, where many of her distinguished statesmen, warriors, poets, artists, and scientists are buried. Monuments, tombs, busts, and memorials crowd every part of a building that epitomizes English history.

Studies

1. What is the "international mind"? The "international conscience"?
2. Look up in an encyclopedia accounts of the Rhodes Scholarships and the Nobel Prizes.
3. What arguments are often urged against capital punishment?
4. Present some of the arguments for and against woman suffrage.
5. What is the work of the Rockefeller Foundation? Of the Carnegie Institution?
6. Name and locate ten of the great European universities.
7. Prepare an oral report on
CHAPTER XXIII

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, 1871–1914

167. The Triple Alliance

Modern civilization, which on the one side creates an international current drawing the world’s peoples together in art, literature, science, and industry, on the other side creates a national current tending to keep them apart. Internationalism or cosmopolitanism lays stress on our common humanity, on the brotherhood of man. Nationalism or patriotism emphasizes love of country and devotion to the "fatherland." National rivalries and antipathies were never stronger than in the nineteenth century, and in the twentieth century they brought forth the calamitous World War.

The national movement in Europe, we have learned, arose during the revolutionary and Napoleonic era, helped to produce the popular revolts between 1815 and 1830, and assumed special importance between 1848 and 1871, when both Italy and Germany won by the sword their long-desired unification. The creation of a united Italy, and especially of a united Germany, quite upset the delicate equilibrium of European politics as established at the Congress of Vienna. The old balance of power disappeared, for the German Empire, from the hour of its birth, took the first place on the Continent.

Bismarck's former policy of "blood and iron" had resulted in the wars with Denmark, Austria, and France. Now that Germany was "satiated," as he declared, he became a man of peace. His policy, henceforth, hinged upon France. The catastrophe of the Franco-German War seemed to remove that country from the

ranks of the great powers, but she recovered rapidly under a republican government and soon paid off the indemnity imposed upon her by the Treaty of Frankfort. But France was not reconciled to the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, which deprived her of 1,000 square miles of territory and more than 1,500,000 inhabitants. Their annexation kept alive the spirit of revenge in France and made her Germany's irreconcilable enemy. To Bismarck it seemed that the French were only awaiting a favorable moment to renew the test of arms, an attitude expressed by Gambetta's motto, "Think of it always and never speak of it." The French in 1870–1871 had fought alone; should they secure the support of Austria-Hungary, Italy, or Russia, the issue of a second Franco-German War might be quite unlike that of the first. Accordingly, Bismarck did all he could to keep France friendless among the nations.

The "Iron Chancellor" turned first to Austria-Hungary. He had prepared the way for good relations by his moderation in arranging terms of peace with Francis Joseph I at the close of the "Seven Weeks' War." After 1871 the Hapsburgs began to seek compensation in the Balkans for the territory they had lost in Germany and Italy. Bismarck supported their pretensions at the Congress of Berlin. Here the "honest broker," as he called himself, successfully opposed the extension of Russian influence in the Balkan Peninsula and agreed to an Austrian occupation of the Turkish provinces of Bosnia and Herzegovina. In 1879 Germany and Austria-Hungary made a secret alliance binding themselves to aid each other if either should be attacked by Russia or by another power which had the help of Russia. It was also arranged that should either party to the alliance be attacked by another power *without* Russian support, then the other party would not only not assist the aggressor but would preserve at least benevolent neutrality. The secrecy attending this treaty was removed by its publication nine years later.

Bismarck scored a further triumph in 1882, when he induced

---

1 See pages 273–274  
2 See page 271.  
3 See page 386.
Italy to throw in her lot with Germany and Austria-Hungary, thus forming the Triple Alliance. Italy took this action, partly to secure good friends on the Continent, but chiefly because of resentment against France, which had just established a protectorate over Tunis, a region marked for Italian colonization.\(^1\) Rumania also joined the group of Central Powers in 1883. The terms of the treaties creating the Triple Alliance have never been fully disclosed, but they seem to have been purely defensive in character. The Triple Alliance continued unbroken until 1915, when Italy declared war against Austria-Hungary. Rumania repudiated it the following year, upon entering the World War.

Bismarck also did his best to convince Russia of Germany’s good will. During the ’eighties the two countries actually bound themselves to benevolent neutrality in case one or the other should be assailed. This “reinsurance compact” was secretly signed in 1884 and was renewed in 1887 for another period of three years. But William II, who forced Bismarck’s retirement in 1890,\(^2\) did not continue the friendly understanding with Russia. The kaiser seems to have believed that the Triple-Alliance sufficiently guaranteed the security of Germany and that the “reinsurance compact” would interfere with Germany’s obligations to Austria-Hungary, whose rivalry with Russia in the Balkans had now become more acute than ever.

\(^1\) See page 399.  \(^2\) See page 340.
168. The Dual Alliance and the Triple Entente

The creation of the Triple Alliance was a challenge to France and Russia to form an opposing alliance. Bismarck's diplomatic skill had postponed it as long as he remained chancellor, but even before 1890 the two countries had begun to draw together. An alliance between them long seemed improbable, in view of the fact that they had fought each other bitterly in the Napoleonic and Crimean wars and of the further fact that one was a revolutionary republic and the other a reactionary autocracy. International politics sometimes makes strange bedfellows, however. Feelings of both revenge and fear stirred France: revenge for the humiliating defeats of 1870-1871 and the loss of Alsace-Lorraine; fear lest with the rapid increase of German wealth, population, and military power she might be suddenly attacked and overwhelmed by her Teutonic neighbor. Under Bismarck, Germany had pursued a peaceful policy; what would be her policy under the kaiser no one could say. In any case, mighty Russia seemed a most desirable ally. Russia, in her part, now realized more keenly the conflict between her interests in the Balkans and the interests of Germany's ally, Austria-Hungary; she held Germany responsible for her failure at the Congress of Berlin; and she, too, felt alarm at the growing preponderance of Germany in European affairs. The time was obviously ripe for a Franco-Russian understanding.

Close relations between France and Russia began in the financial sphere, when the tsar's government, in order to build the Trans-Siberian Railway and develop Russian industries, sold large blocks of securities to French investors. A secret treaty between the two countries was concluded in 1891 and was publicly announced four years later. The precise terms of the treaty are unknown. Apparently, France and Russia agreed that in case either nation was attacked, the other nation would come to its assistance and that peace should be made in concert. The Dual Alliance, like the Triple Alliance, thus appears to have been a
defensive undertaking on the part of the powers concerned. France no longer stood alone, and Germany on her eastern flank had a potential enemy. It was the "nightmare coalition" so feared by Bismarck.

Ever since the Crimean War Great Britain had kept aloof from Continental entanglements. She was no friend either of France or Russia, for the colonial aspirations of these powers, the one in Africa and the other in Asia, clashed with her own. Lord Salisbury,\(^1\) Disraeli's successor as leader of the Tory Party during the last two decades of the nineteenth century, continued the traditional Franco-phobe and Russo-phobe policies of the Tories. The strained relations between Great Britain and France almost resulted in hostilities, as late as 1898. In that year a French exploring expedition entered the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, which Great Britain regarded as within her sphere of influence, and raised the tricolor at Fashoda on the upper Nile. The British government sent General Kitchener from Khartum to expel the intruders. War was in the air, until the French gave way and renounced their claims to the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan. The "Fashoda incident" roused much popular feeling in both France and Great Britain. As for Russia, her steady advance in Central Asia obviously threatened India and led British statesmen to

\(^1\) Prime minister, 1885–1886, 1886–1892, and 1895–1902.
regard that power with ill-concealed fear and distrust. In Kipling's words Russia was "a bear that walks like a man."

Toward Germany and the other members of the Triple Alliance the British attitude was most amicable throughout the period of Bismarck's chancellorship. To avoid giving offense to Great Britain Bismarck scrupulously observed Belgian neutrality during the war of 1870–1871, and for the same reason he long opposed the acquisition of colonies by Germany. The supposed kinship of Germans and Anglo-Saxons and the close connections of the German and British courts (William II was a grandson of Queen Victoria) also made for good relations between the two countries. Nevertheless, as the 'nineties advanced, Great Britain and Germany began to draw apart. One reason was the amazing industrial development of Germany, which by this time had made her a serious competitor of Great Britain in foreign markets. Another reason was the aggressive colonial policy of Germany and her apparent intention of founding a world empire rivaling that of Great Britain. The kaiser himself announced, in one of his rhetorical speeches, that "without Germany and the German Empire" no important step in international matters should be taken, even beyond the seas. But the most important reason was Germany's declared purpose to build up a great navy as well as a great army. To the average Britisher the new German navy seemed a dagger pointed at his country's heart. The sympathetic attitude of the kaiser and his associates toward the Boers, both before and during the South African War, further disturbed the serenity of Anglo-German relations.

The early years of the twentieth century saw Great Britain emerge from her isolation, which some described as "splendid" but others as "dangerous," and seek new friendships on the Continent. The first step was reconciliation with France. The way for it had already been prepared. Edward VII, who mounted the British throne in 1901, upon the death of Queen Victoria, showed a statesmanlike grasp of the situation and used all his personal influence to strengthen Great Britain abroad. He
knew and liked the French people, and they returned his appreciation. France, too, had in Théophile Delcassé a foreign minister anxious to establish friendly relations with her neighbor across the Channel. Official visits in 1903 of King Edward to Paris and of President Loubet to London were followed in 1904 by a definite treaty between the two countries, adjusting their colonial claims. France recognized the paramount position of Great Britain in Egypt; Great Britain gave to France a free hand in Morocco. Conventions were also made relating to Siam, Newfoundland, and other regions. These agreements established a "cordial understanding" (entente cordiale). It was not a formal alliance; it did not provide for military measures, either of defense or of offense; nor did it have special reference to Germany or any other Continental power. The significance of the entente cordiale lay in the fact that it healed the ancient feuds between the two nations and prepared the way for their closer coöperation in the future.

Three years later Great Britain and Russia, who for half a century had jealously watched each other's expansion in Asia, composed their differences. The Anglo-Russian agreement, signed in 1907, was largely arranged by Sir Edward Grey, the British Minister of Foreign Affairs. It settled the troublesome questions relating to Persia,
Colonial Problems

Afghanistan, and Tibet in a manner satisfactory to both powers. The *entente cordiale* thus became transformed into a Triple Entente, for Russia was already an ally of France. Japan, a British ally since 1902, also reached an understanding with Russia in regard to their respective spheres of influence in the Far East.

The change in international relations which between 1902 and 1907 made Great Britain an actual ally of Japan and a potential ally of France and Russia, has been called a diplomatic revolution. Its significance was not lost on Germany. While British statesmen believed that they were only preparing defensive measures against a possible German attack, most Germans pictured Great Britain as plotting their country's ruin. The rift between the two nations steadily widened; by 1914 it had become a chasm.

Such, in outline, was the tangled skein of European diplomacy for nearly forty years following the Franco-German War. The Triple Alliance under Bismarck's guidance dominated Europe without a competitor, until the creation of the Dual Alliance. Something like a balance of power then replaced the earlier primacy of Germany. The old coalition, however, continued to be far stronger than the new, until Great Britain aligned herself with France and Russia. Germany, resentful at what she described as the "encirclement policy" of her enemies, at the "iron ring" which she professed to see being forged around her, now bent every effort to break up the Triple Entente by diplomatic action and by military threats. At the same time she tried to create a "Middle Europe" which, with its annexes in Asia, would effectually separate Great Britain and France from their Russian ally. These German projects raised new colonial problems and reopened the Eastern Question.

169. Colonial Problems

Something has been said in previous chapters about the Greater Europe which arose during the nineteenth and twentieth

---

1 See pages 406 and 408.  
2 See page 420.
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centuries. European expansion went on most rapidly after 1871, when one country after another endeavored to form an empire overseas. This new imperialism was especially fostered by the revival of national sentiment in Europe. Both Italy and Germany wished to obtain colonial dependencies where their people could settle and maintain the language, customs, and traditions of the home land. France sought compensation for her "Lost Provinces" by acquiring African possessions. Russia, Japan, and the United States annexed additional territories. Great Britain, the leading colonial power in the world for more than a century, took renewed pride in her dominions and prepared to extend them as occasion offered. European peoples could not compete for markets, trading-posts, spheres of influence, protectorates, and colonies in every part of the world without becoming as bitter rivals abroad as they were at home. Imperialism, as well as nationalism, thus sowed the seeds of future conflict between them.

A late-comer in the family of nations, Germany found that the best regions for colonization in the temperate zone already belonged to other powers. The colonies which she acquired in Africa and Oceania did not attract settlers, provided no important markets, and imposed a heavy burden on the imperial treasury for maintenance. If Germany was to secure "a place in the sun," it could only be at the expense of other countries and by reliance upon "the good German sword." William II made preparations for the partition of China, but the uprising of the Chinese under the "Boxers" led to the abandonment of this enterprise. He tried to get a foothold in South America by sending his warships to demand from Venezuela the payment of German debts, only to be pulled up sharply by President Roosevelt, who concentrated the American fleet in the West Indies and invoked the Monroe Doctrine. Not more successful was the kaiser's policy in Morocco.

Morocco at the beginning of the twentieth century was a Moslem state inhabited by half-civilized and very unruly

---

1 The kaiser's phrase (1901).

2 The crown prince's phrase (1913).
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tribes. The rich natural resources of the country and its proximity to Algeria made it an inviting field for French expansion. Germany also had some economic interests there. William II precipitated the first Moroccan crisis, at a time when Russia, the ally of France, was involved in war with Japan. He paid a visit to the native ruler, openly flouted the French claims, and asserted in vigorous language the independence of Morocco. France could not afford to accept the challenge thus flung in her face and agreed to submit the Moroccan question to an international conference, which met at Algeciras, Spain, in 1906. The assembled powers prohibited the annexation of Morocco, but left France free to continue her policy of "peaceful penetration." The outcome of the conference thus proved disappointing to the kaiser.

Germany soon found another occasion to test the strength of the Anglo-French entente. Owing to the anarchy in Morocco, a French army had occupied the capital (Fez). The kaiser at once dispatched a warship to Agadir on the Moroccan coast as a notice to France to withdraw her troops. Feeling mounted high in both countries, and Europe for the moment seemed to be on the verge of the long-dreaded war. Great Britain, however, made common cause with France, for Agadir in German hands and converted into a naval base would have formed a palpable threat to British trade routes in the Atlantic. Germany now decided to yield. She agreed to the establishment of a French protectorate over Morocco, accepting as compensation some territory in the French Congo. This "Agadir incident" further embittered international relations. The French regarded their Congo cession as so much blackmail levied by Germany; the Germans looked upon Great Britain's support of France as an unwarranted interference which had inflicted upon them a diplomatic defeat.

170. The Eastern Question

Bismarck had treated the whole Eastern Question with contempt, declaring it "not worth the bones of a single
Pomeranian grenadier.” Under William II, however, Germany managed to supplant Great Britain as the protector of the Ottoman Empire against Russia. The kaiser twice visited the sultan,¹ a bloodthirsty despot whose massacres of Bulgarians and Armenians had aroused the horror of Christian Europe, and ostentatiously proclaimed himself the champion of all Moslems, the ally of Allah. “The three hundred million Mohammedans who live scattered over the globe may be assured of this, that the Ger-

¹ Abdul Hamid II ("Abdul the Damned"), 1876–1909. See page 387.
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man Emperor will be their friend at all times,” said William II in 1898.

Germany now began the “peaceful penetration” of Asiatic Turkey. The fertile regions of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia, sparsely settled and undeveloped, offered many opportunities for the investment of German capital, markets for German goods, and homes for the superfluous population of Germany. Economic exploitation was to be followed by military and political control of the Ottoman Empire, with Germany in command of the Turkish armies and supreme throughout the wide area from the Black Sea to the Indian Ocean. All these dazzling possibilities were foreshadowed in the scheme for a railway intended to unite Constantinople with Bagdad and the head of the Persian Gulf. Nearly all the line as far as Bagdad had been completed by the opening of the World War. German capitalists also began to construct a branch line running from Aleppo in Syria to Medina and Mecca in Arabia. It is obvious that the Bagdad Railway, with its connections, menaced the position of Great Britain in India and British control of Egypt and the Suez Canal.

The practical annexation of Asiatic Turkey formed only a part of the kaiser's ambitious policy. European Turkey, the Balkan states, and Austria-Hungary were to unite with Germany into a huge combination for purposes of offense and defense. “Middle Europe” might ultimately draw within its embrace Holland, the Scandinavian states, and a projected Polish kingdom to include almost the entire manufacturing area of Russia. German commerce would exploit and German militarism would dominate every one of these countries.

The success of the “Middle Europe” project depended upon the attitude of the independent Christian states of the Balkans. It was essential that they should be amenable to German, or at least to Austro-Hungarian, influence and that the influence of Russia should be entirely eliminated from their councils. Dynastic relationships seemed to make this possible. Prince (afterwards Tsar) Ferdinand of Bulgaria was a German; King
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Charles of Rumania was the kaiser's kinsman; and the wife of the future King Constantine of Greece was the kaiser's sister. Even Serbia had a pro-Austrian ruler until 1903, when a revolution of Belgrade brought to the throne King Peter, who leaned toward Russia. The Balkan policy of the Central Powers consequently received a setback, for Serbia lay on the line of the railway from Berlin to Constantinople.

Events now moved rapidly in the Balkans. Taking advantage of the Young Turk Revolution, Austria-Hungary in 1908 proceeded to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina. These two provinces had been freed from the direct control of the Turks by Serbia and Russia, but the Congress of Berlin had handed them over to Austria-Hungary to occupy and administer. Their annexation, violating the Berlin settlement, raised a storm of protest in Serbia. The people of Bosnia and Herzegovina are Slavs, and Serbia expected some day to incorporate them and the Montenegrins in a south Slavic state to stretch from the Danube to the Adriatic. Russia also seethed with indignation at what she considered an affront to the Slavic race by a Teutonic power. Russian troops now began to move toward the Austrian border. At this moment Germany ranged herself by the side of Austria-Hungary "in shining armor," as the kaiser afterwards expressed it, and dared Russia to attack her ally. Both France and Great Britain refused to join Russia in a general European war, and that country, not yet recovered from the struggle with Japan, thereupon gave way, withdrew her support from Serbia, and looked on in deep humiliation while the Central Powers proceeded to reap the fruits of their diplomatic triumph.

The First Balkan War (1912–1913) produced another international crisis. Early in the course of the struggle the Serbians seized Durazzo, a port in the Turkish province of Albania, in order to gain access to the Adriatic. The Montenegrins also captured Scutari, another important Albanian town. Austria-Hungary would

---

1 See pages 387–388.
2 See page 386.
not consent to these annexations, which barred her own expansion to the southeast, and demanded that Durazzo and Scutari be evacuated. Germany, as before, backed her ally. A general European war again seemed very near, until Serbia and Montenegro yielded to the pressure put upon them by the great powers and gave up their conquests. The result was the formation of a new Albanian state with a German prince as its ruler and under German influence. The Central Powers had won a second diplomatic triumph in the Balkans.

The outcome of the Second Balkan War (1913), however, profoundly disappointed the Central Powers. The Treaty of Bukharest left Germany's vassal, Turkey, with only a footing in Europe; it humiliated Bulgaria, the friend of Austria-Hungary; and it planted a hostile Serbia squarely in Macedonia, where she blocked the "Middle Europe" scheme. Even before the treaty had been signed, Austria-Hungary made ready to attack Serbia, but held her hand when Italy refused to cooperate, on the ground that the terms of the Triple Alliance required its members to aid each other only in the case of a defensive war. Germany also seems to have dissuaded Austria-Hungary from undertaking her perilous adventure in 1913. The hour had not yet struck to precipitate a European conflict. Meanwhile, the Central Powers feverishly hastened military preparations, and the other countries, seeing the war clouds on the horizon, likewise took steps to increase their arms and armies.

171. Militarism

Between 1871 and 1914 there were wars in the Balkans, in Asia, and in Africa. The nations of western Europe, however, did not draw the sword against one another for more than forty years. Yet at no other period had there been such enormous expenditures for armaments, such huge standing armies, and such colossal navies. Western Europe enjoyed peace, but it was an "armed peace" based upon fear.

1 See page 388.
The improvements in weapons after 1871 made warfare a branch of applied science requiring expert technical knowledge both on the battle-field and in the munition factory. One needs only refer to the breech-loading rifle, machine gun, and smokeless powder, together with the continuous enlargement of cannon and the use of long-range, high-explosive projectiles. In death-dealing efficiency these new means of destruction threw all previous inventions into the shade. Having created modern civilization, science seemed ready to destroy it.

The changed methods of fighting demanded the "nation in arms," rather than the old-fashioned armies composed of Standing armies volunteers and mercenaries. As early as the eighteenth century, European monarchs began to draft soldiers from among their subjects, but at first only artisans and peasants. During the revolutionary era France resorted to forced levies, allowing, however, many exemptions. Prussia went further during the Napoleonic era and adopted universal military service, as well in time of peace as in time of war. All able-bodied men were to receive several years' training in the army and then pass into the reserve, whence they could be called to the colors upon the outbreak of hostilities. This Prussian system, having proved its worth in the War of Liberation against Napoleon,¹ was extended by William I soon after his accession to the throne.² The speedy triumphs of Prussia in 1866 and 1870 led all the principal nations, except Great Britain, to adopt universal military service. Europe thus became an "armed camp," with five million men constantly under arms.

Great Britain found sufficient protection in her fleet, which it has long been the British policy to maintain at a strength at least equal to that of any two other powers. Her Navies widespread empire depends upon control of the seas, and being no longer self-supporting, she would face starvation in time of war were she blockaded by an enemy. Germany, however, would not acquiesce in British maritime supremacy,

¹ See page 203. ² See pages 267–268.
and under the inspiration of the kaiser, who declared that the "trident must be in our hands," started in 1898 to build a mighty navy. Helgoland,¹ off the mouth of the Elbe, was converted into a naval base, a second Gibraltar. The Kiel Canal, originally completed in 1896, was enlarged in 1914 to allow the passage of the largest warships between the Baltic and the North Sea. Great Britain watched these preparations with unconcealed dismay. Her answer was the complete reorganization of the British fleet, the scrapping of nearly two hundred vessels as obsolete, and the laying-down of dreadnoughts and super-dreadnoughts. The naval rivalry threatened to become so enormously expensive that British statesmen twice proposed a "naval holiday," that is, an agreement to keep down the rate of increase. But Germany refused to enter into an arrangement which would have left Great Britain still mistress of the seas.

The crushing burden of standing armies and navies produced a popular agitation in many countries to abolish warfare. The movement took practical shape as the result of a proposal by Nicholas II for an international conference, which should arrange a general disarmament. The tsar's rescript of 1898 was a telling indictment of militarism in these words: "The preservation of peace has been put forward as the object of international policy. In its name the great states have concluded between themselves powerful alliances; the better to guarantee peace, they have developed their military forces in proportions hitherto unprecedented, and still continue to increase them without shrinking from any sacrifice. All these efforts, nevertheless, have not yet been able to bring about the beneficent results of the desired pacification. . . . In proportion as the armaments of each power increase, do they less and less fulfill the objects which the governments have set before themselves. Economic crises, due in great part to the system of armaments à outrance² and the continual danger which lies in this accumu-

¹ Acquired by Great Britain in 1815 and ceded to Germany in 1890.
² "To the utmost."
lation of war material, are transforming the ‘armed peace’ of our days into a crushing burden which the peoples have more and more difficulty in bearing. It appears evident, then, that if this state of things continues, it will inevitably lead to the very cataclysm which it is desired to avert, and the horrors of which make every thinking being shudder in anticipation.”

As the result of the tsar’s rescript, delegates from twenty-six sovereign states met in 1899 at The Hague, Holland, in the First Peace Conference. A Second Peace Conference of forty-four sovereign states assembled in 1907. Attempts were made at these gatherings to mitigate the

![The Peace Palace at the Hague](image)

horrors of future wars, for instance, by prohibiting the use of asphyxiating gases and “dumdum” bullets and the dropping of projectiles from balloons. Every proposal to reduce armaments encountered, however, the strenuous opposition of Germany. The German government would not abandon those deep-laid schemes for conquest, first in Europe and ultimately
Pan-Germanism

throughout the world, which are summed up in one word—Pan-Germanism.

172. Pan-Germanism

The material development of Germany between 1871 and 1914 was perhaps unparalleled in European history. Her population increased from forty-one to sixty-five millions; her foreign trade more than trebled; and she became an industrial state second in Europe only to Great Britain. Proud of their army, navy, and police, of their handsome, well-ordered cities, of their technical schools and universities, of their science, literature, music, and art, the Germans came to believe that they enjoyed a higher culture (Kultur) than any other people. The Russians, by comparison, were barbarians, the French and Italians decadent; and the British and Americans, mere money-grabbers. “We are the salt of the earth,” the kaiser told his countrymen. Such ideas found a fertile soil in the exaggerated nationalism which had been fostered by the creation of the German Empire.

The ardent belief in the superiority of German Kultur seemed to impose the duty of extending it to alien and therefore inferior peoples. This was Germany’s divine mission, according to her philosophers, historians, clergymen, and government officials. Even the kaiser could say in all seriousness that “God has called us to civilize the world; we are the missionaries of human progress” and that “our German nation shall be the rock of granite on which the Almighty will finish his work of civilizing the world.”

Before the world could be remade upon the German model, it had to be first conquered. Both backward and “decadent” nations possessed their own standards of civilization, which they would not willingly abandon even for Germany’s so-called beneficent Kultur. World-power, in fact, meant war. Accordingly, the leaders of German society labored in press and school and pulpit to prove that war is a holy and righteous thing; that it corresponds in the life of
nations to the "struggle for existence" in animal life; and that by war the weaker, incompetent states are weeded out and room is made for those stronger, more efficient states which alone deserve to inherit the earth. At the same time the people were led to consider war inevitable because of the hostile attitude of Russia, the "Slavic peril"; because France wanted revenge for her "Lost Provinces"; and because Great Britain only awaited a favorable opportunity to take the German navy and stifle German commerce. It was taught that Germany ought not to delay until her enemies were ready for a combined attack; she should attack first and reap the advantage of her military preparedness. This idea of an offensive-defensive war particularly appealed to a people who owed their national greatness to successful conflicts deliberately incurred by unscrupulous rulers.

The autocratic nature of the German government, vesting the control of foreign affairs so largely with the emperor, made the egotistical, domineering personality of William II a very important factor in the international situation. The kaiser inherited the warlike traditions of the Great Elector, Frederick the Great, and William I; and even the shadowy claims to universal dominion put forth during the Middle Ages by the Holy Roman Emperors. His public utterances for thirty years were a constant glorification of war and conquest. One of his first speeches after mounting the throne had an ominous sound: "I solemnly vow always to be mindful of the fact that the eyes of my ancestors are looking down upon me from the other world, and that one day I shall have to render to them an account both of the glory and the honor of the army." On another occasion he said: "It is the soldiers and the army, not parliamentary majorities, that have welded the German Empire together. My confidence rests upon the army." And in 1900, upon the departure of a German expedition for operations against the "Boxers," he told the troops: "When you come upon the enemy, no quarter will be given. No prisoners will be taken. As the Huns under their

---

1 See page 530.  
2 See page 342.  
3 See pages 415-416.
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king, Attila, a thousand years ago, made a name for themselves which is still mighty in tradition and story, so may the name of Germany in China be kept alive through you in such wise that no Chinese will ever again attempt even to look askance at a German."

During the earlier years of his reign the kaiser seemed to find sufficient outlet for his restless energy in the development of Germany. The task lost its novelty and interest after a time, and he turned his uneasy gaze outside the empire to the aggrandizement of Germany abroad. More and more he came to be in sympathy with the aggressive policies advocated by the German militaristic class. It included the army and navy officers, both active and retired; the large landowners (Junkers); the merchant princes, bankers, and manufacturers; the university professors, diplomats, and higher government officials — all, in short, who expected to profit from a greater and enormously more wealthy Germany. These men organized in 1890 the Pan-German League, which soon became the most powerful political organization in the empire.

"We ought not to forget," declared the official circular of the league, "that beyond the boundary lines compassed by the black-red-and-white flag thousands of Germans reside." Holland, the Flemish part of Belgium, the German part of Switzerland, possibly Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, certainly Austria and the Baltic provinces of Russia were all to be absorbed in a bigger Germany. For the Pan-Germans the day of little peoples was over.

The Pan-Germans thought that they could conquer Europe, nation by nation. They expected to overwhelm France by a sudden blow, capture Paris, seize the former Franche Comté and what remained of French Lorraine,¹ together with the Channel ports, take the French colonies, and levy an indemnity large enough to pay the expenses of the war. Then they intended to turn

¹ Once part of the Holy Roman Empire. See page 43.
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against Russia and annex her Polish and Baltic provinces. Their Austrian ally, meanwhile, would overrun Serbia and open the German "corridor" to the Orient. Once mistress of the Continent, Germany might look forward confidently to the issue of a future struggle with Great Britain and the British Empire for the dominion of the world.

Every preparation was made, every precaution was taken, to ensure a prompt, decisive victory. By the summer of 1914, "The Day," a special war tax, to be expended on fortifications and equipment, had been collected. The army had been much increased. Enormous stocks of munitions had been accumulated. The Kiel Canal had been reconstructed. Strategic railways leading to the Belgian, French, and Russian frontiers had been laid down. All things were ready for "The Day." Germany required only a pretext to launch the World War.

Studies

1. Explain the following: (a) entente cordiale; (b) the "Lost Provinces"; (c) "Middle Europe"; (d) "Agadir incident"; and (e) "reinsurance compact."
2. Find illustrations in the history of Europe during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries of the principle of the balance of power. 3. "The Franco-German War of 1870-1871 was the starting-point of a new era in European diplomacy." Comment on this statement. 4. How was Alsace-Lorraine the "open sore" of European politics after 1871? 5. "The history of Europe in recent years often has hinged upon such remote points as a railroad in Asia Minor, or a protectorate in northern Africa, or a harbor in China." Comment on this statement. 6. How would you define (a) militarism and (b) imperialism, as these terms have been used in the present chapter? 7. "England's navy is a necessity; Germany's a luxury." Explain this statement. 8. What is the strategic value of the Kiel Canal? 9. Write a brief character sketch of the kaiser on the basis of the quotations from his speeches in this chapter. 10. Why has war been called the "national industry" of Prussia? 11. Point out on the map the European countries included in the Pan-German program.
CHAPTER XXIV

THE WORLD WAR, 1914–1918

173. Beginning of the War, 1914

The pretext was soon supplied. On June 28, 1914, the archduke Francis Ferdinand, heir to the Hapsburg throne, and his wife were assassinated at Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia. The murderer, a Bosnian and therefore an Austrian subject, belonged to a Serbian secret society which aimed to separate Bosnia and Herzegovina from the Dual Monarchy and add them to Serbia. The Austrian government, after conducting an investigation, alleged that he had been aided by Serbian officials, with the connivance of the government of Serbia. This accusation has never been proved. No doubt exists, however, that the Sarajevo assassination was a political crime, the natural outcome of the propaganda among the South Slavs (Jugoslavs) for the expulsion of Austria from the Balkans as she had been expelled from Italy and Germany.

Nearly a month passed. Then on July 23 Austria-Hungary sent a note to Serbia, harsh, peremptory, and, except in name, an ultimatum. It demanded that Serbia suppress anti-Austrian publications and organizations, dismiss from the army or the civil service all those implicated in the anti-Austrian propaganda, eliminate anti-Austrian teachers from the public schools, and consent to “the collaboration in Serbia of representatives of the Austro-Hungarian government for the suppression of the subversive movement directed against the territorial integrity of the monarchy.” Forty-eight hours

only were granted for the unconditional acceptance or rejection of the ultimatum.

Serbia replied on July 25. She agreed to all the Austrian demands except those which required the presence on Serbian soil of representatives of the Dual Monarchy. Such an arrangement, Serbia pointed out, would violate her rights as a sovereign state — would make her, in fact, an Austrian vassal. She concluded by offering to submit the entire dispute to arbitration by the international tribunal at The Hague or to the mediation of the great powers. Austria-Hungary rejected the Serbian reply as insincere and on July 28 declared war upon her little neighbor. This action was followed by the general mobilization of the Austrian armies, not only for the Serbian war, but also, apparently, for service against Russia.

Russia, the protector of the Slavs of the Balkans, could not look on without concern while a great Teutonic power destroyed the independence of a weak Slav state. But if Russia intervened to aid Serbia, by making war on Austria-Hungary, then Germany, as the latter's ally, would surely attack Russia; and France, bound to Russia in firm alliance, would be obliged to attack Germany. Efforts to preserve the peace of Europe began at once. The Triple Entente first asked Austria-Hungary to extend the time limit for the answer from Serbia. Austria-Hungary declined to do so. Then Great Britain and France urged Serbia to make her answer to the ultimatum as conciliatory as possible. After the Serbian reply had been delivered, Great Britain, through Sir Edward Grey, her Minister for Foreign Affairs, suggested that the four great powers not directly involved should hold a conference in London to adjust the Austro-Serbian difficulty. France, Italy, and Russia accepted the suggestion. Germany rejected it. Finally, Great Britain invited Germany herself to propose some method of mediation, but the German government declared that the whole dispute concerned only Austria-Hungary and Serbia and that Russia should not interfere in it. If Russia did interfere, Germany would back her ally.

We know now why these and other peace proposals during
that last fateful week of July, 1914, were ineffective. Germany
and Austria-Hungary had already decided for war. In the first
place, there is evidence that as early as July 5 a
secret conference of German and Austrian diplo-
mats, army and navy officers, and business men
took place in the kaiser's palace at Potsdam, a suburb of Berlin,
and that the assembled conspirators decided to use the Sarajevo
assassination as a pretext for warlike measures against Serbia.
In the second place, the present republican government of
Austria published in the latter part of 1919 an official volume 1
of documents found in the archives of the former imperial
government, from which it appears that a ministerial meeting
held in Vienna, July 7, 1914, took the momentous decision to
force war on Serbia. This was to be done by sending a note
with such impossible demands that the Serbian government
would be compelled to reject them. An Austro-Hungarian
declaration of war would then follow in due course. The Foreign
Minister, Count Berchtold, who presided at the meeting and
afterwards signed the note to Serbia, declared to the ministers
that the kaiser had "emphatically" assured him of the "un-
conditional support of Germany in case of a warlike complica-
tion with Serbia." Germany was thus prepared to support
Austria-Hungary to the uttermost.

The international situation in the summer of 1914 clearly
favored aggressive action by the Central Powers. Each of the
Entente Powers faced serious domestic difficulties. Russia was embarrassed by industrial troubles
culminating in the proclamation of a general strike
and preparations for street fighting in the capital. France was
disturbed by popular opposition to a new law which extended
military service from two to three years. Even Great Britain
apparently stood on the brink of civil war in Ireland. 2 Never
had the time seemed more propitious for the success of the
long-planned German attack upon the liberties of Europe.

1 Diplomatic Documents on the Antecedents of the War of 1914, Part I, Vienna, 1919.
State Printing Office.
2 See page 300.
Russia had yielded to the Central Powers in the Balkan crisis of 1908 and 1912–1913; in 1914 she accepted their challenge. Russian troops began to mobilize against Austria-Hungary on July 29 and against Germany on July 30. The German government, which had already begun military preparations, sent an ultimatum to Russia ordering that country to start demobilization within twelve hours or accept the consequences (July 31). Russia did not reply. The kaiser, exercising his right to make “defensive warfare,” immediately signed the document declaring that a state of hostilities existed between Germany and Russia (August 1).

Asked by Germany what was to be her attitude in the coming struggle, France replied that she “would do that which her interests dictated,” and began to mobilize. Germany then declared war on France (August 3).

It is now known that had France decided to remain neutral, thus repudiating her treaty with Russia, the German government intended to demand the surrender of the fortresses of Toul and Verdun as a pledge of French neutrality until the close of the war. Germany thus showed herself so anxious to embroil France in the conflict that she made demands which that country could not and was not expected to accept.

Germany also tried to learn the attitude of Great Britain. The German Chancellor, Bethmann-Hollweg, promised that if Great Britain would stand aloof, Germany would agree not to take any European territory from France, but he refused to give assurances as to the French colonies. Sir Edward Grey retorted that Great Britain could never conclude such a disgraceful bargain with Germany at the expense of France. The British Foreign Minister, however, made it clear that Great Britain would not be drawn into a Franco-German War unless France and Russia rejected “any reasonable proposal” for peace put forward by

---

1 See page 570.  
2 See page 342.  
3 Revelations of M. Pinchon, Minister for Foreign Affairs, at the Sorbonne, Paris, March 1, 1918.
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the Central Powers. After the German declaration of war on Russia and the German invasion of neutral Luxemburg, Great Britain promised France the help of the British fleet in case the German fleet operated against the unprotected western coast of France. The British government could not honorably do less, for, in accordance with the Anglo-French entente, France since 1912 had concentrated her fleet in the Mediterranean so that the British fleet might be concentrated in the North Sea against the possibly hostile German navy.

The neutrality of Belgium was guaranteed by the European powers, including France and Prussia, both in 1831 and 1839;²

Article VII

La Belgique, dans les limites indiquées aux Articles I, II, et IV, formera un Etat indépendant et parfaitement neutre. Elle sera tenu d'observer cette même neutralité ouvrer tous les autres États.

Facsimile of Article VII of the Treaty of 1839

"Belgium, within the limits specified in Articles I, II and IV, shall form an independent and perpetually neutral state. It shall be bound to observe such neutrality towards all other states."

Furthermore the Second Peace Conference in 1907, with Germany consenting, expressly declared the territory of neutral states to be inviolable. True to its treaty engagements, the French government on August 1 announced its intention to respect Belgian neutrality. The next day, however, Germany addressed a note to Belgium demanding permission to move troops across the country into France and threatening, in case of a refusal, to leave Belgium’s fate to the “decision of arms.” The Belgian government, under King Albert, declined to “sacrifice the honor of the nation and betray its duty toward Europe.” On August 4 the German army invaded Belgium. Bethmann-Hollweg frankly admitted before the Reichstag, the same day, that the invasion

¹ See page 232 and note 1. ² See page 232.
was "a breach of international law," and the kaiser, in a cable message to President Wilson,¹ acknowledged that Belgian neutrality "had to be violated by Germany on strategical grounds."

An invasion of Belgium was, in fact, vital to the success of the German plan of campaign, which involved a swift, crushing blow at the French before Russian mobilization could be completed. No rapid movement against France was possible from the east, first, because the high bluffs and narrow river valleys in this part of the country made defense easy; and, second, because the eastern frontier had been protected, since the Franco-German War, by fortresses all the way from Verdun to Belfort. An attack from the northeast presented fewer difficulties, for a comparatively level plain, well provided with roads and railways, stretches from Germany through Belgium and France to the environs of Paris. Furthermore, France had not strongly fortified her frontier on the side of Belgium, having trusted to the neutrality of that country for protection.

The neutrality of Belgium has been a cardinal point in British foreign policy since the Middle Ages. To Great Britain it seems essential that the Belgian coast shall not be occupied by a strong military power, thus menacing British control of the Channel.

Over this question she fought with Philip II of Spain in the sixteenth century and later with Louis XIV and Napoleon. Great Britain, moreover, had her explicit treaty obligations to Belgium, obligations which no honorable nation could fail to respect. When, therefore, news

¹ Sent August 10, 1914.
came that German troops were entering Belgium, the British government, at this time controlled by the Liberals under Mr. Asquith, sent an ultimatum to Germany, requiring assurances by midnight, August 4, that Belgian neutrality would be respected. Germany refused, and Bethmann-Hollweg, in his final interview with the British ambassador at Berlin, complained that Great Britain was about to fight a kindred nation just for "a scrap of paper." About midnight Great Britain declared war on Germany.

There is no longer any need to fix the responsibility for the World War. That the German government planned it and then precipitated it has been made evident by the avowals of Germans themselves. The most damning indictment of German policy in 1914 comes from no less a personage than Prince Lichnowsky, who was the ambassador of Germany to Great Britain before the outbreak of the conflict. His memorandum, prepared originally for private circulation among friends but afterwards published in 1918, declares that "we" encouraged Count Berchtold to attack Serbia, although no German interest was involved; that when Russia emphatically declared that Serbia must not be overrun "we" rejected the British proposals for mediation, although Serbia had accepted almost the whole ultimatum; and that "we" replied to Russia's mere mobilization by a declaration of war, thus deliberately destroying all possibility of a peaceful settlement. "In view of these indisputable facts, it is not surprising that the whole civilized world outside Germany attributes to us the sole guilt for the World War."

174. The Western Front

The war quickly converted the Triple Entente into a Triple Alliance. Great Britain, France, and Russia engaged not to make peace separately and to accept a general peace only on terms agreeable to all of them. The instinct of self-preservation, which had united Europe against France under Louis XIV and Napoleon, was
now aroused against the military domination of Germany under the kaiser. As on previous occasions, Great Britain, with her fleet, her money, and eventually her army, formed the keystone of the coalition.

Germany and Austria-Hungary, though less populous and wealthy than their antagonists, held a better geographical position, and at the outset they possessed a superiority both in the number of trained soldiers and in guns, munitions, and equipment. Above all, they were prepared. Austria-Hungary had already massed part of her army against Serbia, while Germany, by means of her strategic railroads, could move and concentrate troops on her eastern or western frontier with greater speed than either Russia or France. Should it prove to be a short war, the Central Powers seemed likely to win an overwhelming victory.

Hostilities began on the western front with the converging advance of the Germans through Luxembourg and Belgium. They occupied the tiny grand duchy without resistance and then threw themselves upon the Belgians. The fortresses of Liège and Namur, supposedly impregnable, were smashed to pieces by the huge German siege guns, and Brussels itself was captured. Nevertheless, the Belgian resistance—heroic, unexpected—delayed by ten full days the arrival of the Germans on the frontiers of France. The French gained time to complete mobilization and the British to send an expeditionary force of one hundred

1 *Fortissimi sunt Belgæ* (Cæsar, *Gallic War*, i, 1).
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thousand men. After the first clash at Mons, the Anglo-French armies retired southward, fighting delaying actions all the way. The invaders soon crossed the Marne and at the nearest point came within fifteen miles of Paris. The opposing forces were now extended in an immense semi-circle, one hundred and fifty miles in length, from the vicinity of Paris to a little below Verdun.

![Map of the Battle of the Marne](image)

**Plan of the Battle of the Marne**

- British army (Field-Marshall French).
- VI. French army (Manoury).
- V. " " (Franchet d’Esperey).
- IX. " " (Foch).
- IV. " " (Langle de Cary).
- III. " " (Sarrail).
- 1. German army (Von Kluck).
- 2. " " (Von Bulow).
- 3. " " (Von Hausen).
- 4. " " (Duke of Württemberg).
- 5. " " (Crown Prince of Prussia).

At the Marne the Allied commanders, General Joffre and Sir John French, stayed the retreat. A new army (the Sixth Army), which had been quietly prepared in Paris and of whose existence the Germans were ignorant, was suddenly launched at their exposed right flank. At the same time General Foch’s magnificent assault drove in their center on both sides of the marshes of St. Gond. The weight of the combined attack sent them
back in confusion, and with heavy losses of men and material, across the Aisne River. In this, the greatest battle of any age, the Germans had been out-generalied and out-fought; German plans for a speedy triumph had been upset; and Paris had been saved.

Both sides now bent every effort to extend their lines northward to the sea. The Germans hoped to seize Dunkirk and Calais, two important Channel ports, and thus to interrupt the direct line of communication between Great Britain and France; but the Allies reached the Channel first and further north at Nieuport. Then followed in October and November, 1914, the first battle of Ypres, when the Germans, by massed attacks, tried vainly to break through the British lines. Near the coast the Belgians cut the dikes of the river Yser, flooding the lowlands and stopping any further advance in this direction. Trench warfare now began to replace open fighting all along the western front from the North Sea to the Swiss frontier, a distance of six hundred miles.

Repeated efforts to break the deadlock on the western front marked the year 1915. Both French and British made some
progress in clearing enemy trenches by means of concentrated shell-fire, but as yet the production of high-explosive shells was insufficient for prolonged "blasting operations." The deadlock

The Germans, on their part, employed poison-gas — contrary to the terms of the Hague Conventions¹ — in the second battle of Ypres, during April and May. The situation was critical for a time, until the French and British manufactured gas masks to overcome the choking fumes. The Allies were eventually obliged themselves to use this hideous device against the enemy.

The first half of 1916 was marked by the German assault upon Verdun, the most important French stronghold on the eastern frontier. The siege of the city lasted nearly five months and cost the lives of at least half a million men on both sides. The Germans under the crown prince were determined to take the place at any cost. The French were equally determined to defend it at any cost. "They shall not pass!"² became the battle-cry of all France. They did not pass. More than that, in the fall of 1916 the French resumed the offensive and within seven hours drove the Germans back almost to their original lines. Ruined Verdun, like ruined Ypres, thus remained in Allied hands.

What more than anything else relieved the pressure on Verdun was the Anglo-French attack against the German lines along the river Somme. By this time Great Britain had

¹ See page 574. ² *Ils ne passeront pas!*
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adopted conscription and had built up a magnificent army commanded by Sir Douglas Haig. The Allies now possessed more heavy guns and munitions than the Germans, and in the "tanks" a weapon destined to prove its value in breaking the trench deadlock. The Allied advance took place on a front of twenty miles to a maximum depth of about nine miles. It was finally checked by German counter-attacks and by bad weather, which turned the battle-field into a sea of mud.

To forestall another attack, the Germans in the spring of 1917 retired on a wide front to the shorter and more defensible Hindenburg Line. The territory evacuated by them was laid completely waste, every building being destroyed, vineyards uprooted, and orchards cut down. The Allies advanced over this wilderness and from April to December conducted a steady offensive, which brought them appreciable gains. The Hindenburg Line still held, however, when the approach of winter put an end to active operations.

The German treatment of Belgium and northern France aroused the horror of the civilized world. Deliberate, systematic massacres of the civil population to prevent or punish resistance, the looting and burning of entire villages, the destruction of Louvain with its famous university, the shelling of the Cloth Hall of Ypres and the cathedral of Reims, the imposition of excessive taxes and heavy fines on Belgian and French cities, the robbing of Belgium and northern France of coal, metals, machinery, and raw materials, finally, the forcible deportation of tens of thousands of civilians, both men and women, for forced labor in Germany — these were some of the atrocities and outrages which characterized German treatment of the conquered territory. The inhabitants would have perished had it not been for the efficient system of relief organized by an American, Mr. Herbert C. Hoover, who enlisted the help of the Allies and of the United States in providing food, clothing, and other necessities of life for the invaded districts.
175. The Eastern Front

There was no deadlock on the eastern front. The Russians mobilized more rapidly than had been expected and put large forces in the field, under the general command of the grand duke Nicholas, an uncle of the tsar. Their plan of campaign involved a simultaneous advance against the Germans in East Prussia and the Austrians in Galicia. The Russian armies which entered East Prussia, a difficult country of lakes, marshes, and rivers, were surprised and well-nigh annihilated by Hindenburg at the battle of Tannenberg (August, 1914). The following January, when the Russians again ventured into this part of Germany, Hindenburg won another overwhelming victory at the battle of the Mazurian Lakes.

The Russians met better luck in Galicia. They overran all this Austrian province and by the spring of 1915 began to penetrate the Carpathian passes into Hungary. These successes had the further result of causing the withdrawal of Ger-
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man troops from the western front, with a consequent weakening of Germany’s offensive power against the French and British.

The summer of 1915 saw some of the most tremendous engagements of the entire war. Hindenburg now became a fieldmarshal, assumed command of the eastern armies of both the Central Powers and started a terrific “drive” in Poland and Galicia. The Germans made full use of poison gas and a smothering fire of high-explosive shells, while the Russians were hampered by lack of guns and ammunition. The result of the fighting is best traced on the accompanying map, which shows the enormous territory reoccupied or newly acquired by the Central Powers. At the end of 1915 the battle-line on the eastern front stretched from the Gulf of Riga to the Rumanian frontier.

Russia’s recuperative power was strikingly exhibited the following year. General Brusilov attacked the Austro-German armies on a wide front between the Priepet Marshes and Bukowina, pushing them back from twenty to fifty miles and making huge captures of men and supplies. The outbreak of the Russian Revolution, early in 1917, made it impossible to continue the offensive. From this time there was little more fighting on the eastern front.

176. The Balkan and Italian Fronts

As soon as the war broke out, Montenegro made common cause with Serbia. The three other Christian states of the Balkans at first did not declare themselves. Bulgaria had no love for Austria-Hungary, but she cordially hated Serbia, her most successful foe in the Second Balkan War.1 Rumania was friendly neither to Austria-Hungary nor to Russia, for both possessed provinces which she wished to “redeem” from alien rule.2 Public opinion in Greece, as voiced by Venizelos,3 the prime minister, favored the Allies. The pro-German King Constantine and the court party managed, nevertheless, to preserve a nominal neutrality.

1 See page 389.  
2 See page 385.  
3 See page 381.
Turkey, largely controlled by Germany and fearful of Russia's designs on Constantinople, soon espoused the cause of the Central Powers. Her entrance did not at first appreciably affect the situation, for she was still cut off from her associates by a neutral Bulgaria and a hostile Serbia. The sultan proclaimed a holy war (jihad) of extermination against the "enemies of Islam." Contrary to German hopes, the Moslems of North Africa, Egypt, and India, instead of revolting, loyally supported France and Great Britain. An attempt in 1915 by an Anglo-French fleet to force the Dardanelles and take Constantinople proved disastrous, however. No greater success attended the heroic efforts of the "Anzacs" (Australians and New Zealanders) to secure a footing on the peninsula of Gallipoli, and the troops were finally withdrawn from this graveyard of Allied hopes.

After long hesitation Bulgaria also threw in her lot with the Central Powers. The situation in the Balkans now changed overnight. Brave little Serbia, who earlier in the war had twice expelled the Austrians, quickly collapsed under the double attack of Austro-Germans from the north and Bulgarians from the east. Montenegro, Serbia's ally, was likewise conquered, together with northern Albania. The triumph of the Central Powers had the important result of opening up railway communication between Berlin and Constantinople.

Military operations in the Balkans were not yet over. Influenced by the success of Brusilov's "drive" on the eastern front
and the Anglo-French victories at Verdun and on the Somme in the West, Rumania decided to join the Allies. Her armies promptly invaded Transylvania. A German-Austrian-Bulgarian counter-stroke drove them out and led to the speedy conquest of two-thirds of their own territory. The Rumanian collapse brought enormous advantages to the Central Powers, who now had access to the grain fields and oil wells of Rumania. It also shortened their battle-front by five hundred miles and facilitated their communications with Bulgaria and Turkey.

After the failure of the Dardanelles campaign a large Anglo-French force had been gathered behind the defenses of Salonika in Greece, partly as a threat to Turkey and Bulgaria and partly to prevent King Constantine from bringing Greece into the war on the side of the Central Powers. He was finally deposed by the Allies, who placed his second son, Alexander, on the throne. Venizelos, whom Constantine had dismissed from office, became prime minister once more and immediately took steps to insure the cooperation of his country with the Allies. The Balkan front henceforth extended westward from the Ægean to the Adriatic.

Italy declared neutrality in 1914, giving the same reason which she had given in 1913, namely, that the terms of the Triple Alliance did not bind her to assist the Central Powers in an offensive war. But Italy was unable to remain neutral. Union with the Allies

---

1 See page 591.
meant an opportunity to secure *Italia Irredenta*, those territories in the north and east of the peninsula still "unredeemed" from the grasp of Austria-Hungary, her traditional foe. Though the pressure of national interests helped to range Italy with the Allies, even more compelling, perhaps, was the conviction on the part of the Italian people that the Allies were fighting in a just cause for everything that mankind holds dear. Italy, an ancient home of civilization, would aid her Latin sister France in defending civilization against what seemed a fresh inroad of the Germanic barbarians.

The entrance of Italy 1 added another front and almost completed the encirclement of the Central Powers. Italian armies marched against Trieste and the Trentino, but for a long time made slow progress. The Austrians held the crests of the mountains and the passes; consequently, the Italians had to force their way upward in the face of the enemy. During the summer of 1916 they finally crossed the

---

1 San Marino also has a place in the Allied honor roll.
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Isonzo River and occupied Gorizia on the way to Trieste. The break-up of Russia after the revolution freed large forces of the Central Powers for service against Italy. An Austro-German attack, late in 1917, undid all that the Italians had accomplished in more than two years of hard fighting and forced them back as far as the Piave River. There, with some aid from French and British troops, the Italians checked their foes.

The military situation in Europe at the end of 1917 clearly favored the Central Powers. On the western front they held Luxemburg, nearly all of Belgium, and a broad strip of northern France containing valuable coal and iron mines. On the eastern front they held Poland, Lithuania, and Courland, the richest industrial districts of the Russian Empire. They had overrun Serbia, Montenegro, and a large part of Rumania. They had taken most of Venetia from the Italians. Their only territorial losses to the Allies were in southern Alsace and eastern Galicia. A different picture, however, was presented outside of Europe and on the sea.

177. The War outside of Europe and on the Sea, 1914–1917

The sea-power of the Allies enabled them to capture Germany’s colonial possessions. The British and French seized Togo and the Cameroons in West Africa. British troops from the Union of South Africa, assisted by loyal Boers, took German Southwest Africa, and in coöperation with Belgian forces took German East Africa. The native population of all these colonies welcomed their release from the cruel, oppressive rule of German officials. The German possessions in the Pacific,¹ south of the equator, were conquered by the Australians and New Zealanders, and those north of the equator by the Japanese.

Japan promptly entered the war on the side of the Allies. She had not forgotten the kaiser’s slighting references to the

¹ See page 351, note 1.
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"Yellow Peril" nor the fact that Germany had been chiefly instrumental in depriving her of Port Arthur and Liaotung Peninsula, after the Chino-Japanese War in 1895. Moreover, Japan had entered into an alliance with Great Britain providing for mutual support were the territorial rights or special interests of either power in the Far East threatened by another power. Japan's special contribution to the Allied cause was the capture of Kiauchau, the German naval base and stronghold in the Far East.

Germany's ally, Turkey, suffered the loss of her outlying possessions. Great Britain proclaimed a protectorate over Egypt and set up a new ruler, or sultan, who was to be quite independent of the sultan at Constantinople. The British also encouraged a revolt of the Arabs against Turkey. Arab troops secured Mecca and Medina, the sacred places of Arabia, and established the kingdom of the Hejaz, which extends along the eastern coast of the Red Sea. Its first ruler is a descendant of the prophet Mohammed.

Two other countries, long under the heel of the Turk, owed their liberation to Great Britain. An expeditionary force, largely composed of Indian contingents, invaded Mesopotamia by way of the Tigris River and entered Bagdad in triumph (March, 1917). Another British army, starting from Egypt, invaded Palestine.

---

1 See page 415.
2 See page 410.
3 See page 350.
and took possession of Jerusalem (December, 1917). The Holy City, after nearly seven centuries, was again in Christian hands.

The fleets of the Allies quickly swept the merchantmen of the Central Powers from the ocean and compelled their warships to keep the shelter of home ports. The few German raiders which remained at large after hostilities began were either captured or sunk. Once only did the German "High Seas Fleet" slip out of Kiel Harbor, to be met by the British battle cruisers off the coast of Jutland (May 31, 1916). Both sides suffered heavy losses in the engagement which followed. With the approach of darkness, however, the German ships returned to their safe anchorage and did not emerge again during the remainder of the war.

Allied control of the sea led to an immediate blockade of Germany and Austria-Hungary. Three results followed. The Allies were able freely to import food and raw materials from their colonies and neutral states. They kept the ocean lanes safe for the transportation of troops from Africa, India, Australia, and Canada, meanwhile preventing the return of Austro-German reservists from the United States and other countries. Finally, the Allies extinguished the commerce of the Central Powers, who were henceforth hard pressed to find the necessary sinews of war for their armies and food for their civilian population.

As the war continued, the Allied blockade became more and more stringent. At first, it prevented the importation into Germany only of munitions and other materials used for military purposes. In February, 1915, Great Britain also declared foodstuffs contraband, and as such liable to seizure if carried from neutral countries in neutral ships to Germany. The British justified their action on the ground that the German government had already commandeered the stocks of grain in private hands to insure the feeding of its armies, in other words, had itself treated foodstuffs as practically indispensable to the conduct of the war.
The Central Powers relied on submarines (U-boats) to break the blockade. During the first months of the war the submarines attacked only enemy warships, but before long they began to destroy without warning enemy merchantmen. This was in flagrant defiance of international law, which requires that a cargo or a passenger ship, under either an enemy or a neutral flag, shall be warned before being attacked and every effort made to safeguard human lives. After the British action in making food contraband, Germany went so far as to declare the waters around the British Isles a "war zone," where all enemy merchantmen would be sunk, whether or not passengers and crews could be rescued. Neutral vessels were also warned against trespassing within the zone. It goes without saying that this declaration constituted only a "paper blockade," of the sort that had been already prohibited by the Declaration of Paris in 1856.¹ The attempt to enforce the blockade by piratical means brought about the entrance of the United States into the World War.

178. Intervention of the United States

President Wilson announced the neutrality of the United States immediately upon the outbreak of hostilities. No other course seemed possible, in view of our traditional policy of non-interference in European affairs and our peaceful temper. The President also asked for neutrality of sentiment on the part of the American people, so that the United States, as the one great nation at peace, might in time be able to mediate between the warring countries. While the government did remain neutral, American citizens could not avoid taking sides. The Central Powers had many active sympathizers, especially among those of German birth or parentage. Public opinion, however, favored the Allies; above all, France, to whom we owed our liberty, and Belgium, so innocent and so cruelly wronged. But as yet there was little thought of our active participation in the war.

¹ See page 487.
Germany’s proclamation of a “war zone” led to an acute controversy with that country. President Wilson protested at once, declaring that the United States would hold the German government to a “strict accountability” for American ships destroyed or American citizens killed. Germany disclaimed all responsibility for “accidents” which might occur. U-boats proceeded to torpedo the great British liner *Lusitania*, with the loss of over one hundred American men, women, and children (May 7, 1915),¹ and also attacked American ships and those of other neutral nations. A “war of notes” between the United States and Germany finally extorted a German pledge not to sink merchant vessels without warning, unless they attempted to escape or offered resistance (May, 1916). Germany never intended to keep her pledge any longer than convenient, as the frank Bethmann-Hollweg afterwards admitted in a public statement. At the end of January, 1917, she notified the American government of her purpose to sink at sight all ships, both enemy and neutral, found within the waters around the Allied countries. President Wilson then severed diplomatic relations with the German government. This act did not necessarily mean war, but it prepared the way for war.

Submarine atrocities combined with Austro-German intrigues and conspiracies throughout the United States to arouse the warlike temper of the American people. From the very start official and non-official representatives of the Central Powers had done all they could to destroy munition plants and steel factories supplying the

¹ In all, 1154 persons were drowned.
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Allies. Funds were sent to the German ambassador for use in bribing Congress to declare an embargo on the traffic in munitions. Spies were multiplied throughout the country. Efforts were made to foment ill feeling in the United States against Japan and in Mexico against the United States. When Germany was about to proclaim unrestricted submarine warfare and believed the intervention of the United States would follow, she even invited Mexico to enter an alliance with her, promising aid in helping that country recover the American Southwest. Such actions convinced our people that Germany and her satellites were running amuck under irresponsible rulers and that national safety, no less than national honor, required us to take the side of the Allies.

American intervention soon became an accomplished fact. The President, in an address before a special session of Congress, urged that since Germany had repeatedly committed hostile acts against the United States, we should formally accept the status of belligerent thus thrust upon us. Congress responded by declaring war on Germany (April 6, 1917). Similar action was taken as to Austria-Hungary in December of the same year. Diplomatic relations with Turkey and Bulgaria were also broken.

America, the President said, had no quarrel with the people of the Central Powers, who had been led blindly into the war. America's quarrel was with their autocratic governments. She asked nothing for herself, neither annexations nor indemnities. She fought to put down divine-right monarchy, secret diplomacy, and militarism, to promote among mankind that ordered liberty under law which she had long enjoyed, and to "make the world safe for democracy." In such a cause American citizens were privileged to spend their lives and their fortunes.

The United States prepared on a colossal scale for the war. Part of the navy was immediately sent to Europe, including a number of torpedo boats and destroyers to fight the German submarines. The government adopted conscription as the most rapid and demo-
cratic method of raising an army, and two months after the declaration of war over ten million young men were registered for service. Officers’ training camps were established, and thirty-two cantonments — virtual cities, each housing forty thousand men — were set up within ninety days to accommodate the private soldiers under training. Congress made huge appropriations for the construction of airplanes, for building cargo ships to replace those sunk by the enemy, for loans to the Allies, and for the purchase of immense quantities of food, clothing, rifles, machine guns, artillery, munitions, and all the other equipment of a modern fighting force. The money was raised partly by increased taxation, partly by borrowing (the Liberty Loans). Other features of the American war program included fuel control, food control, under the efficient direction of Mr. Herbert Hoover, and government operation of railroads, express companies, and telegraph and telephone lines. At the same time, American engineers in France constructed docks, storage depots, barracks, and even entire railways for the reception of America’s armies.

Several countries which so far had remained neutral followed the example of the United States during 1917. Cuba, Panama, Brazil, Siam, Liberia, and China all flung down the gauntlet to Germany. Including Portugal, which joined the Allies during 1916, nineteen sovereign states were now ranged against the four Central Powers.¹

¹ The most important effort from a neutral source to end the war by negotiations came from Pope Benedict XV. On August 1, 1917 he addressed the belligerent nations, proposing, in the main, a return to conditions which existed before 1914. Occupied territories were to be evacuated by both sides; indemnities were to be waived;

¹ Ten Latin-American countries also broke off diplomatic relations with Germany in 1917. They were Costa Rica, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Bolivia, Ecuador, Peru, Santo Domingo, and Uruguay. The first five of these declared war against Germany during 1918. Salvador declared a benevolent neutrality toward the United States, but did not actually enter the war.
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and the questions relating to Alsace-Lorraine, the Trentino, Poland, and other regions were to be settled in a conciliatory spirit. The pope further urged a decrease of armaments, the establishment of compulsory arbitration, and, in general, the substitution of the "moral force of right" for the "material force of arms." President Wilson replied to this appeal as spokesman of the Allies, declaring that no peace which would endure could be made with the autocratic and irresponsible German government.

On January 8, 1918, the President in an address to Congress set forth fourteen points of a program for a just and lasting peace. They included: abolition of secret diplomacy; removal of economic barriers between the nations; reduction of armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety; freedom of the seas; impartial adjustment of colonial claims; evacuation by Germany of all conquered territory and the restoration of Belgium; readjustment of Italian frontiers along the lines of nationality; an independent Poland; self-government for the different peoples of Austria-Hungary and the Ottoman Empire; and, finally, the formation of a general association of nations "for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike." These proposals were generally accepted abroad as a succinct statement of the purposes of the Allies in the World War.

179. The Russian Revolution

The Russian Revolution, beginning on the eve of American intervention, revealed the war more clearly than ever as no mere conflict for the preservation of the balance of power in Europe, but as a world-wide struggle between democracy and autocracy. Popular uprisings in Russia between 1905 and 1906 had compelled the tsar to grant a national legislature (Duma), without, however, seriously weakening the position of the government. The war

See page 372.
The Russian Revolution disclosed how inefficient, weak, and even corrupt that government was. Late in 1916 the pro-German party at the court, including the tsar’s German wife, secretly began negotiations with the Central Powers for a separate peace. Patriotic Russians in the Duma passed a resolution that “dark forces” in high places were betraying the nation’s interest. Nevertheless, the intrigue went on, apparently with the connivance of the tsar, and the demoralization of Russia proceeded apace.

A severe shortage of food in Petrograd brought matters to a crisis. Rioting broke out, and the troops were ordered to suppress it with bullet and bayonet in the usual pitiless fashion. But the old army, so long the prop of autocracy, languished in German prison camps or lay underground. The new army, mostly recruited from peasants and workingmen since the war, refused to fire on the people. Autocracy found itself helpless. The Duma then induced the tsar to sign the penciled memorandum which ended the Romanov dynasty after three hundred and four years of absolute power.1

The revolutionists set up a provisional government, headed by the executive committee of the Duma. Nearly all the members belonged to the party of Constitutional Democrats,2 representing the middle class, or bourgeoisie. Many liberal reforms were announced: liberty of speech and of the press; the right of suffrage for both men and women; a general amnesty for all political offenders and Siberian exiles; and a constituent assembly to draw up a constitution for Russia. The United States and the western Allies promptly recognized the new government.

Socialists did not rest satisfied with these measures. They planned to give the revolution an economic rather than merely a political character. Throughout Russia they organized soviets, or councils representing workingmen and soldiers. The most important of these bodies was the

---

1 See page 56.
2 Popularly called “Cadets,” from the initial letters of the party name.
country, within a year, embraced radical socialism and withdrew from the war. The Treaty of Brest-Litovsk gave the Central Powers a free hand in the West. Great Britain, France, and Italy recognized this fact and prepared to remain on the defensive until the United States should be able to throw the full weight of its resources into the struggle. The Allies could afford to wait. To the Central Powers a prolongation of the war spelled ruin. "Frightfulness" on the ocean had not broken the blockade or starved Great Britain or interrupted the stream of transports carrying American troops in ever larger numbers to Europe. Germany realized that her supreme effort for world dominion must be made in 1918, or never. "If the enemy does not want peace," declared the kaiser, "then we must bring peace to the world by battering in with the iron fist and shining sword the doors of those who will not have peace."  1

Having gathered every available man and gun, the Germans on March 21, 1918, started a "drive" along the line from Arras to La Fère. Their plan was obvious: to split the "drives" Anglo-French forces at the point of juncture on the Oise River; to roll each army back, the British upon the Channel, the French upon Paris; and then to destroy each army separately. The battle which followed surpassed in intensity every previous engagement on the western front. By terrific massed attacks, the Germans regained in a few days all the ground so slowly and painfully won by the Allied offensives in 1916 and 1917. The British were pushed back twenty-five miles, bringing the enemy within artillery range of Amiens and its important railway connections. The critical condition of affairs led the Allies to establish unity of action by putting their forces under the command of General Foch, an admirable strategist who shared with Joffre the glory of the Marne battle. Before this step was taken, General Pershing had already offered the entire American army to be used wherever needed by the Allies. The Germans in April launched another "drive" to the north, between Arras and Ypres, against

1 Address to the Second German Army in France, December 22, 1917.
the British guarding the road to the Channel ports. Again
the enemy drove a deep wedge into the British line. It was at
this dark hour of the struggle
that Sir Douglas Haig issued his
historic order: "With our backs
to the wall, and believing in the
justice of our cause, each one of
us must fight to the end. The
safety of our homes and the free-
dom of mankind depend alike
upon the conduct of each one
of us at the critical moment."
French reinforcements arrived
on the scene in time to check
the German advance. A third
"drive" at the end of May,
between Soissons and Reims,
brought the Germans back once
more to the Marne at Château-Thierry, only forty-three miles
from Paris, but French reserves
again halted the advance. Re-
newed German efforts in June and
July to pierce the Allied line and
reach Paris were fruitless. And
now the tide turned.

General Foch, always an advo-
cate of the offensive in warfare,
found himself by mid-
summer able to put
his theories into practice. He now
possessed the reinforcements sent
by both Great Britain and Italy
to help hold the long line from
the sea to Switzerland, together
with the fresh American troops —
"Pershing's crusaders" — whose mettle had been already tested
at Château-Thierry. July 18, 1918, is a memorable date, for on
that day the Allies began the series of rapid counter-strokes, perfectly coördinated, which four months later brought the war on the western front to a victorious conclusion. How the French and Americans pinched the Germans out of the Marne salient; how the Americans, in their first independent operation, swept the enemy from the St.-Mihiel salient, south of Verdun, and started an advance into German Lorraine which carried them to Sedan; how the British broke the "Hindenburg Line," supposedly impregnable; how the Belgians liberated Flanders — these are only the outstanding events of a period unsurpassed in interest and importance since the dawn of history.

With disaster impending on the western front, Germany could no longer support her confederates in the other theaters of the war. Bulgaria was the first of the Central Powers to collapse. A vigorous offensive, begun during September by British, Greek, Serbian, French, and Italian troops in the Balkans, split the Bulgarian armies apart, thus opening the way for an immediate advance upon Sofia. Bulgaria then surrendered unconditionally. Shortly afterwards Tsar Ferdinand abdicated.
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Turkey, now isolated from Germany and Austria-Hungary, was the second of the Central Powers to collapse. The campaign against the Turks during September and October formed an unbroken succession of victories. British forces, keeping close touch with their Arab allies, advanced northward from the neighborhood of Jerusalem. After initial successes on the plain of Esdraelon, famous as a battle-field in Old Testament times, they took Damascus, the capital of Syria, and soon entered Aleppo, close to the railway between Constantinople and Bagdad. At the same time, the British in Mesopotamia captured the Turkish army on the Tigris. Nothing remained for Turkey but to sign an armistice accepting all the Allied demands.

Simultaneously, Austria-Hungary collapsed. What may be called the second battle of the Piave began at the end of October, when General Diaz, the Italian commander, struck a sudden blow at the Austrian armies and hurled them back along the whole front from the Alps to the sea. The battle soon assumed the proportions of a disaster perhaps unequaled in the annals of war. Within a single week the Italians chased the Austrians out of northern Italy, entered Trent and Trieste, and captured three hundred thousand prisoners and five thousand guns. Austria-Hungary then signed an armistice which, as in the cases of Bulgaria and Turkey, amounted to an unconditional surrender.

The military overthrow of the Dual Monarchy quickly led to its disintegration. Separate states arose, representing the various nationalities formerly subject to the Hapsburgs. Emperor Charles I bowed to the inevitable and laid down the imperial crown which he had assumed in 1916 upon the death of Francis Joseph I. Such was the end of the Hapsburg dynasty, rulers of Austria since the latter part of the thirteenth century.

---

1 See the map on page 568.  
2 See page 598.  
3 See page 354.  
4 See page 65.
The Hohenzollerns also disappeared from the scene. As Germany during that fateful summer and autumn of 1918 began to taste the bitterness of defeat, the popular demand for peace and democratic government became an open summons to the kaiser to abdicate. He long resisted, vainly making one concession after another, until the red flag had been hoisted over the German fleet at Kiel, and Berlin and other cities were in the hands of revolutionists. Then he abdicated, both as emperor and king, and fled to Holland. The other German crowns quickly fell, like overripe fruit. Germany soon found itself a socialist republic, controlled by the Social Democrats.¹

The armistice, which practically ended the war, was concluded by the Allies and the United States with the new German government. It formed a long document of thirty-five clauses, covering every aspect of the military situation and making it impossible for Germany to renew hostilities before the peace settlement. Germany agreed to return all prisoners of war; to surrender her submarines, the best part of her fleet, and immense numbers of cannon, machine guns, and airplanes; to evacuate Belgium, Luxemburg, France, and Alsace-Lorraine; and to allow the joint occupation by Allied and American troops of the Rhinelands, together with the principal crossings of the Rhine (Mainz, Coblenz, and Cologne) and bridgeheads at these points on the right bank of the river. A neutral zone was reserved between the occupied territory and the rest of Germany.² The German government carried out these stringent terms under necessity.

The sudden termination of hostilities found the greater part of Europe in confusion. The former empires of the Romanovs, Hapsburgs, and Hohenzollerns promised to break up into a large number of independent states, with new governments and a new distribution of population. The problems for solution by the peace conference included, therefore, not only the necessary

¹ See pages 345 and 505. ² See the map, page 590.
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arrangements for indemnities in money and territory to be paid by the Central Powers and the disposition of Germany's colonial possessions, but also the creation of a dozen or more sovereign countries with boundaries so drawn as to satisfy all legitimate national aspirations. The World War was to be followed by a World Settlement.

Studies

1. Summarize in essay form (about five hundred words) what seem to you to have been the fundamental causes of the World War. 2. Define the following: ultimatum, mobilization, reservists, blockade, contraband of war, and salient. 3. Draw up a list of the countries in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America which remained entirely neutral during the World War. 4. Compare the World War, as to its epoch-making character, with (a) the Thirty Years' War; (b) the Seven Years' War; and (c) the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars. 5. Show that the assassination of the Austrian crown prince furnished an excuse rather than a reason for war. 6. What were the "strategical grounds" for the German invasion of Belgium? 7. Is it likely that Great Britain would have become a belligerent if Belgian neutrality had not been violated? 8. What made the capture of Paris seem so vitally important to the Germans at the outset of the war? 9. The battle of the Marne has been called "one more decisive battle of the world." Comment on this statement. 10. How did the Austro-German victories on the eastern and Balkan fronts contribute to the realization of "Middle Europe"? 11. Did Japan have sufficient reason for declaring war against Germany? 12. On what grounds did President Wilson adopt a policy of neutrality? 13. Show that the United States, as a neutral, could not properly place an embargo on the export of arms and munitions to the Allies. 14. Enumerate the principal reasons for the entrance of the United States in the war against Germany and Austria-Hungary. 15. Why did not the United States declare war on Bulgaria and Turkey? 16. What gave special significance to President Wilson's "Fourteen Points" as a statement of Allied war aims? 17. How did the revolution in Russia lead to the disintegration of the country? Contrast its results in this respect with the French Revolution. 18. Account for the rapid collapse of the Central Powers in the latter part of 1918.
CHAPTER XXV

THE WORLD SETTLEMENT, 1919–1920

181. The Peace Conference

On January 18, 1919, forty-eight years to a day from the proclamation of the German Empire in the palace of Louis XIV at Versailles, the Peace Conference assembled at Paris. It was a gathering which dwarfed into insignificance the Congress at Vienna or those still earlier congresses of Utrecht and Westphalia. They met to settle the affairs of Europe; this one met to settle the affairs of the world.

The seventy-odd delegates to the conference represented all the Allied and Associated countries (except San Marino, Montenegro, Costa Rica, and Russia) and those which had severed diplomatic relations with the Central Powers (except Santo Domingo). Neutral states were admitted to the conference only when matters affecting their particular interests came up for discussion. Enemy states were altogether excluded, for, in the words of President Poincaré’s opening address, "You have thought that the terms of peace ought to be arranged among ourselves before they are com-

1 Webster, Historical Source Book, No. 20, "Holy Alliance, 1815"; No. 33, "Covenant of the League of Nations, 1919."
municated to those against whom we have fought the good fight."

The number of delegates was fixed as follows: five each for the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan; three each for Belgium, Brazil, and Serbia; two Organization each for Greece, Rumania, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Portugal, China, Siam, the kingdom of the Hejaz, India, Australia, South Africa, and Canada; and one each for the remaining countries. Committees of the delegates, together with other representatives of the powers, were appointed to investigate and report on such subjects as the League of Nations, responsibility for the war, reparation by the enemy, and international labor legislation. Over a thousand experts upon geography, history, race conditions, international law, commerce, and other technical matters coöperated with the delegates. Premier Clémenceau was unanimously chosen chairman of the conference, a merited tribute at once to the man and to France.

The direction of affairs naturally fell to the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan. The two ranking delegates\(^1\) from each of these five powers constituted a Supreme Council to discuss and formulate the business of the conference. As time went on, the difficulty of reconciling the many diverse interests and of reaching a

---

\(^1\) United States: Woodrow Wilson, President, and Robert Lansing, Secretary of State; Great Britain: David Lloyd George, Prime Minister, and A. J. Balfour, Foreign Secretary; France: Georges Clémenceau, Prime Minister, and Stephen Pinchon, Foreign Minister; Italy: Vittorio Orlando, Prime Minister, and Baron Sonnino, Foreign Minister; Japan: the Marquis Saionji, formerly Prime Minister, and Viscount Chinda.
settlement satisfactory to all made it necessary to reduce the original council of ten members to one of five. Finally, Japan dropped from the inner circle, and the "Big Four," namely, premiers Clémenceau, Lloyd George, and Orlando, and President Wilson; decided among themselves the most important questions. Very few of their decisions were made public. This apparent relapse into the ways of the old and discredited secret diplomacy aroused much criticism at the time, especially from those who did not realize the magnitude of the task before the conference and the urgent need of haste in concluding its labors.

Meanwhile, the drafting of the peace treaty with Germany proceeded steadily. Early in May it was delivered to the German delegates, who had been summoned to Versailles for the occasion. They were given a maximum period of fifteen days within which to present their written observations on the entire document. The time limit, however, was subsequently extended.

A long interchange of notes followed. The German government made every effort to secure a radical modification of the treaty and finally presented a set of counter-proposals as a basis for discussion. The Supreme Council, in reply, offered a number of concessions, none of them vitally important. The treaty as thus amended (the changes being written on the margins in red ink) was again delivered to the German delegates, who were allowed five days to declare their purpose of signing it. In default of such declaration, the Allies would consider the armistice terminated and would "take such steps as they thought needful to enforce their terms."

This ultimatum and the peremptory refusal of any further extension of time meant that Germany had the choice between immediate acceptance of the treaty without reservations and renewal of the war. Germany chose to accept it, and her decision brought a relief to tense nerves everywhere. The historic ceremony of signing occurred on June 28 in the Hall of Mirrors at Versailles.
The Peace Conference

SIGNATURES ON THE PEACE TREATY WITH GERMANY

Copyright by International Film Service
The last article of the treaty provided that it should become effective when ratified by Germany on the one hand and by three of the principal Allied and Associated powers on the other hand. Germany ratified it early in July, and similar action was taken during the following months of 1919 by Great Britain, France, and Italy. The exchange of ratifications took place on January 10, 1920, in the Clock Hall of the French Foreign Ministry at Paris. From this day, therefore, the Allied powers and Germany were once more at peace.1

An Associated power still remained technically at war with Germany. The United States had not ratified the treaty owing to opposition in the Senate, which, according to the Constitution, must concur by a two-thirds vote in all treaties made by the President. Senatorial criticism was especially directed against certain features of the League of Nations, as inserted in the treaty. The chief stumbling-block was Article X of the convenant, which declares that "the members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league." Many senators believed that this article, by putting the military and naval forces of the United States at the disposal of the league, impaired the constitutional right of Congress to declare war, and might also result in foreign entanglements which it has always been the American policy to avoid. Attempts were made to amend the treaty by writing into it various reservations indicative of the precise obligations which the United States was willing to accept under it. On both occasions (November, 1919, and March, 1920) when the amended treaty came to a vote in the Senate, it failed to pass by the necessary two-thirds majority. The rejection of the treaty makes it an issue in the presidential campaign of 1920, when,

1 The Peace Conference also ended its historic sessions in January, 1920. Subsequent diplomatic activities on the part of the Allies will be continued by a Council of Ambassadors, empowered to control the execution of the treaties with Germany and her associates, and a Council of Premiers, which is to deal with all important international questions as they arise.
as President Wilson has said, a referendum will be taken "as to the part the United States is to play in completing the settle-
ments of the war and in the preventing in the future of such outrages as Germany attempted to perpetrate."

182. Peace with Germany

The peace treaty with Germany is the longest document of the sort ever drawn. It contains about eighty thousand words, divided into four hundred and forty articles. The Character of the treaty text is in English and French on opposite pages. After the preamble and the list of the high contracting parties, comes the Covenant of the League of Nations. Then follow the articles specifically devoted to Germany.

First of all, Germany restores Alsace and Lorraine to France. German misgovernment of these two provinces since 1871 and the evident desire of most of their people to be reunited to France furnish sufficient justification for the action of the Peace Conference. The possession of Alsace-Lorraine, practically uninjured by the ravages of war, also helps to compensate France for the destruction wrought in her northern provinces. Second, Germany cedes to France absolutely the coal mines in the Saar Basin (north of Lorraine).\(^1\) This area, which was taken from France in 1815, is to be governed by the League of Nations until a plebiscite is held at the end of fifteen years to determine whether the inhabitants prefer French or German sovereignty. Third, Germany agrees that northern Schleswig shall return to Denmark in case a majority of the inhabitants vote for the change.\(^2\) By this action the Allies seek to repair the injury done by Prussia to Denmark in 1864. Fourth, Germany relinquishes certain small districts on her western frontier to Belgium.

The restoration of Poland to a place among the nations has necessitated sweeping changes in Germany's eastern frontier.

---

\(^1\) See the map on page 273.

\(^2\) See the map on page 269. The results of the two plebiscites taken in the spring of 1920 gave the greater part of northern Schleswig to Denmark.
She gives up Posen and West Prussia to the new Polish state. She consents to plebiscites in part of East Prussia and in part of Prussian Silesia to decide whether these regions shall be German or Polish. Finally, she renounces all rights over Danzig, which, with its environs, is to become a free city under the protection of the League of Nations. This action assures to Poland uninterrupted access to the Baltic down the valley of the Vistula.

If all the plebiscites go against her, Germany will lose European territory with an area of about 40,000 square miles and a population of about 10,000,000. Except for Alsace-Lorraine, these losses must be borne by Prussia, which, in consequence, will no longer so completely overshadow the other German states. The Peace Conference thus undid much of both Frederick the Great's and Bismarck's work for the exaltation of the Prussian kingdom.

Germany's name on a far-flung colonial empire is blotted from the map. All her possessions overseas are taken from her. German East Africa goes to Great Britain and Belgium, and German Southwest Africa, to the Union of South Africa. Togo and the Cameroons are divided between France and Great Britain. These territories will be administered under mandates from the League of Nations. The mandate for the German Pacific islands north of the equator is to be held by Japan, and that for the islands south of the equator, by Australia. New Zealand, however, receives the mandate for German Samoa. Germany also renounces, in favor of Japan, all her rights in Kiauchau and the Chinese province of Shantung. The territory outside of Europe sacrificed by Germany aggregates over 11,000,000 square miles, with a population of over 13,000,000.

Responsibility for all damages, both on the land and at sea, is assumed by Germany and her associates in the war. Pending the full determination of the Allied claims, she undertakes to pay during 1919–1921, in gold,

---

1 Pelew, Caroline, Ladrone, and Marshall Islands.
2 German New Guinea, Bismarck Archipelago, and northern Solomon Islands.
The sessions were held in the handsome chamber known as the Salte de l'Hôtel (Hall of the Codex).

After a parting by Jacobin, the official artist, The Peace Conference took place at the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs on the Quai d'Orsay.
HALL OF MIRRORS, VERSAILLES

This splendid apartment contains thirty-four arches, half of them filled with windows overlooking the gardens, and half with large mirrors. Louis XIV used the gallery as a throne room. Here the German Empire was proclaimed in 1871, and here in 1919 the Peace of Versailles was signed.
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securities, commodities, cattle, coal, ships, etc., the equivalent of 20,000,000,000 marks (about $5,000,000,000 at pre-war reckon-
ing). A Reparation Commission is set up by the Allies to fix the amount of further payments and to arrange for the dis-
charge of the entire obligation within a period of thirty years from May, 1921. As security for such further payments, Ger-
many promises to deliver at once to the Allies bonds amounting to 40,000,000,000 marks and bearing interest at 5 per cent. A
second installment of equal amount must be issued by Germany whenever the Reparation Commission is satisfied that she can
meet the interest on the bonds and provide for a sinking fund to pay them off. She agrees to reimburse Belgium for all sums borrowed by that country from the Allied and Associated
governments during the war. Further, she agrees to replace ton for ton all merchant vessels and fishing boats lost or dam-
aged during the war. Allied occupation of the Rhinelands will continue until reparation is completed.

The military, naval, and air clauses of the treaty ought to make Germany innocuous. She must abolish conscription. Her
army must not exceed 100,000 men, including Reduction of
officers. The fortifications west of the Rhine, those in a thirty-mile zone on the east bank of the Rhine, those con-
trolling the Baltic, and those on Helgoland must be destroyed. All importation, exportation, and nearly all production of war
material is prohibited. The German fleet is reduced to a few ships without submarines. No airplanes, seaplanes, or dirigible
balloons may be maintained for purposes of war. Germany
also surrenders her submarine cables. These drastic require-
ments are intended to pave the way for a general limitation of
armaments by all nations.

The treaty contains a clause arraigning “William II of
Hohenzollern, formerly German Emperor, for a supreme offense
against international morality and the sanctity of
treaties.” The Allies and the United States pro-
posed to set up a tribunal for the trial of the kaiser, but Holland
refused to surrender him to the justice of his foes. Another
clause of the treaty relates to the punishment of Germans
accused of having committed acts in violation of the laws and customs of war. The Allies, accordingly, demanded from Germany no less than eight hundred and ninety "war criminals," among whom were the crown prince, Tirpitz, the advocate of ruthless submarine sinkings, Hindenburg, and many other generals of high rank. The German government declared itself unable to meet this demand, without provoking a popular uprising. Under these circumstances the Allies accepted the German counter-proposal for a trial of the accused persons before the Supreme Court at Leipzig.

Few persons, at least in Allied countries, will be found to question either the justice or the wisdom of this peace treaty. To quote President Wilson in his message from Paris to the American people: "It is a severe treaty in the duties and penalties it imposes upon Germany; but it is severe only because great wrongs done by Germany are to be righted and repaired; it imposes nothing that Germany cannot do: and she can regain her rightful standing in the world by the prompt and honorable fulfillment of its terms."

183. Peace with Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey

The treaty with Austria was signed in September, 1919, at St.-Germain, near Paris. Territorially, the St.-Germain treaty does little more than record an accomplished fact, namely, the disintegration of the Hapsburg realm. Austria cedes territory to Czecho-Slovakia and Jugoslavia and recognizes their independence. Other parts of the former Austrian Empire are ceded to Italy (the Trentino and Adriatic possessions), to Poland (Galicia), and to Rumania (Bukowina). The new Austrian Republic becomes a small inland state, German in culture and chiefly German in population. The treaty also embodies various stringent provisions relating to reparation and disarmament.

The treaty with Hungary was long delayed, owing to the inability of the Magyars to set up a really representative government. In January, 1920, the Allies finally presented the text of a proposed treaty to the Hun-
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garian peace delegation at Neuilly, near Paris. The Neuilly
treaty, if ratified, will reduce the new Hungarian Republic to a
small state inhabited almost entirely by Magyars. Czechoslovakia secures that part of northern Hungary containing a
predominantly Slovak population; Rumania, the Rumanian
districts of Transylvania; and Jugoslavia, the Slovenian and
Croatian territories of Hungary. The Magyars and Germans
in the regions to be thus severed from Hungary condemn these
arrangements, as compelling them to become subjects of foreign
states without their own consent. They call, therefore, for
plebiscites to determine the question of national allegiance and
agree to abide by the results of such an appeal to the principle
of "self-determination." The demands made upon Hungary
for disarmament and reparation are substantially identical with
those of the treaty with Austria.

The treaty with Bulgaria, as signed in November, 1919, at
Neuilly, slightly rectifies the western frontier of that state in
favor of Jugoslavia. The frontier with Rumania remains as before the war, although the hope is
held out that Rumania may be induced to give up to Bulgaria that part of Dobruja which is wholly Bulgarian in character. The most important boundary change is on the south, where Bulgaria relinquishes part of Thrace to the Allies, who will ultimately hand it over to Greece. Bulgaria thus loses an
outlet on the Ægean. She must limit her army to 20,000 men, surrender all warships and aircraft, and pay a total indemnity of $445,000,000. The new Bulgarian government has taken
steps to bring to trial and punish ex-tsar Ferdinand and all the
pro-German politicians responsible for involving Bulgaria in the
war.

The disposition of the Ottoman Empire presented one of the
thorniest problems before the Peace Conference. The text of
the treaty with Turkey was not made public until May, 1920. Contrary to general expectations, the sultan will be allowed to retain Constantinople and a
small strip of territory about that city. The shores of the
Bosporus and the Dardanelles will be internationalized,
however, so that the gates of the Black Sea may be free to all nations.

The interior of Asia Minor (Anatolia), the first seat of Ottoman power six centuries ago, continues to be under Turkish sovereignty. Greece secures the city of Smyrna and its neighborhood. This region formed a part of ancient Hellas and still continues a large Greek population. Italy receives a considerable district in southern Asia Minor, with Adalia as its seaport.

The French hold all of coastal Syria, extending from the Taurus Mountains southward to Beirut. The interests of France in this part of the Levant are chiefly commercial, though there is a sentimental tradition dating back to Napoleon and even to the Crusades. The interior of Syria, from Aleppo to Damascus and thence across the Syrian Desert to Arabia, is held by the Arabs. In March, 1920, a Syrian Congress at Damascus proclaimed all of Syria an independent kingdom under Emir Feisal, son of the king of the Hejaz. The new state, however, has not been recognized by the Allies.

The Arabs, who far outnumber the Jews in Palestine, would like to include that country, also, within their new Syrian kingdom. Palestine, since its conquest from the Turks, has been occupied by Great Britain. The British government now receives a mandate for Palestine in order to develop it as a national home for the Jewish people—a people without a country for more than eighteen hundred years.

The Arab kingdom of the Hejaz testifies to a new birth of Islam. The Young Turks, in their efforts to "Ottomanize" all the peoples of the Ottoman Empire, only succeeded in alienating the Arabs, who have never forgotten that from their land came the Prophet, that in it are the holy cities of Mecca and Medina, and that Arabic is the sacred language of the Koran. An Arab revolt against Turkey broke out in 1916, under the leadership of Husein, a descendant of Mohammed and official head (sherif) of Mecca. He was

---

1 See page 388.
promptly recognized as king of the Hejaz, or western Arabia, by the Entente Powers. The Arabs helped the British to capture Jerusalem, and during the last months of the war they did their part in expelling the Turks from Syria.\footnote{1} The kingdom of the Hejaz will doubtless remain for some time under the protection of Great Britain.

The British conquered Mesopotamia during the war and they will retain it by the peace settlement. Their enlightened rule ought to redeem this region, naturally one of the most favored in the world, from the long blight to which it has been subjected by centuries of Turkish misgovernment.

The slaughter of the Christian Armenians by the Turks, with Germany an accessory before and after the fact, is the blackest deed in all the record of the war. The Armenians who remain in Turkish territory will probably be allowed to set up a self-governing state under the friendly oversight and guardianship of the League of Nations.

\footnote{1 See pages 599 and 613.}
historic rights likewise required consideration, together with the necessity of securing strategic frontiers and access to the sea for the new states about to be created. Racial, historical, geographical, and economic factors thus combined to complicate the boundary problems before the conference.

One of these problems concerned the Serbo-Croats and Slovenes, who form the group of South Slavs, or Jugoslavs.\textsuperscript{1} In 1914 the Jugoslavs numbered about 12,000,000, distributed chiefly in the independent states of Serbia and Montenegro and in the following provinces of Austria-Hungary: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Dalmatia, Croatia-Slavonia, and Carniola (the Slovenes).\textsuperscript{2}

The state of Jugoslavia represents a voluntary union of all these peoples. In order to establish it, both Serbia and Montenegro gave up their separate governments and united with the former Jugoslav provinces of Austria-Hungary. The first ruler of the kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes — to use the official title — is Alexander I, crown prince of Serbia. Belgrade is the capital.

The formation of the new kingdom has led to a long and bitter dispute between the Jugoslavs and the Italians. Not satisfied with the extension of Italy into the Trentino and around Trieste,\textsuperscript{3} Italian nationalists pressed for the annexation of the peninsula of Istria, including the important port of Fiume, which is predominantly Italian in population, and a considerable portion of the Dalmatian coast and the adjacent islands. This region (except Fiume) had been assigned to Italy in 1915 by a secret treaty concluded between that country and the Allies, as part of the price of her intervention. The engagement was, of course, annulled by Russia's withdrawal from the war, but it remained morally binding on Great Britain and France. Quite aside from treaty claims, the Italians argued for their historic rights in both Istria and Dalmatia, which were thoroughly Romanized in ancient times.

\textsuperscript{1} See page 355. \textsuperscript{2} See the map on page 356. \textsuperscript{3} "Unredeemed Italy" before the World War. See pages 262 and 624.
and during the Middle Ages were Venetian possessions. The Jugoslovks, on their part, pointed to the fact that only about one-
tenth of the population of Dalmatia is now Italian, the remainder
being chiefly Slavic. They also emphasized the need of Fiume
and other seaports on the Adriatic as outlets for their new
state. The final decision between these conflicting claims is yet
to be made. Meanwhile, Fiume has been forcibly occupied
and held by Italian volunteers under Gabriele d'Annunzio, in
defiance alike of his own government and of the Allied powers.

The Albanian principality created by the European
powers in 1913 disappeared com-
pletely soon after the opening
of the World War. Since then
Jugoslav, Greek, and Italian
troops have occupied portions
of the country. Whether it
will be divided among its
neighbors or allowed to be-
come an independent state re-
mains to be seen.

How unwillingly the Czechs
and the Slovaks fought for the
dual Monarchy in the war is a
matter of common knowledge. More than one hundred thou-
sand Czecho-Slovaks surrendered to the Russians, and many of
them promptly enlisted in the tsar's armies. After the
Russian Revolution it was the Czecho-Slovaks
in Siberia who held that vast country for the Allies against the
Bolsheviks. Czecho-Slovaks from Great Britain, France, Italy,
and the United States also volunteered in large numbers for
service on the western front. There are few finer episodes in
history than this spontaneous uprising of a whole nation.

The collapse of the dual Monarchy was followed almost im-
mediately by the setting-up of a Czecho-Slovak state. It em-

1 See pages 388 and 571.
braces Bohemia, Moravia, and Austrian Silesia, which together formed an independent kingdom until its annexation by Austria in 1525, and also Slovakia. The latter country, once a part of Moravia, has been a Magyar dependency for centuries. Czecho-Slovakia is a republic with a constitution patterned after that of the United States. The first president is T. G. Masaryk, formerly a professor in the university of Prague. The new republic occupies a central position between the Baltic and the Adriatic. It is rich in natural resources, is advanced in agriculture, trade, and manufacturing, and is well provided with common schools. Czecho-Slovakia has every assurance of a prosperous and happy future.

Hard, indeed, was the fate of the Poles during the World War. Those in Russian Poland had to fight against their brothers in Galicia, Posen, and West Prussia. Much of their country formed a fiercely contested battle-ground, and destruction, famine, and death followed everywhere in the wake of the contending armies. In 1914 the tsar, Nicholas II, promised autonomy to all the Poles, both those in Russia and those to be liberated from Austrian and German rule. Germany in 1916 also proposed to set up a Polish state under German tutelage. It was reserved for the Peace Conference, however, to create the free and independent Poland of 1919.

Restored Poland includes nearly all the territory taken from that country by Austria and Prussia in the partitions of the eighteenth century. As previously explained, Danzig is internationalized, and plebiscites are arranged for in those parts of East Prussia and Prussian Silesia which contain mixed Polish and German populations. The Allies have given Poland mandatory powers for twenty-five years over eastern Galicia, the population of which is partly Polish and partly Ruthenian. The remainder of Poland's eastern boundary is left undetermined, until the situation in Russia

---

1 See page 355.
2 See page 234, note 1.
3 See the maps on pages 76 and 233.
The New Nations in Eastern Europe has cleared up. Like its Czecho-Slovak neighbor, Poland becomes a republic. She has bound herself by a special treaty with the Allies to maintain free institutions, under the ægis of the League of Nations.

185. The New Nations in Eastern Europe

All the various peoples on the western border of the Russian Empire profited by the break-up of the tsar’s government to establish independent republics. These have not as yet been recognized by the Allies, except in the case of Finland, nor have their boundaries been definitely determined. The republics are Finland, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, White Russia, and Ukrainia.

The Swedes conquered Finland in the twelfth century and retained it until 1809. Finland, with the Åland Islands, then entered the Russian Empire as a semi-independent grand duchy. The Finnish parliament in 1917 declared for complete separation from Russia. For the next two years Finland had to contend with both the Bolsheviki and the Germans, but Germany’s collapse restored liberty to the country. It was soon recognized as an independent republic by the principal Allied powers. The Finns have a very democratic government, consisting of a one-chamber Diet, elected by free and equal suffrage of all men and women, and a responsible ministry.

The provisional government of Russia in 1917 granted Esthonia a parliament, or Diét, to be elected by universal suffrage. After the triumph of the Bolsheviki in Russia, the Diet proclaimed Estonian independence. The Germans occupied the country in 1918, but their dream of annexing it went the way of the other Pan-German schemes. In 1920 Esthonia signed a peace treaty with the Russian Soviet government, by which Russia abdicates all rights over her former Baltic possession.

The Letts, who call themselves Latvis, dwell for the most

---

1 See pages 62 and note 1, 214, and 359.
part in the former Russian provinces of Courland and Livonia, around the Gulf of Riga. They, too, have had to fight for freedom against both German armies and the Bolsheviki, before securing national existence.

The Grand Duchy of Lithuania, which united with Poland in 1569, became a part of the Russian Empire after the partitions of Poland in the eighteenth century. The tsar’s government made every effort to “Russify” the inhabitants, extinguish their sense of nationality, and force upon them the Orthodox Church. Such was the situation when the World War broke out. The Germans overran Lithuania during their great offensive of 1915, only to evacuate it three years later after the signing of the armistice. Lithuania then proclaimed itself an independent republic.

The White Russians have also set up a republic. The White Russian state is more than twice the size of Lithuania, its northern neighbor.

The Ukrainians (Little Russians, Ruthenians) number about 30,000,000, including many Cossacks. Their country fell under the sway of Poland-Lithuania toward the close of the Middle Ages and did not become a part of the tsar’s dominions until the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. With its broad, fertile plains devoted to agriculture and stock raising and its rich deposits of coal and minerals, Ukrainia bids fair to occupy an important place in Europe. The new government is known as the Ukrainian People’s Republic.

The student will recall that during the nineteenth century Russia widened her boundaries by the annexation of districts on both sides of the Caucasus Mountains. The Caucasian peoples have now set up five republics, namely, Kuban, North Caucasia, Azerbaidjian, Georgia, and Russian Armenia. They contain probably 15,000,000 inhabitants. Nowhere else in the world have so

---

1 See pages 73–74 and 361.
2 See page 358.
3 The name Ruthenian is sometimes restricted to the Little Russians who were formerly Austrian subjects in Galicia and Bukowina.
4 See the map on page 360.
many different tribes, languages, and religions been gathered together. At least fifty different dialects are spoken in this region. Most of the Caucasian peoples are Mohammedans, but the Georgians belong to the Greek Church and the Armenians have a national Church of their own. It is expected that Russian Armenia will ultimately unite with Turkish Armenia\(^1\) into one state.

186. Democracy and Socialism

When the war began in 1914, two-thirds of Europe was under autocratic rule. Germany, which refused to accept either the principles or the practice of democracy, found natural support in reactionary Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey. Autocratic Russia, it is true, fought on the side of the Allies, but the Russian Revolution promised to enroll that country among liberal states. The triumph of the Central Powers would not only have dashed the hopes of the "submerged nationalities" in Europe; it would have imperiled the existence of popular government everywhere. Germany and her satellites in 1914 flung down a challenge to the liberties of mankind.

All know how that challenge was met. Two emperors, those of Germany and Austria; two tsars, those of Russia and Bulgaria; six kings, those of Prussia, Saxony, Bavaria, Württemberg, Hungary, and Greece, and a crowd of princes, dukes, and grand dukes have renounced their hereditary rights and sought refuge either in obscurity or in exile. More than a score of sovereigns dethroned represents part of the balance sheet of the war.

With the emperors, kings, princes, dukes, and grand dukes went the whole theory of absolutism and divine right. Monarchy itself disappeared in most of central and eastern Europe, only the five Balkan states, Rumania, Bulgaria, Jugoslavia, Greece, and Turkey, retaining a semblance of one-man rule. The war revealed, clearly enough, what ruin might be caused by the vanity, selfishness, and ambition of a few persons. They had

\(^{1}\) See page 627.
long menaced the peace and happiness of the world. At last, the world is done with them.

It was quite natural that the socialists should have assumed the leadership of the revolutionary movements in many European countries. As we have learned, however,¹ there are two types of socialism. Moderate socialists rely on the ballot to abolish capitalism and introduce state ownership of the means of production: they are democrats in their political thinking and accept the democratic principle of majority rule. Radical or extreme socialists advocate a violent revolution to overthrow the capitalistic middle class, the hated bourgeoisie, and bring in a dictatorship of the urban proletariat. These socialists, therefore, preach "class conflict"; they would employ "direct action" as the only effective method of reconstructing society. The contrast between the two socialistic parties is well marked in Germany, where the principles of Karl Marx and his followers first became popular among workingmen.

The Social Democrats before the war were the chief opponents of militarism and autocracy in Germany, and even in 1914 a bold minority of them resisted the war fever then sweeping over the country. The events of 1918 strengthened their hands; both the army and the navy became saturated with the revolutionary spirit; and a few days before the signing of the armistice in November a mutiny broke out among the sailors in the fleet at Kiel. It spread swiftly to the great ports of Bremen, Lübeck, and Hamburg, and next to Potsdam and Berlin. The government could not prevent an uprising, for the soldiers in the capital refused to obey orders and some of them went over to the revolutionists. The kaiser then fled. Prince Maximilian, the imperial chancellor, resigned office. A socialist shoemaker, Friedrich Ebert, became head of a provisional government. The German Republic was born.

The moderate socialists in control of affairs immediately encountered the opposition of the radicals, who planned to deprive

¹ See page 506.
the *bourgeoisie* of all power and to set up a proletarian régime. The Spartacans,¹ as they called themselves, were well supplied with arms and munitions. In December, 1918, *The Spartacans* and again in January, 1919, Berlin saw bitter conflicts between the Spartacan rioters and the republican troops. Law and order finally triumphed, after much bloodshed. In March, 1920, the Ebert government also foiled an attempt by reactionary monarchists to seize the reins of power. The disturbed conditions which resulted enabled the Spartacans to set up *soviet* in some of the towns of the Rhine provinces. These efforts to duplicate the conditions prevailing in Bolshevist Russia proved to be likewise unsuccessful.

Ebert and his associates gave Germany a permanent government, through a national assembly which was summoned to meet at Weimar. In order that all shades of political opinion might be represented in the assembly, every German citizen, male or female, above twenty years of age, received the right of voting for delegates. About four hundred delegates were chosen, among them a number of women. The election returns showed that the Spartacans enjoyed little popular support and that the great majority of Germans wanted a democratic form of government, freed of both monarchial and Bolshevist influence. The National Assembly began its sessions in February, 1919, and after months of discussion adopted a constitution which became effective the following August.

The new Germany is essentially a federative republic, though still described by the old name *Reich*, or Empire. Foreign affairs, colonies, immigration and emigration, military organization, coinage, tariffs, and posts, telegraphs, and telephones are reserved to the nation as a whole. The confederated states may legislate on many other matters, subject, however, to the prior right of legislation by the nation. Every state must have a

---

¹ Spartacus was a celebrated gladiator, who in 73 B.C. organized a formidable revolt of slaves, outlaws, and starving peasants against the Roman Republic.
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republican form of government, with representatives chosen in secret ballot by all German citizens, both men and women.

The constitution retains certain time-honored forms and features of the old government. The Imperial Council (Reichsrat), which replaces the Bundesrat, consists of delegates from the confederated states. Each state is to have at least one vote, and in the case of the larger states one vote will be accorded to every million inhabitants. No state, however, can have more than two-fifths of all the votes in the Reichsrat. This clause of the constitution should prevent the control of the council by Prussia.

Long impotent under the old imperial régime, the Reichstag now becomes the supreme law-making body. The Reichsrat may, indeed, refuse assent to a measure passed by the Reichstag, but its veto can be overridden by a two-thirds vote of the latter assembly. Members of the Reichstag hold office for four years.

The president of Germany is to be elected by the entire people for a term of seven years. He is eligible to re-election. The president makes treaties, selects public officials, commands the military forces, and appoints and dismisses the chancellor, together with other members of the ministry. The constitutional provision requiring that the chancellor and his associates shall hold office only as long as they retain the confidence of the Reichstag gives to Germany substantially cabinet government.

Austria also became a republic. A National Assembly, in which the socialists had the largest representation, met in March, 1919, and framed a liberal constitution. The assembly declared for the union of Austria with Germany. The Allies have not as yet consented to this long-delayed unification of the German-speaking peoples of central Europe. One of the clauses of the St.-Germain treaty makes such action dependent upon the approval of the council of the League of Nations.

The Hungarian People’s Republic, headed by Count Karolyi,

1 See pages 342–346.
came into existence shortly after the signing of the armistice. It lasted only until March, 1919. This provisional government then gave way without a struggle to the radical element, under Bela Kun, a pupil of Lenin and Trotsky. The Bolshevist régime founded its authority solely on terrorism and came to a sudden end by August, 1919. After much confusion, Hungarian socialists of a moderate type succeeded in setting up another republican government at Budapest. Returns of the elections to the Magyar National Assembly, held in January, 1920, indicated, however, a decisive defeat for the socialists. Nearly all the votes were cast for a monarchical form of government. The new king will probably be ex-admiral Nicholas von Horthy, who belongs to an old and distinguished Magyar family. The Allies will not permit the restoration of the Hapsburg dynasty in Hungary.

The outstanding fact as respects Russia since November, 1917, has been the ability of the Bolsheviki to retain power. At what a cost we shall probably never know. All reports from that stricken country describe an almost complete collapse of industrial life. Closed factories, disorganized railroads, and starving cities are the result of the social experimentation of Lenin and Trotsky. Their rule is essentially a class dictatorship, since the urban proletariat forms only about a tenth of Russia's population. The Bolsheviki are perfectly consistent, therefore, in opposing the convocation of a national assembly to frame a constitution acceptable to the great majority of the Russian people.

The Bolsheviki, for a time, encountered serious opposition on the part of Russian liberals and reactionaries, who joined forces to overthrow the Soviet government. The anti-Bolshevist movement found its principal support in South Russia, under General Denikine, and in Siberia, under Admiral Kolchak. The fall of Lenin and Trotsky seemed imminent in the summer of 1919, when Denikine's troops advanced toward Moscow from the south and Kolchak's Siberian soldiers began an offensive west of the Urals.
These successes were only temporary. Late in 1919 and early in 1920 the "Red" armies won complete victories on every front and reconquered most of European Russia, Siberia, and Russian Central Asia. The Bolshevist triumph seems to be due chiefly to the fact that the anti-Bolshevists repeated the mistake of the émigrés during the French Revolution and called in foreign assistance from Great Britain, France, Japan, and the United States. This action had the effect of arousing the national sentiment of the Russian people, who were now ready to follow Lenine and Trotsky in repelling the invaders of their country.

The western Allies have now withdrawn from both European and Asiatic Russia, though Japan still keeps some forces in Siberia. While adopting a policy of non-intervention in Russian affairs, the Allies refuse to make peace with the Bolsheviki until assured that the latter have dropped the methods of barbarism — the ferocity, rapine, and cruelty which so shocked the world — for the methods of civilization. Trading relations, however, may be soon established, without a formal recognition of the Soviet government. Russia, whose economic life has been so disrupted by the war and the subsequent activities of the Bolsheviki, requires western capital to revive its drooping industries. The rest of Europe likewise needs to draw upon the rich natural resources of Russia for economic reconstruction after the war.

187. Economic Reconstruction

The war cast its shadow over almost the entire globe. Nothing like it had ever happened before. Twenty-eight nations, with their colonial dependencies, took up arms, while five Latin-American countries severed diplomatic relations with Germany. Only seventeen nations, having less than one-seventeenth of the world's population, remained neutral. Even neutrals, however, could not escape
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1 See pages 171 and 174-175.
2 Andorra, Spain, Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Abyssinia, Persia, Afghanistan, Mexico, Salvador, Colombia, Venezuela, Chile, Paraguay, and Entina.
the economic dislocations accompanying a war of such magnitude.

No exact statement is possible of the number of lives lost in battle action and as a result of wounds, accidents, or disease. Premier Clémenceau, in one of the Allied notes to Germany before she signed the treaty, declared that "not less than seven million dead lie buried in Europe, while more than twenty million others carry upon them the evidence of wounds and sufferings." The Allied note to Holland, demanding the surrender of the kaiser as the instigator of the war, estimated the number killed at ten millions, with three times as many more mutilated or shattered in health. These figures do not include either the millions of civilians, young and old, who perished as the result of pestilence and famine in those parts of Europe occupied by the Central Powers, or the slaughtered Armenians. Not more than five million lives were lost in all the wars from the time of the French Revolution to 1914.

Any figures for the money cost of the struggle must be regarded as merely approximate. Experts of the American War Department place the direct expenditure of the belligerent nations at $197,000,000,000, an amount which probably exceeds the total wealth of the United States. This estimate leaves out all the devastation wrought on the western front and in other theaters of the war, all property destroyed at sea, the depreciation of capital, and the loss of production due to the employment of the world's workers in military activities. At least $100,000,000,000 must be added for these and other items. The grand total would thus reach about $300,000,000,000, exclusive of the expenditures and losses of neutral nations. All the wars from the time of the French Revolution to 1914 cost not more than $25,000,000,000.

The war has been financed to some extent by increased taxation, especially in Great Britain and the United States, but chiefly by borrowing. The nations, in the first place, have issued vast quantities of paper money. Such forced loans are easily made on the Continent, where the
governments control the banks and possess a monopoly of note issue.\textsuperscript{1} The enormous sums thus put into circulation are a primary cause of the rise of prices abroad, increasing several times over the cost of labor and commodities as measured in terms of the money unit. One of the financial problems confronting Europe is the speedy withdrawal of a large part of these notes from circulation. In the second place, the nations have sold their bonds, or promises to pay, to all who would buy them. The amounts raised are far greater than had been supposed possible. The people bought the bonds out of their savings, for the war taught lessons of thrift to almost every one and made it a patriotic duty for the citizen to save that his country might have more to spend. The bonds will be mostly funded into long-time obligations running many years before maturity.

The burdens which our own and future generations must carry are shown by the gigantic public debts of the principal belligerents. In 1919 Great Britain owed \( \$40,000,-000,000 \); France, \( \$35,000,000,000 \); Italy, \( \$10,000,-000,000 \); and the United States, \( \$26,000,000,000 \). Germany at the end of 1918 owed \( \$40,000,000,000 \) and Austria-Hungary, \( \$25,000,000,000 \). What Russia owes and what she intends to repay are alike incalculable at the present time.

The general economic situation in the spring of 1920 was summed up by the Supreme Council in a memorandum as follows: "The process of recovery of Europe must necessarily be a slow one, which cannot be expedited by short cuts of any description. It can be most seriously hampered by the dislocation of production, by strikes, lockouts, and interruption of work of all kinds. The civilization of Europe has indeed been shaken and set back, but it is far from being irretrievably ruined by the tremendous struggle through which she has passed. The restoration of her vitality now depends on the wholehearted cooperation of all her children, who have it in their own power to delay or accelerate the process of reconstruction."

\textsuperscript{1} See page 481.
188. The League of Nations

The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries witnessed a remarkable development of international law. More and more it is recognized that there are certain rules of action which ought to be binding on all civilized nations. These rules relate particularly to the conduct of war. Hugo Grotius, the venerated founder of international law, lived during the Thirty Years’ War and wrote his truly epoch-making treatise to lessen the horrors of that conflict. “I saw prevailing throughout the Christian world a license in making war of which even barbarous nations would have been ashamed. Recourse was had to arms for slight reasons or no reason; and when arms were once taken up, all reverence for divine and human law was thrown away, just as if men were henceforth authorized to commit all crimes without restraint.”¹ Since the time of Grotius, the field of international law has widened, and now not only the regulation of warfare, but the preservation of peace has become the ideal of statesmen, publicists, and all lovers of mankind.

The idea of maintaining peace by international agreements is not new. Several great wars have been followed by projects for the prevention of future conflicts. After the religious struggles of the sixteenth century in France came the “Grand Design” of Henry IV, inspired, it is said, by his minister Sully. The development of this plan for a European Confederation or Christian Republic was frustrated by the assassination of the French king. Near the close of the seventeenth century, William Penn wrote a prophetic Essay towards the Present and Future Peace of Europe (1692). Penn argued that an international Diet or Parliament, obeying “the same rules of justice and peace by which parents and masters govern their families, magistrates their cities, estates their republics, and princes and kings their principalities and kingdoms,” could abolish warfare between the nations. The French revolutionary wars produced Immanuel Kant’s Towards Per-

¹ Grotius, On the Laws of War and Peace, Prolegomena, 28.
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Petual Peace (1795). In this work the great German philosopher declared that perpetual peace might be secured by an international union of states and that such a union would become feasible when autocracies gave way to democracies.

It was the autocrats, however, who made the first attempt at a League of Nations. In 1815, after Europe had been exhausted by the struggle against Napoleon, the tsar, Alexander I, joined with Francis I of Austria and Frederick William III of Prussia in a so-called Holy Alliance. The three rulers pledged themselves "in the name of the Most Holy and Indivisible Trinity" to take for their sole guide henceforth "the precepts of justice, Christian charity, and peace." They further promised to remain united "by the bonds of a true and indivisible fraternity," and "on all occasions and in all places" to lend each other aid and assistance. Several other European sovereigns later signed this pledge, conspicuous exceptions being the Pope, the Sultan, and George IV, the British Prince Regent. Though a praiseworthy attempt to apply much needed principles of morality to international relations, the Holy Alliance never had any real importance. Most statesmen agreed with Metternich's characterization of it as a "loud-sounding nothing." It soon faded into oblivion, being replaced by the far more practical Concert of Europe.1

The five great powers, Great Britain, France, Prussia, Austria, and Russia, who formed the Concert, did not keep peace throughout the nineteenth century. Their conflicting interests and especially their nationalistic aspirations more than once led to hostilities between them. Nevertheless, the idea of a Concert persisted, and from time to time the great powers imposed their will upon the whole of Europe. They neutralized Switzerland in 1815 and Belgium in 1839. At the Congress of Paris in 1856, which concluded the Crimean War, they signed the Declaration of Paris, providing rules for the conduct of maritime warfare.2 By the Geneva

1 See pages 219–220.  
2 See page 487.
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Convention in 1864 they undertook to ameliorate warfare by land and organized the International Red Cross, with branches in every civilized country.¹ In 1878 the great powers, now including Great Britain, France, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy, and Russia, met in the Congress of Berlin for the settlement of the Eastern Question. Nor was the Concert confined to Europe. It organized the Congo Free State² under international guarantees, neutralized the Suez Canal,³ coöperated with Japan and the United States to suppress the Chinese Boxers,⁴ and held the Algeciras Conference⁵ to deal with the Moroccan Question.

The nations also began to resort increasingly to arbitration as a means of adjusting differences between them. Great Britain and the United States, for instance, arbitrated the Alabama claims after the Civil War and in the same way ended a boundary dispute between British Guiana and Venezuela, which threatened for a time to involve the two great English-speaking peoples in fratricidal strife. During the nineteenth century over two hundred awards were made by arbitral courts, and every one was executed. After 1900 many leading countries concluded treaties with each other, pledging themselves to submit to arbitration all controversies except those affecting national honor or vital interests (such as independence).

International arbitration received a great impetus at the two Hague conferences of 1899 and 1907.⁶ The assembled powers could not agree to limit armaments, but besides revising the laws of war they set up a permanent court of arbitration, to which the nations might resort. Though without authority to enforce its decrees, the Hague Tribunal did settle a number of controversies which in earlier days might have led to war. It thus marked a distinct advance toward international peace.

Then came the World War. In her lust for conquest, Germany abruptly withdrew from the European Concert, rejected every

¹ See page 518. ² See page 398. ³ See page 567. ⁴ See page 404. ⁵ See page 574.
proposal for arbitration or mediation, and, after hostilities began, proceeded to violate her treaty obligations and all the recognized usages of warfare, both by land and sea. The Allies, in consequence, became the defenders of international law, as well as the champions of nationality and of democracy. Their enormous sacrifices during the struggle promised to be in vain, unless some means could be found to preserve the sanctity of treaties and prevent future aggressive wars. An international league began to seem, not a utopian scheme, but rather a practical necessity for the peace and security of mankind. Such thoughts as these were repeatedly expressed by responsible statesmen among the Allies, especially by Lloyd George and President Wilson.

As soon as the Peace Conference opened at Paris, a committee representing the Allied and Associated governments began work on the various proposals which had been put forward from time to time for an international league. The committee presented the first draft of a constitution to the conference in February, 1919. Various modifications of it were made as the result of world-wide dis-
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cussion, and the amended document was then inserted in the peace treaty with Germany. The signing of that treaty by the Allied and Associated governments in June, 1919, and its subsequent ratification set up the League of Nations in active operation. The first meeting of the council of the league took place January 16, 1920, at Paris.

The constitution, or Covenant, of the League of Nations, is a short, simple, and dignified document. The objects of the organization are thus stated in the preamble: "The High Contracting Parties, in order to promote international cooperation and to achieve international peace and security, by the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations, by the firm establishment of the understandings of international law as the actual rule of conduct among governments, and by the maintenance of justice and a scrupulous respect for all treaty obligations in the dealings of organized peoples with one another, agree to this Covenant of the League of Nations."

The League of Nations consists of an assembly in which each member has one vote; a council, made up of representatives of the principal Allied powers, together with representatives of four other members of the league; and a permanent secretariat at Geneva, Switzerland. World peace is to be promoted by an agreement between the nations to disarm to the lowest point consistent with national safety. The members of the league agree, furthermore, to arbitrate any dispute which cannot be settled satisfactorily by diplomacy and to carry out in good faith any award that may be rendered. Should a member resort to war in disregard of its obligations, it shall, ipso facto, be deemed to have committed an act of aggression toward all other members, who thereupon shall proceed to sever trade or financial relations with it and, if necessary, to use armed force against it.

The original members of the league are twenty-six ¹ Allied

¹ Twenty-one powers, counting the British Empire as one. However, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, the Union of South Africa, and India are each represented in the assembly of the League, as well as the United Kingdom.
belligerent powers and four powers in a state of diplomatic rupture with the enemy, all of them being signatories of the peace treaty. Thirteen neutral powers were also invited to accede to the league, and all have accepted the invitation. For the future, any self-governing state, dominion, or colony may be admitted by a two-thirds vote of the members, provided it promises faithfully to observe international obligations. The United States, which did not ratify the Versailles treaty, remains outside the League of Nations.

Studies
1. On an outline map draw the boundaries of Jugoslavia, Czecho-Slovakia, and Poland. 2. On the map between pages 626–627, locate the areas occupied by Lithuanians, Letts, Estonians, Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Ruthenians (Little Russians), Slovenians, and Serbo-Croats (Serbs and Croatians). 3. Explain the use in this chapter of the expressions: secret diplomacy, self-determination, plebiscite, mandate, and internationalization. 4. Compare the Peace Conference at Paris with the Congress of Vienna as to membership, procedure, purpose, and accomplishment. 5. What did Mr. Lloyd George mean by declaring, "This is a war of nationalities"? 6. Where were plebiscites to determine national allegiance provided for by the Peace Conference? 7. Trace briefly the history of Poland from 1772 to 1919. 8. On the map between pages 626–627 indicate what territories have been "redeemed" by Italy and Rumania, respectively. 9. How has Greece profited territorially by her participation in the World War? 10. How many independent countries were there in Europe in 1914? How many in 1920? 11. Name and locate the capitals of the new European states. 12. What did President Wilson mean by his statement, "The world must be made safe for democracy"? 13. On the basis of the statements in the text-book, give some account of the origin, character, and extinction of the Hapsburg, Hohenzollern, and Romanov dynasties. 14. Compare the assembly at Weimar in 1919 with the Frankfort Assembly in 1848. 15. Compare the powers of the Reichsrat and Reichstag in the German constitution of 1919 with those of the Bundesrat and Reichstag, respectively, in the constitution of 1871. 16. Compare the abolition of private warfare toward the close of the Middle Ages with the present movement to abolish public warfare.
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TABLE OF RULERS

**Austria-Hungary (See also Holy Roman Empire)**
- Francis I, 1806–1835
- Ferdinand I, 1835–1848
- Francis Joseph I, 1848–1916
- Charles I, 1916–1918

**Belgium**
- Leopold I, 1831–1865
- Leopold II, 1865–1909
- Albert I, 1909–

**Brazil**

*Emperors:*
- Dom Pedro I, 1822–1831
- Dom Pedro II, 1831–1889
- Rodrigues Alves, 1902–1906
- Afonso Penna, 1906–1909
- Nilo Peçanha, 1909–1910
- Hermes da Fonseca, 1910–1914
- Wenceslão Braz, 1914–1918
- Epitácio Pessoa, 1919–

*Presidents:*
- Deodoro da Fonseca, 1889–1891
- Floriano Peixoto, 1891–1894
- Prudente de Moraes Barros, 1894–1898
- Campos Salles, 1898–1902

**Bulgaria**
- Alexander, *prince*, 1879–1886
- Boris III, 1918–

**China**

*Emperors:*
- Kwang-su, 1875–1908
- Hsuan Tung, 1908–1912

*Presidents:*
- Sun Yat-sen, 1912–1913
- Yuan Shih-kai, 1913–1916
- Li Yuan-hung, 1916–1917
- Feng Kuo-chang, 1917–1918
- Shu Shi-chang, 1918–

**Denmark (including Norway until 1814)**
- Christian IV, 1588–1648
- Frederick III, 1648–1670
- Christian V, 1670–1699
- Frederick IV, 1699–1730
- Christian VI, 1730–1746
- Frederick V, 1746–1766
- Christian VII, 1766–1808
- Frederick VI, 1808–1839
- Christian VIII, 1839–1848
- Frederick VII, 1848–1863
- Christian IX, 1863–1906
- Frederick VIII, 1906–1912
- Christian X, 1912–
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France
Louis XIII, 1610–1643
Louis XIV, 1643–1715
Louis XV, 1715–1774
Louis XVI, 1774–1792
The First Republic, 1792–1804
The National Convention, 1792–1795
The Directory, 1795–1799
The Consulate, 1799–1804
The First Empire, 1804–1815
Napoleon I, 1804–1815
Louis XVIII, 1814–1824
Charles X, 1824–1830
Louis Philippe, 1830–1848
The Second Republic, 1848–1852
Louis Napoleon, president, 1848–1852
The Second Empire, 1852–1870
Napoleon III, 1852–1870
The Third Republic, 1870–
Government of National Defense, 1870–1871

Presidents:
Adolphe Thiers, 1871–1873
Marshall MacMahon, 1873–1879
Jules Grévy, 1879–1887
F. Sadi-Carnot, 1887–1894
Casimir-Périer, 1894–1895
Félix Faure, 1895–1899
Émile Loubet, 1899–1906
Armand Fallières, 1906–1913
Raymond Poincaré, 1913–1920
Paul Deschanel, 1920–

Germany (See also Prussia)
Emperors:
William I, 1871–1888
Frederick III, 1888
William II, 1888–1918

Presidents:
Friedrich Ebert, 1919–

Great Britain
Stuart line:
James I, 1603–1625
Charles I, 1625–1649
Charles II, 1660–1685
James II, 1685–1688
William III, 1689–1702
and Mary, 1689–1694
Anne, 1702–1714
Hanoverian line:
George I, 1714–1727
George II, 1727–1760
George III, 1760–1820
George IV, 1820–1830
William IV, 1830–1837
Victoria, 1837–1901
Edward VII, 1901–1910
George V, 1910–

Alexander I, 1917–

Greece
Otto I, 1833–1862
George I, 1863–1913
Constantine I, 1913–1917

Italy (See also Sardinia)
Victor Emmanuel II, 1861–1878
Humbert, 1878–1900
Victor Emmanuel III, 1900–

Japan
Mutsuhito, 1867–1912
Yoshihito, 1912–
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Mexico
Benito Juarez, 1867–1872
Lerdo de Tejada, 1872–1877
Porfirio Diaz, 1877–1880
Manuel Gonzalez, 1880–1884
Porfirio Diaz, 1884–1911
Francisco Madero, 1911–1913
Victoriano Huerta, 1913–1914
Venustiano Carranza, 1914–1920

Montenegro
Peter I, 1782–1830
Peter II, 1830–1851
Danilo II, 1851–1860
Nicholas I, prince, 1860–1910;
king, 1910–1918

Netherlands
William I, 1813–1840
William II, 1840–1849
William III, 1849–1890
Wilhelmina, 1890–

Norway
(Same rulers as in Denmark, 1523–1814)
Christian Frederick, 1814
(Same rulers as in Sweden, 1814–1905)
Haakon VII, 1905–

Poland
Kings:
Sigismund III, 1587–1632
Ladislaus VII, 1632–1648
John II Casimir, 1648–1668
Michael Wisniowiecki, 1669–1673
John III Sobieski, 1674–1696
Augustus II, 1697–1704
Stanislaus Leszczynski, 1704–1709
Augustus II (restored), 1709–1733
Augustus III, 1733–1763
Stanislaus II Poniatowski, 1764–1795

Portugal
(Same rulers as in Spain, 1581–1640)
Kings:
John IV, 1640–1656
Alfonso VI, 1656–1683
Pedro II, 1683–1706
John V, 1706–1750
Joseph Emanuel, 1750–1777
Maria I and Pedro III, 1777–1786
Maria I (alone), 1786–1816
John VI, 1816–1826
Pedro IV (Dom Pedro), 1826
Maria II, 1826–1828
Dom Miguel, 1828–1834
Maria II (restored), 1834–1853
Pedro V, 1853–1861
Luiz I, 1861–1889
Dom Carlos, 1889–1908
Manoel II, 1908–1910
Presidents:
Manoel Arriaga, 1911–1915
Bernardino Machado, 1915–1918
Sidonio Paes and Canto y Castro, 1918–1919
Antonio Almeida, 1919–
## Prussia

### Electors:
- Frederick William, the Great Elector, 1640–1688
- Frederick III, 1688–1701
### Kings:
- Frederick I, 1701–1713
- Frederick William I, 1713–1740
- Frederick II, the Great, 1740–1786
- Frederick William II, 1786–1797
- Frederick William III, 1797–1840
- Frederick William IV, 1840–1861
- William I, 1861–1888
- Frederick III, 1888
- William II, 1888–1918

## Rumania

- Charles I, prince, 1866–1881; king, 1881–1914
- Ferdinand I, 1914–

## Russia

- Michael Romanov, 1613–1645
- Alexis, 1645–1676
- Feodor Alexievitch, 1676–1682
- Ivan V and Peter the Great, 1682–1689
- Peter the Great (alone), 1689–1725
- Catherine I, 1725–1727
- Peter II, 1727–1730
- Anna Ivanovna, 1730–1740
- Ivan VI, 1740–1741
- Elizabeth, 1741–1761
- Peter III, 1761–1762
- Catherine II, 1762–1796
- Paul, 1796–1801
- Alexander I, 1801–1825
- Nicholas I, 1825–1855
- Alexander II, 1855–1881
- Alexander III, 1881–1894
- Nicholas II, 1894–1917

## Sardinia (See also Italy)

- Victor Amadeus II, 1720–1730
- Charles Emmanuel III, 1730–1773
- Victor Amadeus III, 1773–1796
- Charles Emmanuel IV, 1796–1802
- Victor Emmanuel I, 1802–1821
- Charles Felix, 1821–1831
- Charles Albert, 1831–1849
- Victor Emmanuel II, 1849–1861 (king of Italy, 1861–1878)

## Serbia

### Princes:
- Karageorge, 1804–1813
- Milosh, 1817–1839
- Milan, 1839
- Michael, 1839–1842
- Alexander I, 1842–1858
- Milosh, 1859–1860
- Michael, 1860–1868
- Milan, 1868–1882
### Kings:
- Milan, 1882–1889
- Alexander, 1889–1903
- Peter I, 1903–1918
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## Spain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King/Monarch</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philip III, 1598–1621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip IV, 1621–1665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles II, 1605–1700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philip V, 1700–1746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdinand VI, 1746–1759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles III, 1750–1788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles IV, 1788–1808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferdinand VII, 1808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Bonaparte, 1808–1813</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monarch</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ferdinand VII (restored), 1813–1833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabella II, 1833–1868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revolutionary Government, 1868–1870</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amadeo of Savoy, 1870–1873</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic, 1873–1874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfonso XII, 1874–1885</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria-de-las-Mercedes (protector), 1885–1886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfonso XIII, 1886–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Sweden

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King/Monarch</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gustavus Adolphus, 1611–1632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina, 1632–1654</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles X, 1654–1660</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles XI, 1660–1697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles XII, 1697–1718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulrica Eleanora, 1718–1720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frederick I, 1720–1751</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolphus Frederick, 1751–1771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavus III, 1771–1792</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monarch</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gustavus IV, 1792–1809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles XIII, 1809–1818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles XIV, 1818–1844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar I, 1844–1859</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles XV, 1859–1872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oscar II, 1872–1907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gustavus V, 1907–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Turkey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>King/Monarch</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed I, 1603–1617</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustapha I, 1617–1618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othman II, 1618–1622</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustapha I (restored), 1622–1623</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murad IV, 1623–1640</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibrahim, 1640–1648</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed IV, 1648–1687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suleima II, 1687–1691</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed II, 1691–1695</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustapha II, 1695–1703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed III, 1703–1730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmoud I, 1730–1754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Othman III, 1754–1757</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustapha III, 1757–1773</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monarch</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Hamid I, 1773–1789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selim III, 1789–1807</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustapha IV, 1807–1808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahmoud II, 1808–1839</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Medjid, 1839–1861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Aziz, 1861–1876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murad V, 1876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdul Hamid II, 1876–1909</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed V, 1909–1918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed VI, 1918–</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Washington, 1789–1797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Adams, 1797–1801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Jefferson, 1801–1809</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison, 1809–1817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Monroe, 1817–1825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>President</th>
<th>Reigns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Quincy Adams, 1825–1829</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Jackson, 1829–1837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Van Buren, 1837–1841</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Henry Harrison and John Tyler, 1841–1845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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James K. Polk, 1845–1849
Zachary Taylor and Millard Fillmore, 1849–1853
Franklin Pierce, 1853–1857
James Buchanan, 1857–1861
Abraham Lincoln, 1861–1865
Andrew Johnson, 1865–1869
Ulysses S. Grant, 1869–1877
Rutherford B. Hayes, 1877–1881
James A. Garfield and Chester A. Arthur, 1881–1885
Grover Cleveland, 1885–1889
Benjamin Harrison, 1889–1893
Grover Cleveland, 1893–1897
William McKinley, 1897–1901
Theodore Roosevelt, 1901–1909
William H. Taft, 1909–1913
Woodrow Wilson, 1913–1921

Holy Roman Empire
Matthias, 1612–1619
Ferdinand II, 1619–1637
Ferdinand III, 1637–1657
Leopold I, 1658–1705
Joseph I, 1705–1711
Charles VI, 1711–1740
(Charles VII, of Bavaria, 1742–1745)
(Maria Theresa, Austro-Hungarian ruler, 1740–1780)

Francis I, 1745–1765
Joseph II, 1765–1790
Leopold II, 1790–1792
Francis II, 1792–1806 (as Austrian Emperor, Francis I, 1806–1835)

The Popes
Paul V, 1605–1621
Gregory XV, 1621–1623
Urban VIII, 1623–1644
Innocent X, 1644–1655
Alexander VII, 1655–1667
Clement IX, 1667–1669
Clement X, 1670–1676
Innocent XI, 1676–1689
Alexander VIII, 1689–1691
Innocent XII, 1691–1700
Clement XI, 1700–1721
Innocent XIII, 1721–1724
Benedict XIII, 1724–1730
Clement XII, 1730–1740
Benedict XIV, 1740–1758
Clement XIII, 1758–1769
Clement XIV, 1769–1774
Pius VI, 1775–1799
Pius VII, 1800–1823
Leo XII, 1823–1829
Pius VIII, 1829–1830
Gregory XVI, 1831–1846
Pius IX, 1846–1878
Leo XIII, 1878–1903
Pius X, 1903–1914
Benedict XV, 1914–

Prime Ministers of Great Britain
Sir Robert Walpole, 1721–1742
Lord Wilmington, 1742–1743
Henry Pelham, 1743–1754
Duke of Newcastle, 1754–1756
Duke of Devonshire, 1756–1757
Duke of Newcastle, 1757–1762
Earl of Bute, 1762–1763
George Grenville, 1763–1765
Marquis of Rockingham, 1765–1766
Duke of Grafton, 1766–1770
Lord North, 1770–1782
Marquis of Rockingham, 1782
Earl of Shelburne, 1782–1783
Duke of Portland, 1783
William Pitt, 1783–1801
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Henry Addington (Viscount Sidmouth), 1804–1807
William Pitt, 1804–1806
William, Lord Grenville, 1806–1807
Duke of Portland, 1807–1809
Spencer Perceval, 1809–1812
Earl of Liverpool, 1812–1827
George Canning, 1827
Viscount Goderich, 1827
Duke of Wellington, 1827–1830
Earl Grey, 1830–1834
Viscount Melbourne, 1834
Sir Robert Peel, 1834–1835
Viscount Melbourne, 1835–1841
Sir Robert Peel, 1841–1846
Lord John Russell (Earl Russell), 1846–1852
Earl of Derby, 1852
Earl of Aberdeen, 1852–1855
Viscount Palmerston, 1855–1858
Earl of Derby, 1858–1859
Viscount Palmerston, 1859–1865
Earl Russell, 1865–1866
Earl of Derby, 1866–1868
Benjamin Disraeli, 1868
William Ewart Gladstone, 1868–1874
Benjamin Disraeli (Earl of Beaconsfield), 1874–1880
William Ewart Gladstone, 1880–1885
Marquis of Salisbury, 1885–1886
William Ewart Gladstone, 1886
Marquis of Salisbury, 1886–1892
William Ewart Gladstone, 1892–1894
Earl of Rosebery, 1894–1895
Marquis of Salisbury, 1895–1902
Arthur James Balfour, 1902–1905
Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, 1905–1908
Herbert Henry Asquith, 1908–1916
David Lloyd George, 1916–

Chancellors of the German Empire
Prince Bismarck, 1871–1890
Count von Caprivi, 1890–1894
Prince Hohenlohe-Schillingsfürst, 1894–1900
Count von Bülow, 1900–1908
Theobald von Bethmann-Hollweg, 1908–1917
Georg Michaelis, 1917
Count von Hertling, 1917–1918
Prince Maximilian, 1918
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Note.—The pronunciation of most proper names is indicated either by a simplified spelling or by their accentuation and division into syllables. The diacritical marks employed are those found in Webster's *New International Dictionary* and are the following:

ä as in *äle.*
ö as in *öld.*
o as in *oil.*
ch as in *chair.*
g as in *go.*
ng as in *sing.*
ŋ as in *ink.*
th as in *then.*
th as in *thin.*
tu as in *nature.*
ð as in * verdure.*
K for ch as in Ger. ich, ach.
N as in Fr. bon.
y as in *yet.*
zh for z as in azure.

Aachen (ä‘kken). *See* Aix-la-Chapelle.
Abdul-Hamid (Abd-ul-ha‘mîd), II, 887.
Absencee landlordism in Ireland, 997, 998.
Absolutism, royal, 9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 22, 26, 28, 40, 41, 56, 68, 69, 155, 150, 174, 211, 683. *See also Divine right of kings.*
Abukir (‘ab-u-kîr‘) Bay, battle of, 138.
Abyssinia (*âb-l-ai-nî-â), 929, 996, 1395.
Academy, French, the, 50, 318.
Acadie. *See* Nova Scotia.
Adams, 626.
Adowa (âdôwâ), battle of, 928.
Afghanistan, 406, 408, 583.
Africa, physical and racial, 988, 984; opening-up of, 984, 995: Christian missions in, 988; partition of, among European powers, 989-996.
Africa, North, conquered by Ottoman Turks, 84; Italian and French possessions in, 988, 999.
Africa, South, Boers and English in, 87, 88, 999, 400; Union of, 400, 401.
"Agadir (äg‘-a-dîr) incident," the, 567.
Agriculture, 54, 106, 297, 477-489.
Agualdo (â-gô-ul‘dô), 422.
Ahmed, shah of Persia, 406.
Airplane, the, 487, 488.
Airship, the, 468, 469.
Alane (än) River, 688.
Aix-la-Chapelle, Peace of, 72, 72.
AJaccio (ä-jâk‘cho‘), 190, 151.
Alabama claims, the, 648.
Åland Islands, 681.
Alaska, 181, 440, 441.
Albania, 958, 989, 570, 571, 595, 699.
Albaniats, the, 874, 875.
Albany Congress, the, 118.
Albert I, king of Belgium, 884, 588.
Alberta, 445, 446.
Albert Edward Nyanza, Lake, 985.
Albert Nyanza, Lake, 985.
Alcoholism, crusade against, 516-517.
Aleppo, 569, 618, 626.
Alexander I, king of Greece, 596.
Alexander I, king of Jugoslavia, 828.
Alexander, prince of Bulgaria, 887.
Alexandria, 188.
Alfonso XII, king of Spain, 829; XIII, 829, note 8.
Algodras (Span. pron. Al-hâ-thô-râs), Conference, the, 587, 642.
Algeria, 921, 922, 593, 567.
Allah (âl‘), 568.
Alma, battle of the, 898.
Alphabet, Russian, 58.
Alpine man, 5, 841.
Alps Mountains, 5, 252.
Alsace (äls‘-sâ‘), 48, 49, 297, 278, 274, 559, 561, 568, 618, 622. *See also Lorraine.*
Amazon River, 447, 449.
Acerola, Central republics of, 484.
America, North, the Dutch in, 68, 89; English settlement of Virginia and Massachusetts, 98-100; the Thirteen Colonies, 100-11; French settlements in, 114-117; rivalry of France and England in, 117-119; revolt of the Thirteen Colonies, 121-128; formation of the United States, 129-130; British, 443-446.
America, South, Spain in, 480, 481; revolt of the Spanish and Portuguese colonies in, 481, 482; the South American republics, 482-485.
American Federation of Labor, the, 446, 449.
American Revolution, the, 121-123.
Amiens (à-myán'), Peace of, 159, 194.
Amsterdam, 43.
Amun (àmú-n) (Captain Rosal), 447, note 1, 448.
Amur (àmúr) Valley, 405, 415.
Anasthetics, 583.
A-nam, 406.
A-natolia, 406.
Andes Mountains, 485.
Angeles, 14.
Anglicanism, 14, 17, 29, 27, 29, 106, 141, 525.
Anglo-Russian Convention, the, 406, 408, 656.
Angora, 396.
Animals, prevention of cruelty to, 516.
Anne, Queen, 28, 80, 81, 82, 45, 79, 290.
Annunzio, d', (àn-núnzio), Gabriele, 639.
Anonymous exploration, 447, 449.
Anthony, Susan B., 512, 520.
Anthropology, 584, 585.
Anti-Corn-Law League, the, 484.
Anti-Saloon League, the, 516.
Antwerp, 289, 406.
Apartheid, the, 232.
Arabs, the, revolt against Turkey, 509, 696; form the kingdom of the Hejaz, 626, 627.
Arc de Triomphe (àr dé trój-mup'), the, 540, 541.
Archangel, 59.
Architecture, modern, 35, 49, 50, 556.
Arctic exploration, 447.
Argentina, 484, 485.
Arkwright, Richard, 454.
Armada (àrmá-dá'), the Spanish, 98.
``Armied peace,'' 571.
Armenia, Turkish, 627; Russian, 682, 688.
Armenians, the, 588, 627.
Armies, modern, 583.
Armistice with Germany, terms of the, 614.
Arms (àrmz), 610.
Art, English, in the seventeenth century, 85; French, under Louis XIV, 49, 50; modern, 551-559. See also Architecture, Painting, Sculpture.
Articles of Confederation, the, 129, 190.
Artois (àr-twá'), province, 48; Count of, 171 and note 2, 227.
Ashley, Lord. See Shaftesbury, Earl of.
Asia, opening and partition of, 404-421.
Asiatic, 589.
Asynt (à-sánt), the, 168, 169.
Assaye Dam, 402.
Assyria, modern, 589.
Asylums, 515, 516.
Atom, the, disintegration of, 581.
Atrocities, German, 291, 692.
Attila the Hun, 598, 577.
Augsburg (ouks-gúr), Peace of, 584.
Ausgleich (ouks-glúch), the Austro-Hungarian, 352, 353, 526.
Austerlitz (ouster-litz), battle of, 195, 196, 197, 249.
Australasia, 424.
Australia, exploration of, 181; colonization of, 424; in the British Empire, 425; labor legislation in, 497, 498; in the World War, 585, 586.
Australian ballot, the, 287 and note 1.
Australian Commonwealth. See Australia.
Austria, rise and growth of, 65; under Maria Theresa, 66, 67, 71, 72; shares in the partitions of Poland, 78; under Joseph II, 151, 152; unites with France, during the revolutionary and Napoleonic era, 174, 175, 177, 181, 189, 189, 190, 195, 201, 204, 205; territorial acquisitions of, by the Vienna settlement, 514; predominance of, in Germany and Italy, 216; in the Concert of Europe, 219-228; revolutionary movements of 1848 in, 288-291; loss of Lombardy and Venetia by, 259, 362; eliminated from the German Confederation, 268-271; relations of, with Hungary, 301-308; becomes a republic, 610, 625, 886; the St. Germain Treaty with, 624.
See also Austria-Hungary.
Austria-Hungary, government of, 392, 393; nationalities in, 394-397; between 1911 and 1914, 399, 500, 501, 559, 571; in the World War, 573, 581, 682, 686, 618, 694.
Austrian Netherlands, 45, 52, 77, 193, 214.
See also Belgium.
Austrian Succession War, the, 71, 73, 99.
Austro-Prussian War, the, 282, 370, 271, 599.
Austro-Sardinian War, the, 258, 259.
Automobile, the, 467.
Avars (à-várz), the, 54.
Azerbaijan (à-zé-ré-bi-ján'), 682.
Azores (à-zó-rz'), the, 583.
Babes (bá-béz), 91.
Bacon, Francis, 585.
Baden (bá-dén), 197, 219, 248.
Bagdad (bág-dád), 589, 599.
Baker, Sir Samuel, 395.
Balka-Kia're, battle of, 638.
Balance of power, the, in Europe, 44, 58, 73, 194, 518, 565, 566.
``Balance of trade," the, 85.
Balkan Peninsula, the, 814.
Balkan wars (1913-1918), the, 688, 689, 571, 594.
Ballot Act, the, 287.
Baltic man, 4, 5, 841.
Baltic Sea, 60.
Baltimore, 101.
Banking, modern, 480, 481.
Bank of England, the, 480, 561.
Bank of France, the, 190, 480, 481.
Baptism, the, 27, 106, 141, 297.
Bassel (à-sá-del), Treaty of, 179.
Batillle (bá-té'), the, capture of, 168, 290.
Bavaria, 87.
Bavarian Republic, the, 179, 197.
Bavaris, 71, 190, 197, 215, 519, 888.
Bazaine (bá-zán'), General, 379.
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Drama, modern, 585, 586.
Dravidians, the, 410, 411, 426.
Dryden, John, 36.
Dual Alliance, the, 561, 566.
Dual Monarchy, the, See Austria-Hungary.
Duma, the, 973, 974, 986, 987, 988.
Dunant, Henri, 517, 518.
Duna River, 77.
Dunkirk, 588.
Duplexion (du-plesh-ōn), 91, 92.
Duquesne (du-kézn), Fort, 119.
Durazzo (daw-rāt-so), 570, 571.
Dushan, Stephen, 878.
Dynamo, the, 468.

Eastern Question, the, 65, 257, 382, 386, 389, 567-571, 648.
Eastern Rumelia, 886.
East India Company, Dutch, 87, 88, 428.
French, 91; English, 91, 92, 409, 410.
Ebert, Friedrich, 684.
Ecole des Beaux-Arts (ā-kōld boh-wâr'), 543.
Economies. See Political Economy.

Ecuador, 482.
Edison, Thomas A., 471.
Education, 106, 107, 190, 203, 521-529.
Education Act, the, 692.
Egypt, Napoleon in, 188; British occupation of, 402; British rule over, 402, 408, 589, 599.
Eiffel (ē-fel') Tower, the, 549.
Elba, Napoleon at, 205, 210.
Electric traction, 467.
Elizabeth, queen of England, 12, 85, 91, 98.

Empire (ā-mē-prē'), the, 171, 179, 190.
Empire (Ger. pron. Ams) dispatch, the, 273.
Encyclopedists, the, 149, 157.

England, under James I and Charles I, 12-29; the Commonwealth and the Protectorate, 29-26; under Charles II and James II, 91; under William III and Anne, 90-92; union of, with Scotland, 31; in the seventeenth century, 92-96; at war with Louis XIV, 48, 44, 45; in the War of the Austrian Succession and the Seven Years' War, 72, 75, 91; under the first three Georges, 75-83; rule of, with India and North America, 91-98, 117-129; loss of the Thirteen Colonies by, 121-129; at war with revolutionary and Napoleonic France, 177, 188, 159, 184, 195, 198, 199, 200, 203, 206; territorial acquisitions of, by the Vienna settlement, 218; in the Concert of Europe, 219, 220; geography and productions of, 276, 277; parliamentary reform in, 279-239; government of, 259-269; the Irish Question, 295-301; the British Empire, 301-303, 390, 399, 409-412, 424, 425, 428, 443-446; the Industrial Revolution in, 451, 452, 461, 462, 468; commerce of, 477, 478; adopts free trade, 488-485; land tenure in, 488-490; trade unionism in, 492, 498; labor legislation in, 497; between 1571 and 1714, 562-567, 577; in the World War, 550, 551, 552, 558, 554, 555-591, 598-600, 610-612.

"Enlightened despots," the, 150-102.

Entente cordiale (ēn-tānt kōr-dyāl'), the, 575, 586.
Exтельных, 388, 381.

Equal Franchise Act, the, 288, 519, 590.

Erz-se (ār-tāz-śě), 895.
Ess-dra-am, 613.
Esperanto, 511.

Essay on Crimes and Punishments, Beccaria's, 514.

Estates-General, French, 40, 52, 158-162, 548.
Es-tho-nias, 60, 651, 609, 613.
Esthonian, the, 4, 5, 860, 861.
Esthia, the, See Esthonia.
Eugène (ō-zhēn'), Prince, 45.
Eugénie (ō-zhē-nē'), Empress, 251 and note 1, 314.

Europe, geography of, 1-4; population of, 4; racial types in, 4-6; linguistic groups in, 6 and note 1.

Evolutionary theory, Darwin's, 580, 589.
Exchanges, 479.

Exploration, American, 98, 124-126, 447.
Pacific, 130-132; African, 894-896; Asian, 446; Australian, 447; Arctic and Antarctic, 447, 448.
Expositions, universal, 251, 511.

Factory Acts, British, 485, 496.
Factory system, the, 460, 469, 494, 502, 503, 507.

Faroe (far-ō) Islands, 389.

Farther India. See Indo-China.

"Fasoda incident," the, 503.

"February Revolution," the, 287, 288, 508.

Federations: United Netherlands, 8; Swiss Confederation, 5, 197, 393-384; Union of Calmar, 66, 867, 888; United Colonies of New England, 118, 128; Confederation of the Rhine, 197, 198; Germanic Confederation, 215, 216, 264, 269, 271; North German Confederation, 271, 274; Scandinavian League, 385; German Empire, 842-846; Union of South Africa, 400, 401; Australian Commonwealth, 425; Dominion of Canada, 445, 446.

Felsal, Enfr, 626.

Fenian Brotherhood, the, 293.

Ferdinand I, emperor of Austria, 285 and note 1, 298, 340.

Ferdinand I, king of Rumania, 384, note 1.

Ferdinand I, tsar of Bulgaria, 587, 588, 589, 612, 625.

Ferdinand VII, king of Spain, 200, 212, 211, 222, 288, 289, 431.

Ferry (kā-rē') Jules, 593.

Festivals in the Thirteen Colonies, 104, 105.

Feudalism, Polish, 77; remnants of, abolished in revolutionary France, 165.

Fes, 507.

Fiction, modern, 585.
Field, Cyrus W., 470.

Fiji Islands, 424.

Filipinos, the, 421-428, 527.

Finance, international, 468.

Finland, a dependency of Sweden, 9, 60, 62; acquired by Russia, 69, note 1, 196, 214, 856; independence of, 609, 611.

Finns, the, 4, 6, 586, 589, 611.

First Coalition, the, against France, 177, 178, 179.

Flume (fyōo-mā'), 628, 629.

Flanders, 48, 612.

Flemings, the, 7, 66, 280, 384.

Florida, 114, 130, 128, 440.

"Flying shuttle," the, 428.

Foch (fosh), Ferdinand, 587, 610, 611.

Folk songs, 587.
Greek Church, the, 55, 69, 76, 140, 150, 573, 879.
Greenland, 98, 447, 448.
Greenwich (grinti), Royal Observatory at, 35.
Grévy (grá-vo), Jules, 817.
Grey, Karl, 289.
Grey, Sir Edward, 564, 580, 582.
Grenzollen (groyn-dal), Hugo, 641.
Guam (gwám), 445, 446.
Guatemala, 438.
Guiana, Dutch, 98, 213 and note 1; British, 218.
Gulf of the, of London, 551.
Guiana. See Craft Guilds.
Guizot (gii-zout), 297.
Gulf Stream drift, the, 3.
Gustavus Adolphus, 60, 108.
Haakon (hó-kán) VII, king of Norway, 338.
Habeesa Corpus Act, the, 27, 28, 79.
Hague (hág), The, 574.
Hague Peace Conferences, the, 574, 646.
Hague Tribunal, the, 645.
Haidg (haidj), Sir Henry, 599, 604, 611.
Halft (hafit), 480, 489 and note 1.
Hall of Mirrors, the, at Versailles, 274, 618.
Hamburg (hám-boörk), 242 and note 1, 684.
Hamilton, Alexander, 129.
Hampden, 16, 17, 18, 20.
Hanover, 30, 510, 584, 585 and note 1, 141, 270, 271.
Hanoverian dynasty, the, 92 and note 1, 79.
Hapsburg (hárpsbörörs) dynasty, the, 3, 87, 38, 44, 45, 66 and note 1, 216, 304, note 1, 918, 614, 694.
Hardenberg (här-dén-börk), Chancellor, 209, 204.
Hargreaves, James, 454.
Harvey, William, 84.
Hawaiian islands, 132, 494, 428, 440.
Haydn (Ger. pron. lîvd'en), Joseph, 586.
Hejaz (hej-az'), the, kingdom of, 599, 609, 627.
Heilogland (hël-gô-lënt), 219, 573, 623.
Henry IV, king of France, 49, 114, 643.
"Hertzian waves," the, 521.
Herzegovina (hër-zës-gô-vë-në), 375, 396, 599, 570, 579, 625.
Hesse (hës), 271 and note 2.
Hesse-Cassel, 271.
Heutonia Philikis, the, 379.
Highways, 35, 192, 486, 464.
Hi-ma-la-ya Mountains, 446.
Hindenburg (hind-en-börk), General von, 599, 594, 624.
Hindenburg Line, the, 591, 612.
Hindus, the, 410, 411.
Historians, modern, 584, 585.
Hohenlinden, battle of, 129.
Hohenzollern (hôfenzòl-lëtn) dynasty, the, 47, 67 and note 1, 449, note 1, 614, 625.
Holland, wars of Louis XIV with, 48, 44, 89; in the War of the Austrian Succession, 72; colonial empire of, 56-59; at war with Great Britain, 56, 197, 129; during the revolutionary and Napoleonic era, 177, 179, 197; the Dutch Netherlands united with, 214, 290; separation of Belgium from, 292; government of, 858; colonies of, 858, 857 and note 1, 485, 492.
Holland, J. P., 469.
Holstein (hôlshëtn), 286, 289, 290, 271. See also Schleswig.
Holy Alliance, the, 492.
Holy Land. See Palestine.
Holy Roman Empire, the, 8, 43, 44, 197, 193, 295, 264.
Holy Synod, the, in Russia, 58, 359, 809.
Hormuz, (Irish, 298-301.
Honduras, 436 and note 1.
Hong-kong, 414.
Hoover, H. C., 601, 604.
Horthy, Nicholas, 657.
Hôtel des Invalides (hô-tel de-vë-lëd), 50, 206, 548, 549.
Hottentots, the, 294.
Hudson Bay Company, the, 445.
Hudson, Henry, 88.
Hudson River, 95.
Hugo, Victor, 325, 545.
Hungarists (hûng-ôr-nits), the, 94, 49, 69, 98, 108, 143, 156, 589.
Humboldt, Alexander von, 447.
Hungarians. See Magyars.
Hungary. See Austria.
Hungary. See also Austria.
Huns, the, 54, 576.
Hussein, king of the Hejaz, 626.
Ibese, Henrik, 585.
Iceland, 596.
Illiteracy, 292, 293.
Ill-lyric Provinces, the, 197, 214.
Imperial Federation movement, the, 806-809.
Imperialism, aspects of, 791-798; the industrial Revolution and, 450; nationalism and, 585, 586.
Incolao, the, 445, 459.
Indemnity, French, 273, 815, 559; German, 629, 629.
Indentured servants, 109.
Independents, the, 29 and note 1, 24, 27, 90, 91.
India, under the Moguls, 91; rivalry of France and England in, 91-98; government of, 804; a part of the British Empire, 408-410, 411; peoples of, 410, 411; religions of, 411; the caste system in, 412; Indian nationalism, 412; in the World War, 606, 617.
Indian Ocean, the, 88.
Indians, American, 426, 527, 595.
Indus East, 128; West, 839, 438, 439.
Indo-China, 408.
Indo-European languages, 6 and note 1.
Indus River, 410, 446.
Industrial Revolution, the, 450-476.
Industrial Workers of the World, 506.
Industry, government regulation of, 494-498.
Infallibility, papal, dogmas of, 525, 527.
Ingris, 60.
Initiative, the, in Switzerland, 888.
Inkermann, battle of, 598.
Institutions of France, the, 60, 545, 546.
Instrument of Government, the, 85.
Insurance, development of, 478, 490; State 495, 497.
Internationalism, modern, 510-519.
International Postal Union, the, 471, 472, 511.
International Red Cross, the, 512, 517, 518.
"Interpellations," 820.
Inter-racial problems, 426–429.
Invention, 492, 493.
Ionian Islands, 218, 377, 381.
Ireland, 34, 278, 283–301, 563, 561.
"Iron Chancellors." See Bismarck.
"Iron Crown" of Lombardy, 192
Iron and steel in industry, 408.
"Ironides," Cromwell's, 21.
Isabella, queen of Spain, 829.
Islam (faith), 896, 411, 414, 927.
Isonzo River, 588.
Istria, 628.
Italia Irredenta, 262, 597, 628.
Italian-Turkish War, the, 388, 389.
Italy, states of, in 1648, 5; during the revolutionary and Napoleonic era, 151, 152, 159, 169, 197, 198, 258; the restorations in, 212, 213, 254; the Vienna settlement of, 215; the revolutionary movements of 1830 and 1848 in, 254, 241, 242; unification of, 292–293; government of, 284, 285; relations of, with the Papacy, 325, 327; colonial possessions of, 328, 329; between 1871 and 1914, 560, 566; in the World War, 586–588, 615; territorial acquisitions of, 629, 629.
Ivan, Montenegrin hero, 714.
Ivan the Great, 55.
Jacobins (jâk'kô-bînz), the, 178, 175, 176, 150, 151, 192, 229.
"Jacobites," the, 60, note 1.
Jamestown, settlement of, 94, 95.
Japan, geography and people of, 417; civilization of, 418; during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, 419–421, 565; in the World War, 586, 599, 617; acquires Klausch from Germany, 622.
Java, St. 243.
Jena (yâ'nâ), battle of, 196.
Jerusalem, 588, 600, 613.
Jesuits. See Society of Jesus.
Jews, the, 50, 69, 166, 162, 361, 577, 527, 626.
Jihad (jâ'hâd), 596.
Joffre (zhôf'), Joseph, 557, 610.
John VI, king of Portugal, 221, 881.
Joint-stock companies, 85, 86.
Jollet (Fr. pron. zhôl-yâ'), Louis, 115.
Joseph II, Holy Roman Emperor, 151, 159.
Joseph Bonaparte, 197, 200, 431.
Joséphine, Empress, 201, 488, 548.
Juaréz (hwâ'ráz'), Benito, 487, 496.
Jugoslavia, the, 585, 579, 623, 629.
Jugoslavie, 624, 626, 628.
"Julian Calendar," the, 58.
July Column, the, 280, 541.
July Ordinances, the, 229.
"July Revolution," the, 228, 229.
Junker (yûnk're), Prussian, 65, 168, 844, 840, 577.
Justice of the peace, 112, 118.
Jutland, battle of, 600.
Kamchatka, 56.
Kant (kânt), Immanuel, 641.
Karageorge, 875.
Karaél, 60.
Karolyl, Count, 686.
Kay, John, 458.
Kerensky, Alexander, 608.
Khartum (kâr-tö'mû), 401, 402, 562.
Khedive (kêdôv'), the, 402.
Klauschau (kyou-'chô'), 850, 410, note 1, 569, 622.
Kiel Canal, the, 486, 578, 578.
Kiev (kev'), 838.
"King George's War," 118.
"King's friends," the, 82, 128.
Kitchener, Herbert, 401, 402, 562.
Koch (kôk'), Robert, 583.
Kolchak, Admiral, 687.
Königgrätz (kô-nîng-gräts'), battle of. See Sadowa.
Korais (kô-râs'), Adamantios, 379.
Korea, 415, 420 and note 1.
Koslawko (Polish pron. kôš-chyôw'kô), Tadeusz, 77, 78.
Kossovo, battle of, 378.
Kossoth (kôs'sot), Louis, 240, 241, 301.
Kremlin, the, 833.
Kruger, Paul, 399, 400.
Kuban, 682.
Kultur, German, 675.
Labor legislation, 494–499.
Labor unions. See Trade unions.
Labrador, 98.
La Chaise (la shâz'), Pierre, cemetery of, 546.
La Fère (la fâr'), 610.
La Fontaine (la fôntân'), 50.
Lutteuse-faire (lû-tôz-fâr'), doctrine of, 148, 149, 408, 500, 501.
Landtag (lân'tâg), Prussian, 845.
Land tenure, systems of, 106, 139, 397, 398, 488–491.
Langley, S. P., 468.
Language, English, 104, 511.
Languages, universal, 510, 511.
Laos (lôs'), 408.
Laplace (lâ-plâs'), Marquis de, 588, note 1.
La Salle (lâ săl'), Robert de, 116.
Latin Quarter, the, of Paris, 545.
Latvia, 692.
Letts. See Letts.
Laud, Archbishop, 16, 17, 18, 93.
League of Nations, the, 617, 621, 622, 627, 644, 641, 645, 644.
Learned societies, rise of, 145.
Legion of Honor, French, 192, 198.
Legitimitats, the, 286, 816.
Leibnitz (li'îb-nîts), Freiherr von, 84, note 1.
Lenin (lé'nîn), 24.
Leipzig (lî-vg'b), battle of, 294, 219; German supreme court at, 446, 624.
Lenine, Nicholas, 608, 609, 687, 683.
Leo XI, pope, 828, 827.
Leopold I, king of Belgium, 384; II, 384, 396, 397, 398.
Lepanto (lê-pântô), battle of, 64.
Lesser (lê-sôr'), Ferdinand de, 404, 448.
Letters de cachet (lê'trâ dâ kâ-shê), 166, 168.
Letts, the, 861, 861.
Lewis and Clark, explorations of, 447.
Lexington, 124.
Leyden (lî-dên), 96.
Lhasa (lê-shâ), 407, 408
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Nightingale, Florence, 338.
Nihilism, Russian, 387-389, 370.
Nile River, sources of, 385.
 Nobility, British, 186, 290, 292; French, 187, 192.
Nonconformists. See Dissenters.
North Caucasus, 383.
North German Confederation, the, 271, 274.
North, Lord, 58, 88, 194, 279.
North Pole, the discovery of, 447.
Northwest Passage, the, 447 and note 1.
Norway, In the Union of Calmar, 60; allied with Napoleon, 198; united with Sweden, 314, 315, 387; separates from Sweden, 388; government of, 388.
Notre Dame (nô'tr dé'm), Cathedral of, at Paris, 192, 542, 548.
Novara (nô-vâ'ra), battle of, 341.
Nova Scotia, 118, 448, 445.
Novgorod (nôv-gôö-rôd), 55.

Oceania, opening up and partition of, 421-425; 568.
O'Connell, Daniel, 298.
Oddfellowsip, 527.
Oder River, 18.
Ogilthorpe, James, 108.
Oil in industry, 436.
Oise (ôz) River, 610.
Okhotsk (ô-kôhts'k), Sea of, 56.
Old Frussians. See Borussi.
Old Regime, the, 184-189.
Omdurman, battle of, 409.
Ontario, 445.
Open field system, the, 457, 488, 489.
Operas, the, 586, 587.
Orange, house of, 214.
Orange Free State, 399, 400.
Orangemen, the, 300.
Oratorio, the, 586.
Orchestras, the symphony, 586, 587.
Orders in Council, British, 199, 448.
Oregon, 440.
Origins of Species, Darwin's, 580.
Orlando, Vittorio, 618.
Orleanists, the, 516.
Orléans (or-lâ'zô'), Duke of, 180.
Orléans mortuary, the, 286, 287.
Orthodox (Russian) Church, 55, 63, 150, 389, 387, 370, 375, 525.
Otto I, the Great, 197.
Ottoman Turks, 4, 6, 9, 375, 876, 877. See also Turkey.
Owen, Robert, 502.

Pacific Ocean, exploration of, 180-182.
Painting, modern, 85, 588, 589.
Palais Bourbon, the, 619, 545.
Palais de l'Élysée, the, 619, 545.
Palais de l'Institut, 545, 546.
Palatinate, Rheinhessen, 108.
Pale, the Irish, 296.
Palestine, 599, 626.
Panama, 496, 448, 604.
Panama Canal, 386, 489, 442, 448, 456.
Pan-Americanism, 441, 442.
Pan-American Union, the, 442.
Pan-Germanism, 575-578.
Pan-German League, the, 577.
Pauhurst, Mrs. Emmeline, 288.
Panthéon (pân-thé'ô-n), the, at Paris, 544, 545.

Papal Guarantees, Law of, 387.

Papal States. See States of the Church.
Papuans, the, 496.
Paris, revolutionary, 162, 164, 165, 176, 178, 175, 190, 229, 239; siege of, 272, 278; described, 380-384.
Paris, Count of, 516.
Paris, Peace of (1768), 73, 88, 190, 155; Peace of (1789), 127; Treaty of (1856), 292, 238, 358, 354; Declaration of, 467, 599, 642.
Park, Mungo, 395.
Parliament Buildings, the, 553, 555.
Parliamentary reform in Great Britain, 279-299.
Parme, S. 215, 284, 241, 259.
Parnell, C. S., 292.
Parties, British, 295; French, 320; Italian, 323; German, 344, 345.
Pasteur (på-tûr'), Louis, 581, 589.
Patroons, Dutch, 105.
Paxton Conference, the, 618-621.
Peace movement, the, 573, 574, 604, 641, 642, 643.
Peary, Robert E., 447.
Peasant proprietorships, 490, 491.
Pecuniary, the, in eighteenth-century Europe, 159, 168, 155, 166.
Peel, Sir Robert, 488.
Peking (pê-kîng'), 416.
Penal code, the, reform of, 518-515.
Peninsular War, the, 200, 201.
Penn, William, 100, 106, 106, 594, 641.
Perrault (pê-rû'), Charles, 20.
Perry, Commodore M. C., 418.
Pershing, General J. J., 410.
Peru, 406.
Peru, 402.
Peter, king of Serbia, 879, 570.
Peter the Great, 56-58, 62, 65, 65, 185, 140.
Pettion of Right, the, 15, 16, 26, 26, 79.
Petersburg (pê-têr-gûd), 35, note 1, 607, 608.
Philadelphia, 129.
Philippine Islands, 880, 421-429, 440.
Philosophy, French, in the eighteenth century, 143-149; modern, 588, 584.
Physics, modern, 529, 531.
Physiocrats, the, 148, 144, 157.
Pieau (pyôv') River, battles of, the, 593, 618.
Plei-a-di-ly, street, 549.
Piedmont, 196, 212, 221, 256 and note 1.
Pilgrims, the, 35-38, 105.
Pilgrim's Progress, Bunyan's, 86.
Pitt, William (Earl of Chatham), 60-82, 123, 194.
Pitt, William (the Younger), 194, 195, 197, 219, 290, 498.
Plus IX, pope, 241, 249, 255, 256, 827, 925.
Place de la Concorde (plâs de lâ kôr-kôrd'), 237, 812, 541.
Place de l'Etoile (A-tôl'), 541.
Plansee, battle of, 92.
Plebve (plèbê'), 869, 870, 871, 872.
Plevna, 885.
Plural voting, system of, in Belgium, 385.
Plymouth Company, the, 98, 94, 95.
Plymouth, settlement of, 95-96.
Pocket towns, 261, 283, 285.
Poetry, modern, 587, 586.
Poland, Kingdom of, 9, 62, 73-77; partitions of, 77, 78; Grand Duchy of Warsaw, 198, 214; in the Vienna settlement, 214, 288; revolutions of, in the nineteenth century, 294 and note 1; in the World War, 694, 698, 699, 690, 617; republic of, 694, 690, 691.
Poles, the, 75, 855, 861, 860.
Poliignes (pô-lên-yâ'), Prince de, 228.
"Polish Question," the, 75.
Poesy, science of, 148, 144.
Polvo, Marco, 181.
Pol-va'ma, battle of, 62.
Polyneisia, 421.
Polyneiscans, the, 421, 426.
Pom-er-ian-a, western, 61, 62, 63, 214, 288; eastern, 63.
Pondicherry, 91.
Poor Richard's Almanac, 104.
 Pope, the, loses temporal power, 262, 292, 287; infallibility of, 325, 327.
Popular sovereignty, doctrine of, 10, 146, 149, 185, 204, 217, 474.
Port Arthur, 415 and note 1, 490, 688.
Porto Rico, 390, 392, 440.
Portsmouth, Treaty of, 430.
Portugal, a member of the Grand Alliance against Louis XIV, 44; French invasion of, 200; revolutions in, 221, 881; becomes a republic, 383, 388; colonial possessions of, 383 and note 1, 386, 388.
Portuguese East Africa, 386.
Posen, 214, 288, 628, 680.
Postal service, the, 471, 472.
Potamus Palace, the, at London, 407.
Potato Famine, the, in Ireland, 297, 434.
Potsdam Conference, the, 551.
Poverty, modern, 506-507.
Power boom, Cartwright's, 435, 436.
Pragmatic Sanction, the, 66, 67.
Prague (prag), 299.
Prague, Treaty of, 271.
Presbyterianism, 31, 32, 27, 105, 141.
President of France, the, 381-390.
Pressburg, Treaty of, 186, note 1.
Preorea, 401.
Prizes, 482, 640.
"Pride's Purge," 22.
Prime minister, British, 80, 294, 296.
Primogeniture, 186, 187.
Prince Edward Island, 445.
Principles of Geology, Lyell's, 599.
Priest Marshes, 594.
Prison reform, 515.
Privy Council, the, 180.
Proletariat, the, 189 and note 1, 178, 175, 609, 628.
Proportional representation, system of, in Belgium, 386 and note 1.
Protective system, the, 45, 485.
Protectorate, the, in England, 25, 26.
Protestant Episcopal Church, the, 105.
Protestantism, 37, 105, 141, 142, 527.
Protocol of Trenoppen, the, 220, 221.

Provence (pron-vens'), Count of, 171 and note 1.
Prussia, origin of, 67, 68; becomes a kingdom, 68; under the Great Elector, 69; under Frederick the Great, 71-73; 150, 151; shares in the partitions of Poland, 76; wars of, with France, during the revolutionary and Napoleonic era, 174, 175, 177, 179, 195, 198, 204, 205, 206, 207; acquisition of, by the Vienna settlement, 214; in the Concert of Europe, 219-220; revolutionary movement of 1848 in, 242, 248; as the usher of Germany, 290, 296; wars of, with Denmark and Austria, 270, 271; forms North German Confederation, 271; at war with France, 272, 273; heads new German Empire, 274, 245; government of, 345, 346.
Prussia, East, 65, 72, 76, 491, 592, 625, 690; West, 68, 78, 491, 622, 620.
Public debts, statistics of, 640.
Public ownership, 499-501.
Public school system, the, 107, 521-529.
Purely Italian, the, 16-38.
Puritans, the, rise of, 14; persecuted by Laud, 17; divide into Presbyterians and Independents, 21, 22 and note 1; reaction against, 27; establish themselves in Massachusetts, 98-100.
Pyrenees, the, 334.
Pyrenees Mountains, 6.

Quadrilateral, the, 250.
Quakers, the, 27, 145, 141, 512, 597.
Quebec, city of, 114, 116, 120; province, 445.
"Queen Anne's War," 45, note 1.
Queensland, 425.

Races of man, 486.
Racine (rás-sín'), 50.
Redetsky (râ-de-tâ'skô), Marshal, 241.
Radioactivity, 581.
Radium, 581.
Raleigh (rál'è), Sir Walter, 98.
Rationalism in the eighteenth century, 145, 146, 148, 151.
"Red Sunday," 873.
Referendum, the, in Switzerland, 388.
Reflections on the French Revolution, Burke's, 290.
Reform Acts: First, 252, 293; Second, 286, 287; Third, 287.
Regulated companies, 55.
Reichsbank (riks'bânk), 346, 481.
Reichstag (riks'tâg), the, 343, 344, 345, 598, 636.
Reign of Terror, the, 179, 180, 541.
Relma, 591, 611.
"Reinsurance compact," the, 560.
Religions, world, statistics of, 597.
Reparation Commission, Allied, 629.
Republirica: American, 125-180; First French, 117; Batavias, 170, 179; Cisalpine, 189, 197; Ligurian, 189, 196; Swiss, 197; Second French, 237, 249, 429; Roman, 245, 236, 236; Third French, 418, 14, 516-518; Spanish, 54; Portuguese, 381; Chinese, 416; South American, 492; Central American and Mexican, 436; German, 614, 634, 685.
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668  World War, 593, 592, 594, 561, 616; the Russian Revolution, 605–609, 637, 885. 
Russian Campaign, Napoleon's, 302, 503. 
Russian Revolution, the, 564, 606, 683. 
Russians, the, 383, 530. 
 Russo-Japanese War, the, 490. 
Russo-Turkish War, the, 384, 386. 
Ru-th-e'n-ans, the, 355, 358, 690, 689 and note 8. 
Siege of Saraj (sahr), 691. 
"Sabotage," 506. 
Sadoua (sâ'doo-va'), battle of, 271. 
St. Andrew, order of, 57. 
St.-Denis (dân-nè'), 543. 
St.-Quentin (ek-dân'), Augustus, 587. 
St.-German (sahr-mâ'n'), suburb of Paris, 548. 
St.-Germain, Treaty of, 694. 
St.-Gond, 587. 
St. Ie-lans, Napoleon at, 206. 
St. Lawrence River, 114. 
St.-Mihel (mî-âl'), 612. 
St. Paul, cathedral of, 85, 551, 552. 
St. Petersburg, 50 and note 1. See also Petrograd. 
St.-Simon (sâ-môn'), Memoirs of, 50. 
Sa-kha-lin' Island, 420. 
Salem, 105. 
Sant' Narciso, 490 and note 1. 
Santo Domingo, 498 and note 1, 616. 
Saratoga, battle of, 197. 
Saskatchewan, 445, 446. 
Savoy, 8, 45, 47, 169, 213, 256, 258, 259. 
Saxo-Weimar (saks-vî'mâr), 217, 218. 
Saxony, 72, 196, 197, 214, 215, 224, 243, 248, 270, 499, 638. 
Scandinavian League, the, 888. 
Scheidt (shek't) River, 86, 426. 
Schleswig (shlah-ziv'ik), 260, 270, 271 and note 1, 621 and note 2. See also Holstein. 
Scholasticism, 382. 
Schools, common, 107, 149, 521–529. 
Schurta (shôrt'ta), Carl, 243. 
Science, development of, in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, 84, 85, 144, 145; modern, 628–633. 
Scottish-Irish, the, 108. 
Scotland, 3, 10, 31, 277, 278. 
Scott, Captain R. F., 449. 
Scott, Sir Walter, 585. 
Sculpture, modern, 587. 
Sec'f'ry, 570, 571. 
Sea-power, British, 98, 118, 189, 195, 199, 209, 208, 204. 
Second Coalition, the, against France, 138, 189. 
Sects, Protestant. See Protestants. 
Secularization of Church property, 169, 190. 
Sedan (sâ'dân'), battle of, 272, 318. 
Sedan chair, the, 38. 
Seine (sân') River, 539, 541. 
Senate, French, 315, 541.
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Taft, W. H., 422.
Tahiti (tā-hē-tē), 424.
Tahiti Islands, 430.
Talleyrand (tā-lē-rān'), 310, 311.
Tanganyika (tān-gān-yē-kā), Lake, 396.
Tannenberg, battle of, 592.
Tartars, the, 4, 5.
Tasman, A., 211.
Tautau, 424, 425.
Taurus Mountains, 626.
Taxation, under the Old Régime, 139, 148, 156, 195.
Telegraph, the, 469, 470.
Telephone, the, 470, 471.
Telford, Thomas, 483.
Temple of the Papacy, 210, 252, 253, 326, 527.
Ten-Hour Act, the, 486.
“Tennis Court Oath,” the, 161, 169.
Teutonic Knights, the, 69, 68, 73, 361.
Texas, 440.
Thackeray, W. M., 335.
Thames (tāmz), River, 549.
Thanksgiving Day, origin of, 105.
The French Frans (tā-fraⁿ-frāⁿ-sōⁿ), the, 546.
Thessaly, 380, 381.
Thiers (tē-yār), L. A., 297, 816, 816.
Third Coalition, the, against France, 195, 196.
Third Estate, the, 183, 189, 159, 160, 161, 162.
Third Section, Russian, 365, 367.
Thirteen Colonies, the, established, 98-106; civilization of, 104-107; economic development of, 107-110; political conditions in, 111-114; become independent, 191-129; establish the United States, 128-130.
Thirty Years’ War, the, 36, 60, 289, 641.
Thorwaldsen’s (tōr-wāld-sēn’s), Bertel, 826.
Thrace, 380, 826.
Tibet (tī-bēt’), 407, 585.
Ticoderooga, Fort, 119, 120.
Tientsin (tē-ēnt-sēn’), 406.
Tilseft, Peace of, 196, 195, 196.
Tir-buk-tu, 395.
Timbuctu, 426.
Tithes, church, in France, 189, 165.
Tobacco, 96.
Topi, 309, 500, 622.
Toleration, religious, 90, 49, 106, 142, 145, 150, 151, 190, 190, 190.
Toleration Act, the, 30, 106, 142.
Tolla, 189, 488, 486.
Tolstoy (tōl-stōy’), Count, 585.
Töln-kön’, 406.
“Tories,” the, 125.
Torture, use of, 514.
Tory Party, the; origin of, 28 and note 1; in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, 80, 92, 279, 250, 282, 294. See also Conservative Party.
Toul (tōl’), 43, 583.
Toulon (tō-lōn’), 178, 181, 183.
Tower of London, the, 500, 551.
Townshend Acts, the, 123.
Towns, the, in New England, 31.
Trade unions, 494.
Trade Union Act of 1775, the, 498.
Trafalgar (tīf-a-lä-gar’), Cape, battle of, 195, 196, 198.
Trafalgar Square, 551.
Trans-Andean Railway, 446, 446.
Transportation, inventions in, 468-469.
Trans-Siberian Railway, the, 406, 466, 561.
Transvaal (trān-sā’lē), the, 399, 400.
Transylvania, 390, 388, 506, 626.
Treaties: Westphalians, 8, 38, 48, 53, 61, 213, 215; Utrecht, 45, 47, 118, 218, 516; Azia-Chapelle, 72, 92; Paris (1768), 78, 98, 120, 158; Paris (1789), 127; Versailles (1789), 127; Basel, 179; Campo Formio, 180, 190, 193, 194; Lunéville, 159, note 2; Amiens, 189, 194; Pressburg, 196, note 1; Tilsit, 194, 197, 198; Vienna, 210-216; Paris (1806), 258, 258, 388, 384; Paris, 271; Frankfort, 273; San Stefano, 886; Berlin, 396, 396, 370; Bukharest, 396, 396, 572; Portsmouth, 490; Brest-Litovsk, 609; Versailles (1919), 614-624; St.-Germain, 624; Neufly, 624, 625.
Trent, 262, 615.
Trentino (trēn-tē-nō), the, 262, 597, 604, 628.
Tricolor, the, 164.
Trieste (trē-ēstē), 262, 257, 606, 628.
Triple Alliance, the, 559, 560, 561, 565.
Triple Entente, the, 564, 565.
Tripô-lí, 328, 395, note 1.
Troy (trō’), Congress of, 220.
Troyes, Leon, 609, 609, 637, 638.
Tulleries (tōl-lē-rē’), palace of the, 165, 167, 173, 175, 190, 192, 251, 541.
Tunis, 322, 393, 560.
Turenne (tō-rō-nē’), 41.
Turin (tōr’i-nē), 262.
Turkey, expansion of, 64; decline of, since 1853, 64, 65, 577; loses Montenegro, Serbia, and Greece, 375-381; in the Crimean War, 389, 388; loses Rumelia, 384; in the Russo-Turkish War, 385; loses Bulgaria, 386; Young Turk revolution in, 387, 388; in the First and Second Balkan wars, 385, 389; Germany and, 387-389; in the World War, 395, 606, 613; armistice with, 613; peace treaty with, 622-627.
Turks. See Ottoman Turks.
Tuscany, 8, 216, 241, 259 and note 2.
Two Sicilies, kingdom of the, 5, 81, 215, 221, 241, 261.
Tze-hei (tē-shē’), empress dowager of China, 415, 416.
U-boat warfare, German, 601, 602.
Uganda Protectorate, the, 401, 428.
Ukraine (ūkrān’), the, 55 and note 1, 69, 609, 682.
Ulster, 296, 299, 300.
Uniformitarian theory, Lyell’s, 599, 580.
Union Acts, of: England and Scotland, 31, 278; Great Britain and Ireland, 275, 298, 300.
Union Jack, the, 279.
Unionist Party, British, 265, note 1.
Unitarians, the, 30, 106, 141, 142.
United Colonies of New England, the, 118, 125.
United Kingdom, formation of, 278; government of, 293-291.
United States, the, formation of, 125-128, 489, 440; colonial possessions of, 422, 498, 494, 489, 440; commerce of, 478, 479; trade unionism in, 493, 494; labor legislation in, 497; enters the World War, 601-604; talks to
ratify the Peace Treaty with Germany, 629, 621, 646.
Universities, modern, 523.
Ural Mountains, 1, 53.
Uranus, planet, 529, note 1.
Uruguay, 482.
Utopian socialism, 502 and note 2, 604.
Utrecht (útrıkst), Peace of, 45, 47, 118, 218, 519; Union of, 526.

Valmy (vál-mé), battle of, 177.
Van Diemen’s Land. See Tasmania.
Van Dyck, Sir Anthony, 85.
Varennes (vá-ren), 172.
Vatican Palace, the, 325, 327; Council, 595.
Vauban (vó-bān), 41, 42.
Vendé (ván-dé), La, 178.
Vendôme (vón-dóm), Column, the, 314, note 1, 541.
Venetian, 421, 441, 566.
Venice, republic of, 8, 92, 192, 195, 196, 197, 241.
Venizelos (vén-i-zé-lós), Eleutherios, 381, 564, 565.
Venice (vén-čé), 48, 582, 584, 589.
Vermont, 100, note 1.
Versailles (vérs-sá), palace of, 39, 40, 155, 157, 158, 161, 162, 167, 241, 574, 618.
Victor Emmanuel II, king of Italy, 242, 256, 257, 259, 261, 269, 282.
Victoria, colony of, 428.
Victoria Nyanza, Lake, 395.
Vienna, 64, 65, 182, 198, 201, 299, 240.
Vienna, Congress of, 210–216.
Vikings, the, 387.
Vilafranca, armistice of, 229.
Virgin Islands, 399, 440.
Višuia River, 1, 65, 78.
Viall, William, 39.
Volfajk (vo-lé-fák), 511.
Volga River, 55.
Voltaire (vó-lár), 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 157, 158, 545.
Vries (vrís), Hugo de, 580.

Wagner (vágu-nér), Richard, 587.
Wagram (vágrám), battle of, 301.
Wales, 278, 525.
Wallachia (váł-lák-lá), 894.
Wallachia (váł-lák-sa), the, 375.
Walloons, the, 7, 65, 230, 384.
Walpole, Sir Robert, 31, 194, 290.
Warfare, modern, 572, 641. See also Army, Navy.
War of Liberation, Prussian, 204, 219, 265.
War of 1812–1814, the, 443, 444, 486.
Warsaw, 74, 206, 238.
Wartburg (vár-tbór-g), Festival, the, 218.
Washington, George, 125, 129, 458.
"Water frame," Arkwright’s, 454, 455, 456.
Waterloo, battle of, 205, 206.
Watt, James, 456, 457.
Waërve (vávrv), 205, 206.
Wealth, increase and diffusion of, 474, 475.

Wealth of Nations, Smith’s, 144, 450, 504.
Weaving, improvements in, 456, 456.
Weisweiler (wéz-wo-lyér), 410, note 1.
Weimar (fér-már), Assembly, the, 625.
Wellesley (wélz-lé), Sir Arthur. See Wellington, Duke of.
Wellesley, Duke of, 200, 205, 206, 210, 239, 235, 551.
Welsh, the, 278.
Wentworth. See Strafford.
Wesley, John, 141, 518.
Western Australia, 425.
West India Company, Dutch, 88, 108.
Westminster Hall, 21, 538; Abbey, 558–559.
Westphalia, Peace of, 8, 88, 48, 58, 61, 218, 215.
Whig Party, the, origin of, 28 and note 1; in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, 79, 80, 99, 296, 292, 298, 294. See also Liberal Party.
Whitney, Eli, 456, 457.
White Russia, 682.
Wilberforce, William, 518.
Wilhelmia, Queen, 566.
Willard, Frances E., 518.
William II, king of England, 29 and note 1, 30, 81, 45 and note 1, 44, 45, 70, 117, 296; IV, 232, note 1.
William, Prince of Orange. See William III.
William the Silent, 45.
Williams, Roger, 106, 524.
Wilson, Woodrow, 584, 601, 602, 606, 618, 624, 644.
Windischgrätz (vindish-grátz), Prince, 239.
Winthrop, John, 98.
Wireless telegraphy and telephony, 471.
Witchcraft, delusion in the Thirteen Colonies, 105.
Wolfe, James, 230.
Woman’s Christian Temperance Union, 516.
Women, emancipation of, 515–520.
Workshops, national, in France, 508.
World congresses, 511, 512.
World War, the, origin of, 579–582; course of, 599–615; casualties in, 689; money cost of, 689; how financed, 640.
Wren, Sir Christopher, 25, 551.
Wright, Orrville and Wilbur, 468.
Württemberg (vúrt-tém-bérk), 197, 215, 219, 683.
Wyoming, 560.

X-rays, the, 581.

Yiddish language, the, 581.

Yorktown, 127.
"Young Italy," 254, 255, 261.
Young Men’s Christian Association, the, 517.
Young Turks, the, 387, 388, 570, 626.
Ypres (é-pré), battles of, 585.
Yser River, 586.

Zambesi River, 395.
Zemstvos (zá-mí-tó-vos), Russian, 566.
Zeppelin (tsé-pe-lín), Count, 468.
Zollverein (tsó-lfér-in), the, 266, 269.