THE BORZOI HISTORICAL SERIES

Under the editorship of Harry Elmer Barnes, Ph.D., Professor of Historical Sociology, Smith College

MODERN WORLD HISTORY

1776–1926

A Survey of the Origins and Development of Contemporary Civilization

By ALEXANDER CLARENCE FLICK, Ph.D., Litt.D.

State Historian of New York. Formerly Professor of European History, and Head of the Department of History Syracuse University



NEW YORK
ALFRED · A · KNOPF
MCMXXVI

COPYRIGHT, 1926, BY ALFRED A. KNOPF, INC.
SET UP, ELECTROTYPED, PRINTED AND BOUND
BY THE PLIMPTON PRESS, NORWOOD, MASS.
PAPER FURNISHED BY W. F. ETHERINGTON &
CO., NEW YORK.

WITHDRAWN
LIBRARY
DEC 27 1926

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TO
SOME THOUSANDS OF STUDENTS
WHOSE DISCUSSIONS HELPED
CREATE THIS BOOK

EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION TO THE BORZOI HISTORICAL SERIES

In few fields of human learning has there been more progress than in the development of historical writing in the last half century. Fifty years ago, while the subject-matter of history had increased in accuracy to a notable degree, as compared with the works of the early chroniclers and pamphleteers, it was still extremely narrow in its scope and interests. The more scholarly historians were so absorbed in the problem of the methods of documentary research that they neglected the larger consideration of the desirable type of subject-matter. The content of historical works was chiefly political material, treating of wars, dynastic changes, political campaigns, diplomatic entanglements, and governmental corruption. Much space was devoted to anecdotes and episodes, interesting and amusing in themselves, but of no vital importance in understanding the past. Events were organized about great personalities instead of being put in the dynamic setting of cultural life and institutional development. This historical literature of a half century ago was nationalistic in its outlook, chauvinistic in tone, and bigoted in its attitude towards other peoples and races. It was for the most part written from that decisively patriotic point of view which held that the culture and institutions of other peoples were markedly inferior to those of the countrymen of the writer, and regarded national culture and institutions as a unique local achievement. The time perspective was fatally restricted by the conception of the "dawn of history" some six thousand years ago. There was little or no comprehension of human history as a process extending back through an almost immeasurable period of time and combining contributions from all parts of our planet. The truly genetic point of view and the world outlook were notable by their absence.

In the last two generations, due to the originality and enthusiasm of such historians as Green, Maitland and their disciples in England, Karl Lamprecht and his school in Germany, Rambaud and Berr in France, Altamira in Spain, Ferrero in Italy, and John B. McMaster, James Harvey Robinson, Edward P. Cheyney, Frederick Jackson Turner, James T. Shotwell, James H. Breasted, Carl Becker, Preserved Smith and others of their type in the United States, we have witnessed the repudiation of this old narrow and inadequate type of historical writing and the development of what has been called "the new history."

This form of history is concerned with an account of the development of human culture and institutions. While fully conscious of the necessity of accurate methods of research, it pushes on to the

next and more vital task of providing a broader content and an interest in the interpretation of the materials gathered by research. The new history is as wide in its interests as the entire range of human activities and achievements in the past. It deals not only with politics, dynasties and treaties, but with art, material culture, philosophy, education, medicine, literature, and manners and customs. Cultural achievements have replaced racy anecdotes, and institutional evolution has supplanted striking episodes.

The content of the new history has been widened as much with respect to the geographical range of its outlook as it has with regard to the scope of the interests embodied. The new history is as universal in its orientation and appreciation as it is comprehensive in subject-matter. It adopts a world point of view, searching out the contributions to the growth of human culture which have been made on all parts of the planet. It also makes it clear that human history has become more and more an international process with the progress of modern discovery and the new methods of transportation and communication. Further, as a result of the new time perspective forced upon us by cosmic development, historical geology, biological evolution and cultural anthropology, the new history rests upon a recognition of the slight fraction of human existence comprised within a period of written history. The age of man since the "dawn of history" is in reality modern history, and the old chronology and periodization of history are proved to be hopelessly inadequate and misleading. The genetic viewpoint and the new time perspective reveal the history of man as a long process of growth and expanding achievement, reaching from *Pithecanthropus Erectus* to the radio and aeroplane. The new history, then, includes the achievements of all the historic peoples of the past and present. It departs entirely from the chauvinism and bigotry of the earlier variety of nationalistic historical narrative. While it freely recognizes that some nations have been more important than others in their contributions to human culture, this discrimination in emphasis is based solely upon the relative influence and the level of the cultures produced, and not upon their racial basis, geographical location or political affiliations.

Thus far, the new history has been limited, for the most part, to the monographic, methodological and polemic works of the leaders of the various groups interested in this movement. There has been no organized effort to rewrite the totality of human history from the standpoint of the newer interests and assumptions. Hitherto, world histories have tended to be either ephemeral literary projects executed by authors possessed of stylistic capacity but with little historical knowledge, or they have been equally unreliable anthologies of the works of the contemporary historians of past ages, few of whom have had any comprehension of the standards of historical accuracy which have been worked out in the last hundred years.

A new standard for textbook writing was set a quarter of a century ago by James Harvey Robinson in his *History of Western Europe*, which revolutionized the spirit and subject-matter of historical manuals. Since that time a number of his former students, such as J. S. Schapiro, C. J. H. Hayes, Lynn Thorndike and Preserved Smith have followed his example in writing excellent treatises which have embodied the same breadth of interests as exemplified by Professor Robinson. Others, such as Professors Breasted and Webster, have independently arrived at dynamic and synthetic attitudes towards history and the preparation of historical textbooks. It is believed by the editor, however, that the *Borzoi Historical Series* represents the first organized and systematic effort to plan a group of college textbooks which are to cover the greater part of human history and the leading cultural areas strictly from the standpoint of the tenets of the new history. The Series is designed to provide textbooks which will enable teachers sympathetic with the newer point of view in the writing and teaching of history to present the history of mankind in such a fashion as to emphasize the evolution of civilization and the growth of institutions, instead of chronicling battles, describing the alternations of dynasties, analyzing treaties, and relating anecdotes concerning diplomats and political bosses. The comprehensive *History of Civilization* Series, which is being published by Mr. Knopf parallel with this textbook series, will provide a vast body of supplementary reading similar in the scope of its subject-matter and identical in its historical objectives.

In regard to time perspective, the editor of the Series holds that history must begin with the very origins of the human race, and the background for the succeeding volumes is supplied by the excellent manual by Dr. Goldenweiser on the civilization of primitive man. At the same time, it is evident that the history of mankind since the Scientific and Industrial Revolutions has become much more complex and varied, and much more pertinent for the guidance of contemporary social opinion. As a consequence, there are more volumes planned for the recent age than for the earlier periods. No attempt is made to control and distribute the assignments on a sharp chronological basis. Here the governing conceptions are the principle of the continuity of history, and the recognition of the need for special treatment and analysis of the cultures of particular areas.

As to subject-matter, the main emphasis is laid upon the history of culture and institutions. Yet there is no ignoring of the really vital aspects of political evolution. International relations and political and diplomatic history are presented in a broad fashion, indicating their relation to the deeper social, economic and cultural forces which condition them. Instead of the usual procedure of making political history the backbone of the narrative, and then offering a sop to the more progressive historians by sandwiching in an occasional chapter on manners and customs, this series assumes

that institutional and cultural development constitute the only intelligent basis for the organization of historical material, and political and diplomatic history is viewed as of secondary, though by no means negligible, significance.

In regard to geographical and cultural outlook, this Series endeavors as far as possible to get away from the occidental psychosis so prevalent in the western world. The world point of view is adopted as basic, particularly in modern times, and adequate attention will be given to a survey of the rise and development of civilization in all the important cultural areas of both the western and eastern hemispheres. The main emphasis is, of course, put upon the growth of western civilization, but nothing will be neglected which has in any important way contributed to the building up of occidental culture. The Series is founded upon the assumption that in the contemporary age, in particular, it will not be possible to ignore the fact that civilization has progressively become a world process, and that the interaction of East and West must be kept continually in mind.

It is further maintained as a fundamental conception that historical facts are vitally important only when intelligently organized and accurately interpreted. Hence, in this Series the interpretation of historical data will be emphasized distinctly more than casual narrative and the mere chronicling of many concrete facts. In this way only can history be made a real introduction to the social sciences from the genetic point of view, and a valuable impulse to the growth of social intelligence.

While these are the dominating principles guiding the editor of this Series, no attempt will be made to impose his particular theories of history in detail upon any of the collaborators in the enterprise. Each author will be left free, as he should be, for a wholly independent organization and exposition of the material in the field which he covers. General adherence to the program above outlined has been assured in advance by selecting as authors for the volumes which will be included men who are in general sympathy with the historical philosophy underlying the new history. It is believed that such individual differences as exist with respect to their views on the organization and interpretation of historical material will only lead to greater originality, vividness and variety in the successive volumes which will make up the Series as a whole.

If this collection of textbooks is able to achieve rather more than any previous enterprise in the way of bringing about that indispensable *rapprochement* between the abstract formulation of the principles of the new history and the actual teaching of history in the institutions of higher learning, the aspirations of both the editor and the collaborators will have been amply realized.

In regard to maps the publisher and the editor are agreed that the time has come frankly to admit that it is impossible to include in

a textbook on history a pedagogical equipment in this field in any way comparable with that to be obtained in such admirable historical atlases as those by Shepherd, Muir, and others, and in the several excellent series of wall maps issued by American publishers. Hence, the decision has been made to publish the Borzoi Historical Series without maps, and to assume that the instructors using these texts will exploit the unprecedented resources now available in the atlases and wall maps. It is hoped that this will have the incidental effect of improving the teaching of history by forcing the student away from reliance upon a necessarily inadequate equipment in map material in the textbook and into contact with the rich and diverse display to be found in the atlases and wall studies.

HARRY ELMER BARNES

Northampton, Mass., June 1, 1926

EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

THE volume by Dr. Flick on *Modern World History* is the first to be published since the scheme for the *Borzoi Historical Series* was launched. The volume by Dr. Goldenweiser on *Early Civilization* has been taken over for the Series because of its unusual adaptability to furnishing the background for the succeeding volumes.

The scope of this volume is somewhat different from that of the majority of works on modern history, which have generally devoted a single volume to the period since 1815. Dr. Flick's work has been planned on the basis of a conviction that teachers are becoming yearly more thoroughly convinced that the general history of Europe from 1500–1925 is too long and complex a period to be satisfactorily handled in a course running through only one year. This volume is designed to supply the basis for a year of class-room discussion on the period since the Scientific and Industrial Revolutions. For teachers, however, who prefer to follow the popular procedure of covering the entire period since 1500 in one year, a volume is in preparation by Professor James E. Gillespie which will deal with the history of modern Europe from 1500–1815. This may be combined with the work of Dr. Flick by omitting the material in the latter book dealing with the developments between 1760 and 1815. The material in Dr. Flick's book on the period since the Congress of Vienna is thoroughly adequate to constitute the basis for a semester course on the history of Europe in the nineteenth century.

Dr. Flick's work conforms in admirable fashion to the fundamental tenets of the Series as a whole. The emphasis is chiefly upon social, economic and cultural history. The political and diplomatic history has been properly limited to that essential minimum necessary to indicate the outstanding phases of political evolution in the nineteenth century as well as the leading problems of contemporary political life. Nothing of importance has been omitted from the record of political development and diplomatic negotiations, and the significant material in that field will stand out all the clearer in the mind of the student because of the fact that it is not obscured by a mass of irrelevant anecdotal and episodical detail. In treating the wars which have fallen within this period, it has been assumed that their causes and results are of infinitely greater importance than the battles and strategy involved. Hence, much more space has been given to the background and aftermath of the chief armed conflicts of this age than to the details of the military campaigns.

More than any other textbook writer on modern European history, Dr. Flick has emphasized the fact that the history of the world

since the middle of the eighteenth century can only be intelligently described and accurately interpreted as a process of the interchange of material culture and ideas between all parts of the planet. The content of the book is thoroughly consistent with the title, and the story is distinctly an account of modern *world history*. This viewpoint should not only contribute to a more intelligent attitude towards the evolution of civilization, but should also serve to curb bigotry, intolerance and chauvinism in the study of history. There is no greater defect in our historical textbooks today than the presentation of material from a provincial and exaggerated patriotic point of view, and nothing can do more to dispel and remove this defect than the dominating conceptions of Dr. Flick's manual.

Dr. Flick is peculiarly well fitted to prepare a book based upon these fundamental assumptions, as he is not only thoroughly acquainted with the factual material through a quarter of a century of study of the sources and monographs in this field, but he has travelled more extensively in Europe and the Orient than any other author who has thus far attempted to produce a manual in the field of modern history. Much of the urbanity, tolerance and insight which is evident in the volume is to be traced to this extended travel, the most truly civilizing influence operating upon man.

In addition to these general qualities of the volume with respect to the larger phases of the organization of the enterprise, the book possesses certain special features which are believed by the editor to be superior to the treatment of these topics or problems in any other existing manual. The diplomatic history of Europe from 1870–1912 is presented more thoroughly and more profoundly than in any comparable textbook, and for the first time such material has been based upon the new documentary evidence recently published in such great sets as the *Grosse Politik*. Again, the section dealing with the immediate causes of the World War represents the first thorough statement of the revisionist point of view in any college manual. For the first time, the intelligent and open-minded teacher may lead his students away from the illusions and hatreds generated by the war-time mythology which has permeated all too many manuals right down to the present time. Further, this volume offers the first adequate survey of the history of the Balkan States and Turkey which has been written by a scholar who is a specialist in the history of this area. Likewise, special attention is given to the rise of the new states created in central and western Europe as a result of the World War. Finally, the concluding sections on the characteristics of contemporary culture and social institutions constitute a considerably more thorough presentation of this extremely important type of material than is found in any other college manual in the field of European history.

Teachers who do not share the historical views of the editor and of the author of this volume, already have available a number of

manuals which are congenial to their tastes and desires. If the present treatise proves helpful to the ever-growing body of teachers who are desirous of introducing into class-room practice a more dynamic type of historical material, this *Modern World History* will have achieved the purpose for which it was prepared.

Conformable to the policy announced above with respect to the Borzoi Historical Series as a whole, Dr. Flick's book is printed without maps, with the understanding that the instructor will make use of atlases and wall maps.

HARRY ELMER BARNES

Northampton, Mass., June 1, 1926

NOTE OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

THE editor and author here desire to express their appreciation of the courteous and efficient help of experts who have read, criticized and revised those sections of the work in which they are specially interested. The sections on the history of the United States were read and criticized by Professor Cardinal L. Goodwin of Mills College. The material on the French Revolution and the Napoleonic period has profited by the suggestions of Professor Joseph Ward Swain of the University of Illinois. The chapters dealing with Germany and Austria have been read and thoroughly revised by Professor William L. Langer of Clark University. The chapters on France, Italy, the lesser countries and the World War have been improved through a critical reading by Professor Clarence Perkins of the University of North Dakota. The chapter on the third French Republic was read and criticized by Professor Mack Eastman of the University of British Columbia. Professor Howard Robinson of Miami University read the chapters on England and made many helpful suggestions as to revision. The chapters on Russian history have been examined by Professor Selig Perlman of the University of Wisconsin. The material on the Balkan States and Turkey since 1815 was entirely rewritten by Professor F. S. Rodkey of Miami University. The section on the diplomatic history of Europe from 1870–1912 is very largely the work of Professor Langer, while the editor is responsible for the material on the immediate causes of the World War. Mr. John H. Wuorinen of Columbia University has rendered assistance in preparing the material on the new states of central and eastern Europe. The chapters on the expansion of Europe *overseas, and the development of modern imperialism were critically* read by Professor Harry J. Carman of Columbia University. The sections on Latin-American development were criticized by Professor J. Fred Rippy of the University of Chicago. The chapters on social and economic history were read by the editor. Finally, the proof of the entire volume has been subjected to a critical reading by Professor Theodore Collier of Brown University, whose detailed and precise mastery of the facts of modern European history has enabled him to detect many minor slips, errors and omissions, as well as to suggest the revision of certain interpretations throughout the volume. In the selection of bibliographies valuable assistance has been given by Miss Helen Boatfield, graduate fellow in history at Cornell University.

CONTENTS

PART I

SURVEY OF WORLD CIVILIZATION IN THE LATTER PART OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF RECENT WORLD HISTORY

		PAGE
1.	Introduction	3
2.	Political Developments	4
3.	Social and Economic Changes	7
4.	Educational Improvements	9
5.	Religious Transformations	10

CHAPTER II

THE EXPANSION OF EUROPE AND THE COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION

1.	Progressive Forces in European History	13
2.	The Expansion of Europe	15

CHAPTER III

THE NEW RÉGIME IN NORTH AMERICA

1.	European Origins	21
2.	British Imperial Policy	21
3.	The Movement for Independence	27
4.	New Experiments in Government	29
5.	The Movement for a Federal Republic	32
6.	The New Régime in North America	37
7.	Effect of New Régime in North America on the Rest of the World.	42
8.	Latin America, Africa, Asia and Oceania	43

PART II

EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH A NEW RÉGIME IN EUROPE

CHAPTER IV

THE OLD RÉGIME IN EUROPE

Political Conditions in the Various States
European Society

PAGE

3. Religious Conditions 66
4. Cultural Conditions 69
5. The Industrial System 72

CHAPTER V

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION: ITS INFLUENCE ON OTHER PEOPLES

1. The Old Régime in France 75
2. The Genesis of the Revolutionary Spirit Prior to 1789 87
3. The Summoning of the States General 92
4. The National Constituent Assembly 94
5. The Legislative Assembly 99
6. The National Convention 101
7. The Directory 106

CHAPTER VI

THE NAPOLEONIC ERA AND ITS INFLUENCE ON OTHER PEOPLES, 1799–1815

1. The Consulate, 1799–1804 110
2. The Napoleonic Empire, 1804–1815 112
3. Permanent Contributions of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Era to World Civilization 121

PART III

SYSTEM OF REACTION AFTER 1815

CHAPTER VII

RESTORATION AND REACTION UNDER INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATISM

1. Europe in 1814 129
2. Metternich and His Principles 130
3. The Congress of Vienna 131
4. Treaties, Alliance and Congresses to Preserve Peace 135
5. Restorations in France, Spain, Portugal and Italy 137
6. Reaction in Great Britain Under the Old Tories, 1815–1832 139

CHAPTER VIII

ABANDONMENT OF LIBERALISM IN RUSSIA AND THE MAINTENANCE OF AUTOCRACY IN CENTRAL EUROPE

1. Russia under Alexander I and Nicholas I 145
2. The Austria of Francis I 146
3. Prussia under Frederick William III, 1797–1840 148
4. The Germanic Confederation 149

PART IV

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND THE GROWTH OF CONSTITUTIONAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

CHAPTER IX

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

	PAGE
1. The Meaning and Significance of the Industrial Revolution	155
2. The Background and Antecedents of the Industrial Revolution	156
3. The Technological Revolution: the Coming of the Empire of Machines	160
4. Economic Results of the Industrial Revolution	166
5. Social Results of the Industrial Revolution	168
6. The Industrial Revolution in France	170
7. The Beginnings of the New Industrial Order in Germany	173
8. Spread of the Industrial Revolution	176

CHAPTER X

THE POLITICAL REVOLUTIONS, 1820–1848

1. The Swing away from Reaction	179
2. Revolution in Spain and the Spanish-American Colonies	179
3. Revolution in Portugal	182
4. Revolutions in Italy	183
5. The Greek Revolution	183
6. The Revolution of 1830 in France	185
7. The Reign of Louis Philippe, 1830–1848	187
8. Spread of the Revolution of 1830 over Europe	190

CHAPTER XI

THE REVOLUTIONS OF 1848 AND THEIR EFFECTS ON THE WORLD

1. Scope of the Revolutions of 1848	196
2. The Revolution in France	196
3. The Revolution in Germany	200
4. Revolution in the Hapsburg Dominions	202
5. The Chartist Movement in Great Britain	205
6. Effects of the Revolution of 1848 in Other Countries	207

CHAPTER XII

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL TRENDS AND ACHIEVEMENTS TO 1850

1. The Leading Forces and Aspirations	211
2. An Era of Constitution-Making	212
3. The Germs of Socialism	216
4. The "Utopian Socialists"	216
5. Louis Blanc and French Socialism	218
6. Lassalle, Marx, and German Socialism	220
7. Anarchism	222

PAGE

8. Social, Economic, Religious and Educational Reforms 223
9. Achievements to 1850 226

PART V

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONALISM AFTER 1850

CHAPTER XIII

NATIONALISTIC STRIVINGS BEFORE 1850

1. Origins of Nationalism 231
2. Nationalism after 1815 232
3. Secret Societies 235
4. Other Forces Promoting Nationalism 236

CHAPTER XIV

FRANCE UNDER LOUIS NAPOLEON BONAPARTE, 1848-1871

1. The Rise of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte 238
2. The Second Napoleonic Empire at its Height 239
3. The Decline of the Second Empire 241
4. The Causes of the Collapse of the Second Empire 243
5. Alsace-Lorraine and the World War 244

CHAPTER XV

THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY

1. Preparation 246
2. The Italian War for Independence 248
3. Completion of Italian Unification 249

CHAPTER XVI

THE CREATION OF THE NEW GERMAN EMPIRE

1. Growth of Nationalism 252
2. Bismarck's Plans for the Unification of Germany 253
3. The First Step — War with Denmark 255
4. The Second Step — The Austro-Prussian War 255
5. The Third Step — The North German Federation 257
6. The Fourth Step — The Franco-Prussian War 258
7. The Foundation of the German Empire 260

CHAPTER XVII

FORMATION OF THE DUAL MONARCHY OF AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

1. Obstacles to a Centralized Empire 262
2. The Compromise of 1867 263
3. Progress of Austria-Hungary after 1867 263

CHAPTER XVIII

THE CONSOLIDATION OF RUSSIA

PAGE
1. The Despotism of Tsar Nicholas I 267
2. Tsar Alexander II, 1855–1881 268

CHAPTER XIX

THE UNIFICATION OF THE UNITED STATES

1. The Lack of National Unity 274
2. The Civil War 275
3. Social, Economic, and Educational Progress 278
4. The Achievements of Nationalism to 1880 279

PART VI

NATIONAL CONSOLIDATION, INDUSTRIAL AND WORLD POWERS

CHAPTER XX

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

1. Neutrality and Foreign Relations 285
2. Political Reforms 285
3. The Government of Great Britain 287
4. Political Parties 290
5. Social Reforms 291
6. Educational Changes and Religious Reforms 294
7. The Irish Question 296

CHAPTER XXI

FRANCE UNDER THE THIRD REPUBLIC

1. The Provisional Republic 301
2. Republic or Monarchy? 302
3. The Republic under Republicans 304
4. *Separation of Church and State* 307
5. The New Imperialism 308
6. Socialism 309
7. Foreign Affairs 310
8. The French Government and Political Institutions 313
9. *Material Prosperity* 315

CHAPTER XXII

THE GERMAN EMPIRE AFTER 1871

1. The Government 318
2. The Chancellorship of Bismarck, 1871–1890 321
3. The Reign of Emperor William II, 1888–1918 326

CHAPTER XXIII

THE DUAL MONARCHY OF AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

PAGE

1. The Dual Government 334
2. The Austrian Empire 335
3. The Kingdom of Hungary 336
4. Foreign Relations 337

CHAPTER XXIV

THE EXPANSION OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE

1. Expansion in Asia 339
2. Maintenance of Autocracy under Alexander III 340
3. Nicholas II — The Last Tsar 342
4. The Russo-Japanese War and the Revolution of 1905 344
5. Russia Under the National Dumas 345

CHAPTER XXV

GROWTH OF THE KINGDOM OF ITALY AND THE MINOR POWERS OF WESTERN EUROPE

1. Political Institutions of Italy 349
2. Problems Confronting Italy after Unification 350
3. Foreign Policy of Italy 354
4. The Spanish Kingdom 355
5. The Portuguese Republic 358
6. Holland 359
7. Belgium 360
8. Switzerland 361
9. Denmark 362
10. Sweden and Norway 363

CHAPTER XXVI

TURKEY AND THE BALKAN STATES, 1815-1914

1. Turkey at the Opening of the Nineteenth Century 366
2. The Awakening of Nationalism in the Balkans 375
3. The Development of International Rivalry in the Near East, 1832-1856 380
4. Failure of the International Attempt to Rejuvenate Turkey, 1856-1878 385
5. National Problems in Turkey and the Balkan States, 1878-1908 392
6. International Rivalry in the Near East at the Close of the Nineteenth Century 400
7. The Young Turk Revolution and the Balkan Wars 404

PART VII

NATIONAL IMPERIALISM AND THE SPREAD OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION OVER THE WORLD

CHAPTER XXVII

THE OLD AND THE NEW IMPERIALISM

PAGE

1. The Decline of the Old Imperialism 413
2. Rise of Modern National and Economic Imperialism 414
3. Missions and European Expansion 418
4. Nationalism, Political Expansion and the New Colonialism 422
5. The New Imperialistic Spirit 424

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE OLD WORLD IN THE NEW

1. Europe in America 429
2. Africa and Asia in America 433

CHAPTER XXIX

THE UNITED STATES BECOMES A WORLD POWER

1. Territorial and Industrial Expansion 438
2. Pan-American Relations 440
3. The Era of "Big Business" 441
4. Foreign Relations 442
5. Political, Social, and Educational Changes 445

CHAPTER XXX

THE LATIN-AMERICAN REPUBLICS

1. Civilization 448
2. Political, Social, and Economic Development 448
3. Economic Penetration and Foreign Relations 452

CHAPTER XXXI

THE BRITISH EMPIRE

1. Great Extent of the British Empire 455
2. The Dominion of Canada 456
3. The Commonwealth of Australia 457
4. The Dominion of New Zealand 458
5. Union of South Africa 459
6. Imperial Federation 462
7. Other British Colonies 464
8. The Empire of India 465

CHAPTER XXXII

EUROPE AND AMERICA IN ASIA, AFRICA AND OCEANIA

PAGE

1. The Intrusion of Western Civilization in the Orient 469
2. Western Intervention in Asia 470
3. The Awakening of China 472
4. Threatened Partition of China 475
5. Reforms and Political Changes in China 476
6. The First Western Visitors to Japan 480
7. The Political and Industrial Revolutions 481
8. Japanese Imperialism 483
9. Europe and America in Africa 485
10. The Europeanization of Australasia and Oceania 491
11. General Conclusions 493
12. The World of 1800 and Today Compared 495
13. Results of the New Age of Imperialism 496

PART VIII

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE WORLD WAR

CHAPTER XXXIII

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

1. International Relations and Diplomacy to the Retirement of Bismarck 503
2. International Relations After Bismarck's Dismissal 510

CHAPTER XXXIV

THE CAUSES OF THE WORLD WAR, 1914–1918

1. The Underlying Causes 529
2. Contributary Factors in Europe and the World: Nationalism, Militarism, Capitalism, Imperialism, Secret Diplomacy 530
3. The Immediate Causes of the World War 535

CHAPTER XXXV

HOW THE EUROPEAN WAR BECAME A WORLD WAR

1. German Violation of Belgian Neutrality 556
2. Rapid Spread of the War Area 557
3. The United States Enters the War Against the Central Powers 558
4. Relative Strength, Resources, and Ideals of the Belligerents 561

CHAPTER XXXVI

THE LEADING MILITARY EVENTS OF THE WORLD WAR 1914–1918

1. The First Year 565
2. The Second Year of the War 566

PAGE

3. The Third Year of the War 567
4. The Fourth Year of the War 568
5. The War in Asia and Africa 569
6. The War on the Seas 570
7. The War in the Air 571

CHAPTER XXXVII

MAKING PEACE

1. First Peace Drive of the Central Powers 573
2. Peace Proposals of Pope Benedict XV 573
3. Russia's Peace Efforts 574
4. Peace Terms in the Armistice 575
5. The Paris Peace Conference 576
6. The League of Nations 580
7. Treaties of Peace with Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey 583

CHAPTER XXXVIII

RESULTS OF THE WORLD WAR

1. Losses in Life and Property 583
2. The Political Results 585
3. The Economic and Social Results 589
4. The Religious and Educational Results of the War 594

CHAPTER XXXIX

EUROPEAN REVOLUTIONS SINCE 1914 AND THE CREATION OF NEW STATES

1. The Russian Revolution 597
2. Changes in Germany 607
3. The Dissolution of Austria-Hungary 613
4. The War and the New National States of Northern and Central Europe 615
5. Turkey and the Balkan States since 1918 628

PART IX

A SURVEY OF CONTEMPORARY CIVILIZATION AND INSTITUTIONS

CHAPTER XL

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

1. Nature of Political Institutions 643
2. Extension of the Franchise 644
3. New Conception of the Function of Government 646
4. International Political Organization 648

CHAPTER XLI

THE GROWTH OF INTERNATIONALISM

PAGE

1. Diplomatic Machinery 650
2. Official International Agencies 652
3. Projects for World Peace and the Federation of the World 655

CHAPTER XLII

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS

1. The Industrial Revolution and Modern Social Conditions 660
2. Growth of Commerce 661
3. The War on Poverty 663
4. Socialism 668
5. The Woman's Movement 672

CHAPTER XLIII

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

1. The Growth of Information and Literacy 676
2. Education the Corner Stone of Civilization 677
3. Higher Education and Other Cultural Influences 680

CHAPTER XLIV

THE NEW SCIENCE

1. The Theory of Evolution 683
2. The Study of Matter and Power 686
3. Medicine and Surgery 688
4. The New Social Sciences 690
5. Achievements of the New Science 693

CHAPTER XLV

RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS

1. Religions of the World 698
2. Christianity and Modern Life 699

Index 705

PART I

SURVEY OF WORLD CIVILIZATION IN THE LATTER PART OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF RECENT WORLD HISTORY

1. Introduction

The lifetime of two of our ancestors seventy-five years of age would reach back to the beginnings of the American Revolution. Within that brief period of time more important changes have taken place in the life and institutions of man than had occurred in the entire previous history of the world. The expansion of Europe, the Commercial Revolution, the Industrial Revolution, the advance in transportation and communication, the spread of intelligence, and the resulting political, economic, and social changes have produced what is in reality a new civilization. The continents have been explored from pole to pole, and a more accurate knowledge of the human race has been obtained. The natural resources of the globe have been used for man's comfort and happiness. The oceans have become great highways for intercourse between the most distant peoples; and railroads, canals, rivers, automobiles and airplanes have connected inland centers of population with one another. Science has made man the master of nature, and in a hundred ways the unity of mankind has been increased and emphasized.

Changes in last 150 years

It must be remembered that the modern world did not come into existence suddenly. By comparison with previous periods, the changes came rapidly, but the causes for these transformations run far back into the past. The institutions of today have been produced under the laws of continuity and differentiation. It is easy to see that the world of Gregory VII and St. Dominic differed greatly from that of Erasmus and Luther; that the world of Calvin differed from that of Richelieu and Louis XIV; and that the world of Jefferson, Mirabeau, Burke, and Stein differed from that of today. Resemblances persisted, but differences were continually creeping in — into politics and religion; into commerce, transportation, manufacturing, and agriculture. The sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries were remarkably fertile in science and the growth of ideas, which in turn produced many alterations in practice.

Laws of continuity and differentiation

The transition, however, was not even and uniform. Progress was more marked in the United States, England, and France. It was less so in central Europe, and still less in eastern and southern Europe. Asia, Africa, and, in large part, South America remained relatively unaffected until well into the nineteenth century. All stages of civilization, indeed, are still found on the earth.

Before studying in detail the development of the world during the past one hundred and fifty years, it will be helpful to consider

the great problems of human progress which man has either solved or attempted to solve.

2. Political Developments

Government throughout the world at the end of the eighteenth century was predominantly monarchical. The wild tribes of America, Australia, Africa, and Asia were ruled by their chiefs. Turkey, China, and Japan were oriental despotisms. Continental Europe was governed by kings, emperors and tsars, who arrogated to themselves the authority to rule their subjects by "divine right." In but few of these countries did the people have the right to make their own laws or to shape their own political destinies. The governments were autocratic, and whether they were good or bad, wise or unwise, depended largely upon rulers, who were restrained only by custom, ancient privilege, and physical inability from wielding all the power they claimed. Within the British Empire, however, were to be found the beginnings of self-government. Great Britain and Ireland had their parliaments, and the English-speaking colonies in the New World their local assemblies, but scarcely anywhere else did the people participate in the government. The most conspicuous example of self-government came with the American Revolution in 1776 and the creation in 1789 of the American Republic. Since that time one of the great political problems of the world has been either to democratize monarchies or to replace them by republics. So successful has been this twofold effort that today autocratic government has well-nigh disappeared from the earth.

Rise of self-government

A constitution outlining the governmental organization of a political group is a comparatively recent development. Prior to 1789 the constitutions found among the English-speaking peoples were the best models. Great Britain, through a long development of local and central institutions, was operating under a constitution partly written and partly unwritten, and thus supplied the greatest stimulus in modern times to the creation of constitutional governments in other nations. The American colonies, after declaring their independence, formed their own written state constitutions which had far-reaching effects. The first conspicuous example of a modern written national constitution was that adopted by the United States in 1789, based in part upon the state constitutions and in part upon the British model. France, during the Revolution and the era of Napoleon, formed a whole series of written constitutions, beginning with that of 1791. With the British, American, and French patterns to point the way, constitutional government has spread rapidly during the past century, and today every civilized state has a constitution. During the beginning of the last century the American model was widely copied in Latin America and elsewhere; but in recent years, particularly in the new constitutions following the World War, the British and French examples have had

Creation of Constitutions

more influence. A comparison of the world in 1789 with the world today will show to what extent the creation of political constitutions has been one of the leading achievements of the modern age.

The growth of a special form called parliamentary government was restricted before 1789 to the British Empire. Its leading features were a legislature of two houses and a cabinet responsible to the will of the majority of the lower house. The English type, in one form or another, has been very widely adopted all over the world. The bicameral feature has been generally accepted; the cabinet system less so. The right to vote was restricted to the privileged few in the British Empire a century and a half ago. On the European continent it was confined to the freemen of a few small self-governing communities. Elsewhere it was unknown. The first pronounced extension of the franchise came with the formation of the American Republic and the French Revolution. Since that time there has been a continual widening of this privilege in all civilized states until today it is universal for males, and has also been extended to women in the more progressive states. But this victory was won only after a long and bitter struggle.

Growth of the parliamentary system

The establishment of civil and political liberty was a burning issue of the period. Under the arbitrary governments of the eighteenth century, the common man was not secure in his person or his property. He had to pay such taxes as the monarch was pleased to levy. He might be thrown into prison, tortured, and even condemned to death with what seems to us only a pretense of public trial or the benefit of witnesses in his behalf. For a hundred and fifty years intelligent and fearless men and women combined repeatedly to obtain the enactment of laws to guarantee personal rights and liberties, such as freedom of speech, assembly, petition, and the press; religious liberty; equality before the law; proper treatment and a fair trial in case of arrest; property rights; the protection of the home, labor, women, children and health; and the right to vote and to hold office. For the most part these rights have been incorporated in the various constitutions, or have been provided for in special laws. The struggle for civil and political liberty has been a long one and is still in progress.

Civil and political liberty

The enactment of wise and humane laws was necessary to counteract the edicts of the eighteenth century, which were chiefly intended to protect the interests of the privileged classes. Equality before the law was practically unknown. Trials were notoriously unfair to the accused of the lower classes. Under the criminal laws of the times punishments were invariably harsh, even ferocious. During the past century great changes have been made in the modes of punishment for crimes, prisons have been reformed, and the new science of criminology has sought to protect society by stressing the importance of child-rescue, the humane treatment of adult criminals, and efforts to reclaim the violators of law for decent citizenship. The

Changes in criminal law

modern problem has been to prevent crime, not by severe vengeance upon the criminal, but by the certainty of punishment and by the reformation of the offender.

Origin of political parties

In their modern form political parties can hardly be said to go back to the eighteenth century. Their rise coincided with the development of popular government. Political writers of the earlier period viewed parties as dangerous bands of selfish intriguers. Indeed, the framers of the constitution of the United States held that view and never dreamed that political parties would become one of the essential features of the American political system. But parties grew up outside of constitutions and law, and today they constitute integral parts of the governmental machinery of most modern nations, though they function to a considerable extent as extra-legal institutions. In no two countries, however, have political parties assumed the same form or operated in the same manner. Their history is, nevertheless, essential to a clear understanding of how the world has been ruled in recent times.

Spread of nationalism

The growth of nationalism characterized this era. The English, Scots, and French were the first three peoples in the world to be inspired by the modern spirit of nationality as contrasted with the vague aspirations and persistent hostilities of the Germans and Italians under the mediaeval Empire. They were followed by the appearance of modern nationalism in Spain, Portugal, Denmark, and Sweden. It is worthy of notice, likewise, that all these states were examples of the national monarchy. In central, eastern, and southeastern Europe the peoples were almost untouched by a comparable nationalistic movement prior to 1800. The American Revolution with its Declaration of Independence justifying the right of political revolution, the French Revolution with its slogan "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," and the wars of Napoleon gave a new impetus to the doctrine of nationalism. Napoleon was at first successful on the continent in his appeals to the national sentiment aroused by the Revolution. To win support he encouraged nationalistic hopes in both Poland and Italy, but his imperialism provoked national revolts against him in Spain, Portugal, the Netherlands, and Prussia which helped to cause his downfall. By obliterating old landmarks, boundaries, and dynasties, the French Revolution and Napoleon paved the way for the rebuilding of Europe along national lines. In ignoring this principle, the Congress of Vienna committed its chief blunders which directly and indirectly changed the map of the world. The Latin-American states secured their independence. The Greeks obtained their political freedom from the Turks. Belgium separated from Holland. Italy was united and the German Empire created. The Balkan states became self-governing nationalities after 1878. Norway separated from Sweden. The World War gave birth to at least eight new nationalistic states.

Intense nationalism during the latter part of the nineteenth

century produced four significant results: (1) the various "pan" movements — Pan-Germanism, Pan-Slavism, Pan-Hellenism, and "unredeemed Italy"; (2) national imperialism, which led to a general scramble for colonial empires in the backward parts of the earth; (3) a rivalry in armaments among the great powers; and (4) alliances of groups of nations to realize and advance their nationalistic ambitions. *Results of nationalism*

With the rise of the nation-states there appeared among them a new set of relationships dealing with war and peace, trade and travel, and citizenship which is called internationalism. By slow degrees the Law of Nations developed to regulate these new inter-state problems. With the growth of self-government, the spread of intelligence, the increase in world business, new methods of transportation and communication, and the multiplication of international societies, congresses, and institutions, there resulted a better understanding among the different groups of people in the world. The various efforts to bring about a new political organization of the nations of the earth for the purpose of guaranteeing to them national security and the right of peaceable progress, and to provide means for settling international disputes legally instead of by war, culminated in 1919 in the creation of the League of Nations. *Appearance of internationalism*

3. Social and Economic Changes

The Industrial Revolution produced more changes in the life and institutions of the world during the past century than the epoch-making political revolutions. It began in England about the time of the American Revolution, then extended to the more progressive portions of Europe and to the United States, and has now spread in differing degrees to all civilized nations on the earth. The every-day life of the people at the close of the eighteenth century did not differ very much from that of the world in the time of Julius Caesar, Charles the Great, or King Alfred. To understand present civilization with its comforts and conveniences; its marvelous transformations in the transport of persons, goods and ideas; its multitudinous industries, large cities, improved mechanical methods, increase in wealth, and social and economic problems, one must study carefully the origins, progress and effects of the Industrial Revolution. *Effects of the Industrial Revolution*

New divisions of society were produced by the Industrial Revolution. In the old régime there were nobles and serfs; guildmasters, and journeymen and apprentices; and merchants and clerks. The factory system gave rise to two new classes — the capitalists and the wage-earners. The former are more frequently called the *bourgeoisie* and consist of the owners of industries, bankers, merchants, landlords, and professional men; the latter are the *proletariat* and include day-laborers in factories, trades, mines, and on the farms. The appearance of these new classes soon forced to the front a whole series of new problems involving wages, hours of labor, health and sanitation, Bourgeoisie *and* proletariat

living conditions, and the employment of women and children; the *right of the workers to organize unions for the protection of their* interests, strikes and lockouts; insurance against accident, old age and unemployment; free competition and monopoly; state interference in industry; and the causes of poverty. Social and economic reforms in all the more advanced nations have satisfactorily solved some of these burning questions, but others still await adjustment. These issues have been so characteristic of recent world history that they should be given careful attention by students of world affairs.

Increase in world wealth

An increase in the wealth of the world, unprecedented in earlier times, has occurred during the past century. The number of millionaires has multiplied rapidly in all the countries of the globe, and even billionaires are not unknown. Their wealth has been invested in countless enterprises at home and abroad. The trade and commerce of the world have left no product unsought and no market unexploited. Financial institutions have been organized in every corner of the earth on both a national and an international basis. It was estimated that in 1921 the wealth of the United States alone reached the colossal sum of $350,000,000,000 — an amount that exceeded the combined wealth of Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, and Belgium. A study of the distribution of wealth today shows that its owners form a significant pyramid. At the top are a few persons who possess most of it and enjoy enormous incomes; in the middle are large numbers with moderate fortunes; and at the bottom are the masses of the people with relatively little wealth and small incomes. Under this system the idle leisure class is being constantly augmented. Economists quite generally agree that these pronounced inequalities in the distribution of wealth, which give the few more and the many less than is necessary for their comfort and happiness, are undesirable and dangerous in a democratic world, because they reverse the dictum "the greatest good for the greatest number."

Appearance of socialism

Numerous have been the schemes to solve the problem of industrial waste and social injustice. Historically, the most significant movement in this direction was the rise of socialism in its various forms. Its germs are found in the revolutions at the end of the eighteenth century. It had doughty champions in England and France during the first part of the nineteenth century, and broke forth as a mighty force in the Revolution of 1848. In that year *Marx and Engels formulated socialism into a statement of principles*, which sought to substitute for the capitalistic system of private, income-producing property, collective state ownership and operation of lands, factories, stores, railroads, and other means of production. Marxian socialism sought, in addition, to unite the workingmen of all countries in a class war on capitalism to realize the Socialistic Commonwealth. This revolutionary movement expressed itself under many divergent organizations and enlisted the devotion

of millions of men and women throughout the world. It entered politics and captured seats in legislatures and even premierships. Finally in 1917 one branch of radical socialism gained complete control of Russia, and has been putting its theories into practice. Socialism has been bitterly attacked by its opponents. Whatever his personal feelings may be, the student of recent world history must recognize socialism as a force in modern life and must seek to understand its causes, growth, variations, and results.

Abolition of serfdom and slavery

The abolition of serfdom and human slavery was not accomplished in the civilized portions of the earth until the nineteenth century. At the close of the eighteenth century serfdom had long been abolished in England, but it was widely prevalent on the continent of Europe. The French Revolution overthrew the remnant of the system in France and the adjoining states, yet it lingered in central Europe until the Revolution of 1848, and was not discarded in Russia until 1861–6 nor in Japan until 1871. Traffic in the slavery of human beings, particularly the African Negroes, to supply labor for the English, Dutch, French, Spanish, and Portuguese colonies, culminated in the latter part of the eighteenth century. The British slave trade reached its utmost extension about the time of the revolt of the American colonies, when 192 ships with a capacity for 47,000 slaves were engaged in the traffic. Both the American Declaration of Independence and the French Declaration of the Rights of Man proclaimed the doctrine of human freedom and equality. Some religious sects like the Quakers advocated the abolition of slavery. Denmark had the honor of first doing away with slavery in her colonial possessions in 1792. England passed a law in 1807 which put an end to the British slave trade and forbade the importation of slaves to colonies won in the Napoleonic wars. This example was followed gradually by other European states and by some of the American commonwealths. The United States by the Emancipation Proclamation of 1863, followed by a constitutional amendment, ended slavery in North America, and Brazil by the act of 1888 eliminated it in South America. The Ottoman porte in 1889 ordered the suppression of slavery. The twentieth century witnessed efforts to get rid of slavery in Africa both by individual nations and by international congresses but the barbarous traffic is not wholly extinct today, for it still exists in a few portions of the Dark Continent.

4. Educational Improvements

The Intellectual revolt

The intellectual revolution, which occurred the latter part of the eighteenth century and did so much to bring on the political revolts, was a distinct attack on conditions and ideals that were largely mediaeval. Beginning in England and America, it made the greatest headway in France, and found champions all over Europe, even in Russia. Its leaders were philosophers, scientists, economists, poets, and historians. It advocated religious toleration;

attacked rule by divine right; set forth a new political economy which denounced the unjust system of taxation and opposed restrictions on trade; and ushered in a new era of scientific inquiry. This movement, projected into the nineteenth century, gave the world a new conception of nature, man and God. It opened the way for the conquest of the forces and materials of the earth; it displaced ignorance and superstition by knowledge; and, by modifying man's institutions and enlarging his horizon, it helped to produce the civilization of today. The organized agencies of intelligence and culture at the close of the eighteenth century were comparatively few. Nowhere were there free public schools and universities supported by general taxation for all the people. On the contrary, it was commonly believed that education was intended only for the privileged few. Indeed, not until well into the nineteenth century did the conviction begin to prevail that it was the duty of the democratic state to educate all its members in order to make them enlightened and useful citizens. This spread of education has been one of the most important problems of recent world history.

Growth of scientific thought

The growth of scientific thought during the past hundred years or so has had no parallel in the advance of man. From the beginnings in earlier days, the whole earth has been explored and studied; the various peoples have been visited and described; the varieties of human, animal and plant life on earth have been investigated; the structure of the globe and its mineral resources have been revealed; the universe of stars and planets has been penetrated and charted; the laws of the human mind have been fathomed; almost unbelievable mechanical inventions have been created; and human knowledge has been increased in a thousand different directions by the experimental, philosophical, social, and applied sciences. Though the printing-press, books, newspapers, and libraries had served for several centuries as a means for the dissemination and preservation of ideas and information, so widely have they been employed in recent times that the age might well be called that of the printed page. Today a poor student may own a collection of books such as would have been possible only to the wealthy in the days of his grandfather. He who can not buy books has at his disposal the resources of a free library. The number of homes without a newspaper or magazine discussing the current happenings of the world is rapidly diminishing. As a result of these educational agencies, the decline in illiteracy has been marked during the past century, but much still remains to be done even in the most highly civilized nations. At the same time attention has also been devoted to literature in its various forms, and to music, art, and the theater as means of culture.

5. Religious Transformations

Recent world history has been characterized by the continuance of the old religions, both Christian and pagan, which existed in the

Continuance of the old religions

eighteenth century. Old states have disappeared and new ones have been created, and social and educational institutions have been transformed, but religious institutions everywhere have shown a remarkable persistence. The great faiths of the world still play a leading role in controlling the conduct of individuals and in moulding civilization. Christianity as the faith of the most highly civilized nations on earth has endeavored through missionary efforts and political aid to make a conquest of the world. The Mohammedans have also been unusually active in religious propaganda. The other great religions have not been so aggressive in winning converts.

Religious toleration

One of the religious problems which the modern world has had to face is that of toleration. It was not so long ago that the adherents of one religious doctrine felt it to be a holy duty to repress or kill those of another faith. The religious wars of the hostile sects of Christians in Europe were cruel and bloody. Catholics hated Protestants, and the various Protestant denominations were intolerant of one another. Monarchs insisted upon conformity to the state faith or persecution followed. Imprisonment and death for nonconformity, or heresy, were not unknown down to the French Revolution. But since that time there has been a remarkable growth of the spirit of tolerance among the various Christian sects as well as among the communicants of the different religions of the world. Considerable advance will have to be made, however, before the right spirit of mutual understanding is realized among the devotees of the different religious groups.

Persistence of state churches

Prior to the Reformation the Roman Catholic Church was accepted as the state church by all the states of western Europe, as the Greek Orthodox Church was acknowledged in eastern Europe. After the Reformation some of the states of northwestern Europe made one or another of the Protestant creeds the "established church." Within this period there began an effort to separate the church and state, and before the close of the eighteenth century it was notably successful in the United States and France. So far has the movement gone that today eighteen Christian states have adopted the principle, and efforts are being made to bring about the same result in other states. Out of this tendency has come the separation of the schools from the church, which has now become quite general.

Christian federation

The federation of all branches of Christendom has been advocated and some steps have been taken to realize this objective. Protestant churches have learned to coöperate in missionary work and thus avoid duplication and waste, and some of them have actually brought about an organic unification. But the complete realization of Christian unity remains for the future.

The rise of the modern state has taken from the church some of its social and political functions of earlier days and thus freed it to devote more attention to problems of human welfare.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

General Histories

W. Oncken (editor), *Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen*, 50 vols. (1879–1893); E. Lavisse and A. Rambaud (editors), *Histoire Générale du IV^e siècle à nos jours*, 12 vols. (1894–1901); T. Flathe, *Allgemeine Weltgeschichte*, (translated as *History of All Nations*), 24 vols. (1902); A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, and S. Leathes (editors), *Cambridge Modern History*, 14 vols. (1902–1912); H. G. Wells, *Outline of History*, 2 vols. (1920).

General Histories Covering Most of the Period

W. Müller, *Political History of Recent Times, 1816–1848, with Special Reference to Germany*, English translation by J. P. Peters (1882); C. Bulle, *Geschichte der neuesten Zeit, 1815–1885*, 4 vols. (1867–1887); Sir E. Hertslet, *The Map of Europe by Treaty since 1814*, 4 vols. (1875–1891); A. Debidour, *Histoire diplomatique de l'Europe, 1814–1914*, 4 vols. (1891–1917); C. A. Fyffe, *A History of Modern Europe, 1792–1878*, (1896); Continued in G. P. Gooch, *History of Modern Europe, 1878–1920* (1923); C. M. Andrews, *The Historical Development of Modern Europe, 1815–1897*, 2 vols. (1896–1898); C. Seignobos, *A Political History of Europe since 1814*, English translation by S. M. Macvane, (1900); F. A. Kirkpatrick (editor), *Lectures on the History of the Nineteenth Century* (1902); W. A. Phillips, *Modern Europe, 1815–1899*, (edition 1902); A. Stern, *Geschichte Europas seit den Vertragen von 1815 bis zum Frankfurter Frieden von 1871*, (1894–1924). Vols. I–X, which have so far appeared, carry the narrative to 1866; J. H. Robinson and C. A. Beard, *The Development of Modern Europe*, 2 vols. (1907–1908); *Readings in Modern European History*, 2 vols. (1909); C. D. Hazen, *Europe since 1815*, 2 vols (rev. ed. 1923); *Modern European History* (1917); E. Driault and G. Monod, *Evolution du monde moderne: histoire politique et sociale, 1815–1909* (1910); L. C. Jane, *From Metternich to Bismarck, 1815–1878* (1910); J. A. R. Marriott, *The Remaking of Modern Europe, 1789–1915* (1920); R. W. Jeffery, *The New Europe, 1789–1889* (1911); O. Browning, *History of the Modern World, 1815–1910*, 2 vols. (1912); C. E. M. Hawkesworth, *The Last Century in Europe, 1814–1910*, (1913); P. Feyel, *Histoire politique du XIX^e siècle*, 2 vols. (1913–1914); C. J. H. Hayes, *A Political and Social History of Modern Europe*, 2 vols. (2d vol. rev. 1924); J. S. Schapiro, *Modern and Contemporary European History (1815–1921)*, revised edition (1921); E. R. Turner, *Europe, 1789–1920* (1920); E. Fueter *World History, 1815–1920*, English translation by S. B. Fay (1922).

CHAPTER II

THE EXPANSION OF EUROPE AND THE COMMERCIAL REVOLUTION

1. Progressive Forces in European History

The people now living on the earth would make about twenty groups as large as that in the United States. Their civilization follows an ascending scale from savage tribes to the most progressive nations. Five thousand years ago certain groups were further advanced in intelligence and modes of living than others existing today. In fact the most enlightened peoples of the world at the present time constitute only about one fourth of the total inhabitants. Racially they are restricted largely to the yellow race and to the white race, and geographically they are confined to eastern Asia, to Europe, and to the nations planted by the expansion of Europe to North and South America, to Australia, and to Africa. Elsewhere there is but a sprinkling of highly intelligent people.

Small part of the human race enlightened

A survey of the history of this comparatively small portion of the human race, which can be called superior in civilization, reveals the fact that they have undergone a continuous change from the earliest to the most recent times. It seems clear, also, that the Europeans, and the group of newer nations resulting from their expansion to other continents have shown the greatest capacity for progress. Indeed even those Asiatics who rank highest in civilization have borrowed much from the Europeans and their offspring. This Europeanized world of today, it is quite apparent, differs in many important ways from the world of Washington, George III, Voltaire, and Frederick the Great; still more from the world of Shakespeare, Calvin, Columbus, John Hus, and Loyola; and vastly more from the world of Cicero, Alexander the Great and Socrates.

Capacity of Europeans for progress

It will be helpful, therefore, in understanding the history of the world during the past century and a half, to review briefly, those forces that have helped to produce the ideas and institutions of the present time:

1. The older peoples, more particularly the Hebrews, Greeks and Romans in the Mediterranean basin, and the Arabs, Hindus and Chinese in Asia, developed high types of civilization, which have persisted either directly or indirectly. The institutions of a large portion of the earth still reflect their influence. The Latin, Teutonic, Slavic and Japanese peoples are deeply indebted to these ancient influences.

Persistence of old stocks

Continuance of old religions

2. The older religions, such as Judaism, Confucianism, Buddhism, Christianity and Mohammedanism set the standards of faith and conduct for millions of adherents, and are still vital forces on the earth. The missionary impulse of Christianity is one of the oldest and most permanent forces in the general movement of European expansion over the globe. The Crusades brought the peoples of western Europe into contact with the richer civilizations of the east. As a result, exploration and trade were stimulated, eastern ideas and products were introduced into the west, mediaeval customs and institutions were weakened, the Italian trading cities grew up, and Europe received a powerful impetus towards expansion.

Effects of the Renaissance and Reformation

3. The Renaissance rediscovered for European peoples the literary and artistic contributions of Greece and Rome, aroused a new interest in the universe, and gave man a new sense of his own dignity and a new interest in things of this world. The Protestant Revolt, which followed it, led to a secession of northern Europe from the mediaeval church. It proclaimed salvation by faith yet shifted salvation from faith to works, aided the rise of national states, gave a higher conception of the ethical value of this life, made man's conscience the final arbiter in both spiritual and worldly affairs, and stimulated interest in manual labor and pecuniary profits. The earlier mechanical inventions such as the printing-press, the mariner's compass, fire-arms, and the telescope and microscope, greatly extended the range of man's intelligence and power. Supplied with these aids, Europeans set out more boldly to conquer the world and the modern era had begun. The social and economic revolution of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries changed the system of production from the guild and barter to that of wages and money, laid the foundations for a wealthy middle class, accelerated the decline of feudalism, and strengthened nationalism. These changes, coupled with the new inventions, released in Europe motives and processes of world-wide significance.

Rise of the secular state

4. The Reformation took the control of the social order of a large part of Europe out of the jurisdiction of the Papacy and put it in the hands of the secular states. In the countries where this happened, ecclesiastical affairs became national instead of international. The individual's political relations were emphasized and his allegiance to the state stressed. Next to the revolt against the dogma of the old church, the new interest in politics was of the greatest significance for the future. No sooner had the bitter religious wars, which followed the Reformation, subsided than ecclesiasticism was supplanted by politics as the "pivotal interest of civilized man." The state and not the church, as an institution, henceforth claimed the first attention, and also the primary loyalty. New theories of the state were evolved to fit the new social structure of the world. The politico-theistic system put God behind the state, and thus opened the way for the rise of the theory of political absolutism by divine

right. Machiavelli elaborated the idea that the ruler of a state is omnipotent, and above all law, civil and ecclesiastical. He not only substituted the supreme power of the state for that of the church, but also the authority of the absolute ruler for that of God. Bodin of France formulated the doctrine of secular absolutism which was so widely accepted in the two centuries following the Reformation. A Dutchman named Althusius first set forth the idea that the sovereign state is composed of both the people and the ruler, and that it is subject to moral law. This conception of the state was elaborated by Grotius, the "father of International Law," and by Pufendorf. A distinct advance was made by Locke, an Englishman, and Montesquieu, a Frenchman, who contended that the state is not the product of some arbitrary power but a historical and social development to meet human needs. This idea replaced the God-made state by the man-made state. The concept of the equality of man before God was transferred to the ideal of equality before the law, and in the eighteenth century gave new force to the proclamation of the sovereignty of the people which had been asserted during the papal controversies of the fourteenth century and demonstrated in England by the final triumph of Parliament in 1688.

2. The Expansion of Europe

The overseas expansion of Europe followed the Renaissance and Reformation and produced a remarkable series of discoveries, explorations and colonization. The impetus for this expansion came in part from the forces already enumerated and in part from new economic, political and religious motives. Economic jealousy of the commercial monopoly, which the Italian cities enjoyed over the Levant trade, was an important cause of overseas activity. No doubt mere curiosity and the spirit of adventure also played a role. The desire of the leaders of the Christian church to convert the heathen induced them to support these exploring enterprises. So the mad race for colonial empires began. Under the patronage of Prince Henry (1394–1460), Portuguese navigators explored islands in the Atlantic and the coast of Africa; Vasco da Gama found the sea route to India (1498) and the East Indies; and Cabral discovered Brazil (1500). Under Spanish direction, Columbus discovered the New World (1492); and Magellan circumnavigated the earth (1519–1522). Meanwhile the French, English and Dutch joined in the scramble for North America and other parts of the globe, while Russia was soon expanding eastward into Asia.

Motives for overseas expansion

Out of these beginnings strong "rival commercial empires" quickly sprang up in Portugal, Spain, the Netherlands, France and England, with their interests clashing and their possessions sprawling over the earth. Out of the series of wars that were waged by land and sea for world power during the two centuries prior to 1763,

"Rival commercial empires"

England emerged as mistress of the sea and in possession of the largest colonial empire.

The Commercial Revolution

In order to understand recent world history, one should know in some detail the major results of the overseas expansion of Europe. This movement was accompanied, in the first place, by a commercial revolution. There was an increase in both the size and number of ships, as well as in the technique of navigation. The center of commercial activity shifted from the Mediterranean basin to the waters of the west and north, and commerce became oceanic. Both the volume of trade and the geographical scope of trading operations became greater. *The increase in the quantity of the precious metals* brought about a new system of finance. Prices had to be readjusted. Capital took on a new meaning and found new uses. Credit institutions, banks, stock exchanges, and insurance companies came into existence. Speculation and "get-rich-quick" schemes for making money appeared. Necessity and the spirit of adventure led to the organization of joint-stock companies and commercial corporations, ofttimes as regular trading monopolies under the sanction of the state, to exploit the backward parts of the earth. In time, naturally, new commercial theories and policies arose. The mercantilist theory, which predominated from about 1500 to 1750, regarded money as "the most desirable form" of wealth. Hence each nation sought to attract to itself the largest share of gold and silver by selling as many manufactured articles as possible to other countries and by buying from them as few things as possible. This meant that the country whose exports had an excess value over imports was "prosperous." The difference in trade, or "balance of trade," as it was called, would be paid for in coin to the advantage of the nation receiving it. It was all a matter of "political arithmetic" to increase not so much the wealth of the state, as its power. Furthermore, it was believed that governments might employ any measures, such as bounties on home manufactures, high duties on imports, special rules for making cloth, candles, barrels and pins, and rigid restrictions on colonial business, such as the English Acts of Trade and Navigation, for the purpose of securing this favorable "balance of trade."

Mercantilism replaced by laissez-faire *doctrine*

In France a decree of 1700 limited the right to make stockings to eighteen towns. Frederick the Great of Prussia encouraged 30,000 immigrants to settle in Silesia, and, to encourage the spinning of cotton, granted the spinners special privileges. The whole theory of business was based upon a close supervision of industry and trade by the paternalistic state. It was quite logical that most of the mercantilists were champions of the absolute rule of the day as set forth, for instance, in Hobbes' *Leviathan* (1651). These ideas prevailed quite generally until towards the end of the eighteenth century, when they gradually gave way to the *laissez-faire* doctrine, which based commercial prosperity on natural law, elevated agriculture as the chief productive industry and advocated the abolition of the

guilds and the policy of "hands off" for the state in economic matters. Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* (1776), one of the most important of modern books, is shot through with these new economic theories.

The overseas expansion of Europe, in the next place, paved the way for the Industrial Revolution which occurred the latter part of the eighteenth and the first part of the nineteenth centuries. The increased demand for goods made in Europe led to a pronounced development of European industries, such as textiles, trinkets for trade with the natives, and the manufacture of new commodities like pottery, hardware, glass, furniture, and leather goods. At the same time an agricultural revolution was taking place, particularly in England. Better farming tools were made. New crops of grain, vegetables, fruits and nuts were introduced from foreign lands. The European peoples became accustomed to strange articles of food such as maize, sugar cane, potatoes, tomatoes, peanuts, and artichokes. The breeding of horses, cattle, sheep and swine was improved. These advances in farming, in turn, stimulated the industrial transformation.

Coming of the Industrial Revolution

The expansion of Europe and the attendant commercial revolution also produced marked social changes among the European peoples. The introduction of foreign products, such as new articles of food, drink, dress and ornament raised the standards of comfort, set new fashions in clothing, and encouraged a display of luxury and personal adornment. The larger supplies of food made it possible to support a more numerous population. Tea, coffee, cocoa, and tobacco led to the creation of coffee-houses, smoking-taverns, and other social institutions. The planting of colonies sent a stream of immigrants to the newer parts of the world and thus weakened the home population. Travel to foreign parts was stimulated, and resulted in the increase of knowledge. In Europe serfdom began to disappear, while the lot of the peasant was slowly improved. The middle class increased in number, wealth and influence until the day was not far off when they would strike for greater political rights.

Social results

Finally the political results of the expansion of Europe must be noted. Dynastic national states, such as England, Spain, France, Russia and Prussia, began to emerge as the monarchs' royal resources increased. It was money derived largely from colonies and commerce *that enabled the kings to hire officials and soldiers of their own* and thus make themselves independent of the feudal lords. But these early dynastic national states were built up on the theory of the divine right to rule, which, in turn, soon resulted in the triumph of secular absolutism. When arbitrary royal autocracy began to threaten the interests of the rising middle class, which had aided the rulers in a mutual war on the hated feudal lords, that class, in self-protection, attacked autocratic monarchy and sought to subject kings to constitutional limitations. The merchants and bankers, particularly,

Political results

supported by the lawyers and literary men, sought freedom from arbitrary taxation, and immunity from royal restrictions on the freedom of trade. Out of this agitation developed the "contract" theory of the origin of society and the state, the *laissez-faire* doctrine of industry and commerce, and the philosophical justification of revolution.

Political revolutions in the Old World and the New

The first conspicuous example of a clash between the middle class and common people, on the one hand, and an absolute monarchy upheld by the aristocracy, on the other, was found in the English Revolutions of the seventeenth century. Although Charles I submitted to the Petition of Right in 1628, which curtailed his rights as king, still his later arbitrary acts provoked Parliament to revolt. The middle-class Puritans and townsmen, and many of the yeomanry supported Parliament, while the nobility and landlords favored the king. The revolution resulted in the death of Charles I as a "tyrant" and "traitor," and in the creation of the Puritan Commonwealth under Cromwell. The "Instrument of Government" establishing the Protectorate was the first written constitution ever used by a great state. The new government favored the freedom of the press, tried to establish religious toleration, and brought prosperity to the agricultural and commercial classes. But deep-rooted customs and traditions, sentimental loyalty to monarchy, and a reaction against overstrict Puritanism in moral conduct and popular customs brought about the restoration of the Stuart monarchy. It was not long, however, until the absolutism of James II produced the Revolution of 1688. Parliament adopted the Bill of Rights, which ended royal absolutism in England, made an aristocratic Parliament the real governing power, and granted to the people many civil rights. But it must be clearly borne in mind that for a century and a half government in England was in the hands of a small number of the rich and privileged, while on the continent of Europe royal absolutism continued for another century before it began to disappear. The American Revolution of 1776, and the French Revolution of 1789 mark the next advances in the political organization of the world. These movements will be explained and interpreted in the following chapters.

Economic areas of the world

The end of the eighteenth century saw the world divided, according to economic geography, into three areas: (1) Europe and those regions in the New World colonized by Europeans; (2) eastern Asia, which included China and Japan, unprogressive and isolated; and (3) the rest of the world, some parts of which were under European colonial influence, such as India, Australia and South Africa, and other parts of which were unexplored and even unknown, such as the interior of South America, central Africa, and central Asia.

This overseas expansion brought Europe into contact with two distinctly different areas: (1) one inhabited by uncivilized peoples like the Indians of America and the Negroes of Africa and (2) the other peopled by civilized groups such as the Hindus, Chinese and

Japanese. In consequence the east and the west were united to a larger extent than is commonly believed. Indeed, historians have not yet stressed sufficiently the reactions of this overseas expansion. The west was affected in thought and life to a far greater degree than appears on the surface. Not only were European and American geographical names sprinkled over the rest of the world, but the world was largely Europeanized in spirit, outlook, and accomplishment. Today Europe is merely a portion of this "Greater Europe" and the process of "Europeanization" appears to have just begun. But the reactions of the process in the way of extra-European influences on European civilization were nearly as great.

Reaction of overseas expansion on the West

It is significant to note contemporary French opinion at the end of the eighteenth century concerning the value to mankind of the expansion of the Old World to the New. In 1782 the Academy of Sciences, Belles-Lettres and Arts of Lyons, France, offered a prize for the best lecture upon the following questions: "Has the discovery of America benefited or injured the human race? If it has been a benefit, how may these benefits be preserved and increased? If it has been an evil, how are these evils to be remedied?" A decade later, for the purpose of discussion, the French Academy asked: "What has been the influence of America upon the politics, commerce, and manners of Europe?" The replies to these questions indicated that it was believed that the discovery of America was an evil because (1) it caused the natives to be slaughtered and enslaved; (2) it carried to Europe unknown pests and diseases; and (3) American gold and silver raised prices more rapidly than wages and hence caused distress and discontent among the workers. The monograph crowned by the French Academy concluded thus: "America has corrupted our morals, and therefore has been a baneful influence. America has encouraged vanity, idleness, and love of luxury. That is her crime. She has contributed to the comforts and conveniences of life, and to that extent is entitled to our gratitude. She has supplied our industries with new substances and raw materials; that is her triumph."

Contemporary opinion of effect of the expansion of Europe to America

In 1923 the *Latin American Review* sent out a questionnaire asking the same question: "Has the discovery of America contributed to human happiness?" The replies received indicated a belief that (1) it had harmed the natives; (2) it had introduced Negro slavery; (3) it had increased the danger of war; (4) it had injured France, Italy, and Spain by diverting trade from the Mediterranean to the west; and (5) it had benefited England and Germany by enabling them to gain an ascendency over Latin civilization.

Recent Latin-American opinion

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

The Expansion of Europe and the Commercial Revolution

General Works

* W. C. Abbott, *The Expansion of Europe*, 2 vols. (1918); R. Muir, *The Expansion of Europe* (1918); C. Day, *History of Commerce* (1907); W. Cunningham, *An Essay on*

Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects, 2 vols. (1910); A. T. Mahan, *The Influence of Sea-Power upon History, 1660–1783* (1898); H. C. Morris, *The History of Colonization*, 2 vols. (1900); A. Zimmerman, *Die Europaischen Kolonien*, 5 vols. (1898–1903); * E. P. Cheyney, *The European Background of American History* (*American Nation* Series, Vol. I) (1904); H. E. Bolton and T. M. Marshall, *The Colonization of North America, 1492–1783* (1920).

Works Dealing with the Enterprises of Particular Countries

E. G. Bourne, *Spain in America* (*American Nation* Series, Vol. III) (1904); E. Levasseur, *Histoire du commerce de la France*, Vol. I (1911); F. Parkman, *Pioneers of France in the New World* (1865); R. G. Thwaites, *France in America* (*American Nation* Series, Vol. VII) (1905); G. B. Malleson, *History of the French in India, 1674–1761* (2d edition 1909); Sir J. R. Seeley, *The Expansion of England* (1895); G. L. Beer, *Origins of the British Colonial System, 1578–1660* (1908); A. D. Innes, *A Short History of the British in India* (1915); H. Robinson, *The Development of the British Empire* (1922); * J. E. Gillespie, *The Influence of Oversea Expansion on England to 1700* (1921); * J. B. Botsford, *English Society in the Eighteenth Century* (1924).

CHAPTER III

THE NEW RÉGIME IN NORTH AMERICA

1. EUROPEAN ORIGINS

IN the English colonies of North America there was developed during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries a new social and political order. The European origins of this change centered in (1) the Reformation, which stood for religious freedom; (2) the economic revolution of the sixteenth century, which substituted private competition for common effort; (3) the English Revolution of the seventeenth century, which stressed the political rights of the individual; and (4) the expansion of Europe and the attendant Commercial Revolution, which opened the non-European world to conquest and gave rise to the middle class. Under the influence of these forces, colonists fled from Europe to the New World to escape political tyranny and religious persecution, or went to better their economic lot, or for the sheer joy of adventure.

European origins of the new social and political order in America

Separated by three thousand miles of water from the homeland, they were left, for generation after generation, to develop their institutions largely in their own way without serious interference from the English government. A freer life in a new land, the rapid increase of wealth, and the victories won in colonial wars, increased their self-confidence, encouraged a spirit of independence, and led them to oppose interference in their affairs by the home government. As a result the colonies gradually came into a conscious realization of their own social, religious, and political separateness from the land of their origin and the government of their allegiance. It was but natural, therefore, that their interpretation of the British constitution began to differ from that of English statesmen. At the same time that Great Britain began to realize that there was a British Empire, these colonials became acutely aware of the inherent conflict between their own economic interests and the commercial purposes of this new imperial policy.

Contributory factors in the New World

2. BRITISH IMPERIAL POLICY

Prior to 1763, the attitude of the British government towards the American colonies was one of general neglect rather than rigid supervision. Such control as did exist followed no uniform rule, but differed with each colony. A board of trade created in 1696 and a secretary of foreign affairs had general oversight over colonial matters, while royal governors and their appointees represented the

British colonial policy before 1763

crown's interest in individual colonies. The numerous conflicts between the colonial assemblies and the royal governors resulted, as a rule, in a victory for the former. The right of the board of trade to veto colonial laws was seldom used. Although nationalistic historians have painted in glowing color the "oppressive acts" of the British government in restricting trade and manufacturing in the colonies, still, as a matter of fact, these measures were either laxly enforced or else evaded by smuggling and bribery. Indeed so beneficial to the colonials was the British commercial system before 1763 that a recent writer has called that period "the Golden Age of commerce" for American merchants. It seems clear, therefore, that the long absence of rigid control of colonial commerce by England explains in large measure the hostility of the mercantile classes after 1763, when the British government resolved to introduce new trade regulations.

Prosperity of colonial trade

While these new trade regulations were engaging the attention of the northern colonies, where commerce formed one of the chief occupations, another problem confronted the planters of the south, whose capital was invested in the raising of tobacco and rice. To plant and harvest their crops, these planters began to borrow money from British capitalists, who accepted mortgages on the produce for security. At the same time British merchants gave credit to the planters for the purchase of such articles as were needed for the plantation life. Thus it soon came to pass that the planters were operating on borrowed money. As a result the planting class in the colonies found itself in a state of "economic vassalage" to British merchants. When the British creditors found it difficult to collect their loans, they sought relief from Parliament. The colonial assemblies retaliated in protests, lax bankruptcy laws, and the issuance of cheap paper money. Consequently the disgruntled, debt-ridden planters of the south gladly joined their protesting mercantile brethren of the north, when after 1763 the British government adopted a new colonial policy.

Grievances of the southern planters

Behind the colonies fronting on the Atlantic, into the interior region stretching from Canada to Florida, had gone bands of the more adventuresome Americans. Among them were English, Germans, and Scotch-Irish. These back-country settlers, imbued with a spirit of self-reliance gained from conflict with the Indians and the wilderness, living a simple life on their small farms, were developing a civilization more distinct and perhaps more democratic than the two groups of colonists already mentioned. Some of these frontiersmen had quarrelled with the colonial governments over representation, justice and taxation, and hence were quite familiar with the burning political questions of the day. Now the new land policy of the British government aroused their resentment. The board of trade of 1761 ordered the governors to grant no more lands, and to discourage settlements which might "interfere with the Indians"

Grievances of the frontiersmen

bordering on the colonies. To make matters worse, George III in 1763 by royal act closed to settlers all lands west of the Alleghanies to the Mississippi from Florida northward to the fiftieth degree of latitude. All persons who had "either willfully or inadvertently seated themselves" on reserved lands were ordered to leave. At the same time the purchase of land from the Indians was forbidden. To make matters still worse for these pioneers, all trade with the Indians, including the rich fur trade, was restricted to persons licensed by royal officials. These restrictions on the freedom of trade and settlement touched the frontiersmen to the quick. They were not slow, therefore, to give voice to their particular grievances by joining the merchants of the north and the planters of the south in a protest against the new colonial policy of Great Britain.

Trade with the Indians

In those days, when transportation and communication were slow and difficult, time and distance were important factors in imperial politics. Isolation and the influences of a frontier environment produced a new type of an American — one who was brave, self-reliant, resourceful, and rather scornful of Old World pretensions. Consequently it was a feeling of economic independence rather than a hatred of economic control that led the colonists to express their defiance. The actual economic grievances were at that time unduly magnified, and were greatly overstressed after the Revolution had been brought to a successful conclusion. A recent writer has said that the British and Spanish colonies were more leniently governed than any others in an age when Europe was dominated by the mercantile theory that colonies existed for the benefit of the mother country.

Time and distance as factors

The year 1763 marked the end of a victorious war against France by which the British flag was extended to Canada and to the territory within the present boundaries of the United States as far west as the Mississippi. But the war had left the British government staggering under the largest national debt in the history of the country. The first task confronting George III and his ministers, therefore, was the readjustment of public finances. Hence there was devised a new imperial policy which marked a pronounced change in the relations of Great Britain to her North American colonies. The recent war had opened the eyes of the home country, apparently for the first time, to the wealth of the colonies. The new policy was regarded as quite justifiable under the mercantilist theory of that day. It was well known, also, that the old laws regulating industry and commerce had been laxly enforced. It was now proposed to enforce rigidly the old laws, and, in addition, to raise about $750,000 through a series of carefully devised acts of the British Parliament. With little question in Parliament of either their legality or their wisdom, the following measures were passed:

The inauguration of a new imperial policy

1. An act of 1763 declared void all colonial laws authorizing paper money, or extending the life of outstanding paper bills, by

Colonial paper money forbidden

means of which debts owed to English creditors had been largely annulled.

Sale of western lands limited

2. The same year a royal proclamation limited the sale of western lands, forbade settlements on them, and sought to regulate trade with the Indians.

The Sugar Duties

3. The Sugar Act of 1764 was a revenue measure which levied duties on sugar, indigo, calico, silks and other commodities imported into the colonies. Special precautions were taken to enforce the law; and naval, army and civil officials were instructed to see that the duties were collected. The purpose of this measure was stated to be the improvement of the trade between the colonies and the mother country, and the defense of the colonies.

The Stamp Act

4. The Stamp Act of 1765 required the colonists to use special stamped paper, on which the tax had been paid, for all legal transactions, such as deeds, wills, mortgages and notes, and licenses to sell liquor or to practice law. The tax was collected on newspapers, pamphlets and almanacs. Playing cards carried a tax of one, and dice ten shillings. The tax on a college diploma was two pounds. The same administrative machinery devised for the enforcement of the Sugar Act was employed for the collection of a revenue from the Stamp Act. The money raised was to be paid directly to the British treasury.

The Quebec Act

5. The Quebec Act, in 1774, granted religious toleration to the Catholics in Canada, shoved the southern boundary of Quebec southward to the Ohio River, and proposed to set up a government by a viceroy in this western section of the Empire.

These acts were the first fairly inclusive taxation measures that Parliament had enacted for the American colonies. It should be pointed out that at the same time Parliament assured to the colonies and some of their products a preferred, even a monopolistic, position in English markets.

This new policy of strict imperial control of the colonies, following a long period of "salutary neglect," quickly transformed into action revolutionary ideas that had been growing for a long time. The regulations of trade injured honest traders and smugglers alike, and threatened to ruin the great business houses of the large cities. Hence the merchants of the north took the lead in the protest against the irritating measures. The prohibition of paper money aroused the debt-ridden planters of the south. The farmers and traders of the interior were angered at the attempts to deprive them of their holdings and to curtail their traffic with the natives. The Stamp Act not only united the merchant and the farmer but also aroused the ire of newspaper men, lawyers, ministers and bankers. The Quartering Act likewise was interpreted as an attempt to force the colonists into submission. It was not long, therefore, until the merchants were boycotting English goods through "non-importation agreements"; the planters and frontiersmen were clamoring for home rule; the news-

Effects of these acts on colonial public opinion

papers were demanding the repeal of the obnoxious laws; the lawyers were denouncing the acts as unconstitutional; the colonial legislatures were insisting upon the "immemorial rights of Englishmen"; and a Stamp Act Congress representing all the colonies was drawing up a declaration of rights including self-taxation and trial by jury. *The public mind became feverish, and mobs burned stamp*-collectors in effigy and destroyed property. In Boston and elsewhere serious riots broke out against the British officials who tried to sell the stamped paper. These manifestations of resistance to the new imperial policy show that the judgment of John Adams was correct when he wrote: "The Revolution was in the minds and hearts of the people" and "Revolution and union were gradually forming from 1760 to 1776."

Explanation of John Adams

The British Parliament soon revealed a disposition to compromise with the stubborn colonists. The Stamp Act and the Sugar Act were repealed, amidst great rejoicing in America. But the other obnoxious measures were left unchanged, and a Declaratory Act announced that the colonies were bound in all cases by the crown and Parliament of Great Britain. Hence in 1767 a second attempt was made to enforce the new imperial policy. The Townshend Acts sought to raise a revenue in the colonies for the support of colonial governors, judges, and other royal officials, as well as for the defense of the colonies, by import duties on glass, lead, paints, and tea. The collection of this tax was placed in the hands of British commissioners named by the king and paid out of the British treasury. These customs officers were to be supplied by the colonial courts with search warrants, which empowered them "to search for and seize" prohibited goods. Violators of the law were to be tried in courts without juries. As soon as news of these acts reached America, the commercial classes, whose interests were chiefly imperiled, once more took the initiative in renewing the "non-importation agreements." Within a year the imports of Great Britain dropped $3,500,000 and during the next three years not over $80,000 in duties was collected by the royal customs officers. The planters and farmers, with grievances of their own, again joined the merchants. Under such leadership the *proletariat* was not slow to supply materials for mob violence.

Efforts of the British government to compromise

This time Parliament seemed to be determined to force the colonies to submission. When the assembly of New York protested against the expense involved in supplies asked for British troops, Parliament suspended the assembly until, after a third election, it reluctantly obeyed. The royal governor of Massachusetts also dissolved the assembly of that colony when it refused to rescind a letter addressed to the other colonies condemning the new imperialism, declaring that Parliament had no right to tax the colonies without their consent, asking for a greater degree of home rule, and suggesting some common action to secure their rights. The assemblies of

Coercion arouses the colonists

Maryland, Georgia, South Carolina and Virginia were likewise dissolved for endorsing similar views. British troops sent to overawe Boston in 1768 were hooted and hissed as "lobsterbacks," on account of their red coats. The "Boston Massacre" followed in 1770 and the next year a similar distressing event occurred in North Carolina. Then followed the burning of the armed British ship *Gaspée* in Narraganset Bay. By this time the conflict, guided in the colonies by political agitators aided by the turbulent elements, began to take on the appearance of a righteous crusade for constitutional freedom and natural rights.

Finding the Townshend revenue acts a failure, Parliament, in 1770, repealed all the duties except a trifling tax on tea; but there was no thought of relaxing the other commercial regulations. The mercantile classes now ceased their agitation and once more turned their attention to business. Such was not the case with the radicals, however. In the commercial colonies Sam Adams started a movement to organize committees of correspondence in the towns to unite the laborers of the ports with the farmers of the rural districts for political agitation to secure their rights. In the plantation colonies the burgesses of Virginia created a provincial committee of correspondence to voice the grievances of the planters. In 1773 a new tea act passed by Parliament, which gave the powerful East India Company a monopoly over the sale of tea in the colonies, once more led the merchants to countenance the popular agitation. Captains of tea ships were roughly handled in the American ports. At Boston a band of citizens dressed as Indians boarded the tea ships and dumped overboard tea chests valued at $75,000. The Boston tea riot proved to be a crisis in both the mother country and the colonies. New York, under the leadership of the "Sons of Liberty," quickly imitated Boston with a tea party of its own.

Radicals take the lead in resistance

"The die is cast," said King George III. "The colonies must either triumph or submit." Lord North held the same view, and even Pitt was ready to support the government in asserting its authority. British merchants saw in this destruction of private property a defiance of law which the government could not ignore. The issue was generally viewed as one involving law and order, and not merely trading rights. Parliament proceeded to pass five punitive measures: (1) the port of Boston was closed to outside commerce; (2) the old charter of 1691 in Massachusetts was revoked and the colony made a royal province; (3) persons accused of murder in connection with the enforcement of the law were to be transferred for trial to England or to other colonies; (4) the quartering of troops in Massachusetts towns was legalized; and (5) the boundaries of Quebec were extended to the Ohio River. As great a jurist as Lord Mansfield praised the acts penalizing Massachusetts for its "overt act of high treason proceeding from our own lenity and want of foresight."

Retaliatory measures of the British government

3. The Movement for Independence

In the colonies, outside of New England, the Boston "Tea Party" met with disapproval by the more respectable people. The moderates even proposed to pay for the tea destroyed and expressed a desire to come to an amicable understanding with the home government. But the "Five Intolerable Acts" gave the radicals the advantage of leadership, and made compromise difficult. Burke's doctrine of conciliation found few supporters on either side of the ocean. The extremists among the Americans ceased to speak of their "rights as Englishmen" and began to demand their "natural rights as men," which John Locke had used with such telling effect in defending the English Revolution of the seventeenth century, and which the French philosophers were now popularizing. American patriots began to assert that their rights did not depend upon the English constitution, or the royal charters, but upon the "natural, inherent, and inseparable rights of the colonists as men." Even the young Alexander Hamilton, carried away by this idea exclaimed: "The sacred rights of mankind . . . are written . . . by the hand of divinity itself, and can never be erased or obscured by mortal power." The line of cleavage in every colony now became more clearly marked between the moderates, who came to be called Tories by their enemies and Loyalists by themselves, on the one side, and the radicals, or Whigs, or revolutionists, on the other.

Programs of the Tories and Whigs

Both parties accepted the call for a test of leadership in an intercolonial congress. Heated contests occurred in most of the colonies in the election of delegates to the First Continental Congress at Philadelphia in the fall of 1774, "to determine upon wise and proper measures . . . for the recovery and establishment of their just rights and liberties, civil and religious, and the restoration of union and harmony between Great Britain and the colonies." A petition setting forth their grievances was sent to the king, and the colonists were urged to stand firmly and unitedly for their sacred rights. The revolutionary step was taken of stopping the importation of British goods into America and of putting the enforcement of the measure in the hands of "committees of safety" elected by the people.

The First Continental Congress in 1774

The Continental Congress did not meet as a revolutionary body. There was no intention to declare for armed resistance and but few extremists dreamed of actual separation from the Empire. The primary object was to uphold the American interpretation of the political relation of the various local governments to the imperial government. When this body, through the adroit manipulations of an aggressive minority, was changed into an instrument for the promotion of revolution and independence, the moderate men of all classes began to withdraw. With extremists in control, both in England and America, an armed clash was inevitable. Men like Pitt and Burke in England were powerless in their efforts to persuade the

government to adopt conciliatory measures, and indeed only encouraged American opposition. In America the aggressive minority, through effective organization and bold, shrewd maneuvering, forced every man to take a stand either for or against armed rebellion in 1775 and independence in 1776.

The Second Continental Congress

The appeal to force to settle the controversy, which up to this time had been based on argument, began with Lexington and Concord in April, 1775 — "the little thing" that ended in "the great event." The following month the Second Continental Congress met. It assumed the power of government, declared war, appointed Washington commander-in-chief of the army, sent agents abroad for foreign aid, and addressed a final petition to the king. In August George III declared the colonists, "misled by dangerous and ill-designing men," to be rebels, and hence called upon the civil and military authorities "to bring the traitors to justice." Parliament soon followed with an act cutting off all intercourse with America. The fundamental issue was now clear, as it is dispassionately viewed today. A people, who through many forces had come to feel themselves capable of managing their own affairs, were determined not to permit their natural rights to be invaded and conscious energies to be directed without their own consent whether by a distant imperial government or by minority governments at home. In this sense the American Revolution was a landmark in the growth of democracy. This new freedom in America was based, it is true, partly on abstract political philosophy, but in the truest sense it was the simple outgrowth of an enlightened self-interest.

The fundamental issue

The Declaration of Independence 1776

Paine's Common Sense

Events were rapidly ushering in a new régime in America. Groups of cool-headed men on both sides of the Atlantic vainly sought to formulate terms of peace. The old order was crumbling and the old ties were breaking. Independence became the vital question of the hour warmly discussed by all classes of men everywhere. Perhaps nothing did more to crystallize public opinion than Paine's *Common Sense*, of which over 100,000 copies were eagerly read by the aroused Americans. He condemned monarchy as a tyrannical system of government and urged the adoption of a "constitution of the people." He demanded the immediate separation from Great Britain and the creation of "the free and independent states of America." "Sound doctrine and unanswerable reason," was Washington's comment on the pamphlet, echoed by hundreds of thousands of Americans. "Is not America already independent?" asked Sam Adams. "Why then not declare it?" South Carolina adopted a plan of self-government. North Carolina, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Virginia put themselves on record as favorable to the new move. The Continental Congress advised the colonies to set up governments of their own, and on July 4, 1776, adopted the Declaration of Independence. Swiftly the news was carried to every village that a new nation had taken its place among the nations of the world.

The ideas contained in the Declaration of Independence make this document one of the great milestones in the struggle for popular government, which for three centuries has shaken royal thrones and challenged the rule of aristocracies. Its leading principles, in one form or another, held by advanced thinkers in the Old World and the New, were undermining the old political systems and bringing in the new régime of democracy. Its fundamental doctrines were: (1) that "all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights" among which are the rights of life, liberty, the pursuit of happiness, and self-taxation; (2) that government is instituted by men to secure these rights; (3) that "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed"; and (4) that whenever any form of government "becomes destructive of these ends," it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and to "institute new government" to secure these sacred objects. Then followed a list of twenty-seven instances of the violation of the rights of the colonists as men and Englishmen. In conclusion the representatives of the "United States of America" proclaimed the "free and independent states" absolved "from all allegiance to the British Crown," and solemnly pledged their lives, fortunes, and sacred honor to assure the new status.

Principles in the Declaration of Independence

This "best and noblest of American state papers" served as the party platform of the revolutionists, and clearly stated their case to the whole world. Its detailed indictment of George III carried conviction, and its fervent generalities inspired enthusiasm in the hearts of the patriots. By making the rights of Englishmen secondary to the rights of men, its clear and forceful statement of principles made it a charter of liberty of universal significance. It spoke for men in Latin America and Europe as well as for the colonists. It supplied a new chapter in the drama of world-wide democracy by sending forth a protest against every political institution and social privilege not based on popular approval.

Historical significance of the Declaration of Independence

4. New Experiments in Government

Firm in the belief that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed," the states advanced the real American Revolution by setting up new political institutions which largely discarded the old European forms of government. Separate republics were created, based in part upon European ideas modified by American influences, and in part upon the compact theory of rule so widely held at that time. Monarchy was discarded entirely and nobility found no place in the new system. A new democratic power was emerging in America. Rhode Island and Connecticut made their old charters, with a few changes, serve as constitutions, but the other eleven states formed new governments. The first written state constitution ever adopted by popular vote was that drawn up in 1780 in Massachusetts. These constitutions gave the modern world its first

Creation of independent states

example of a series of imposing republics. They were translated into the French language and given wide circulation in Europe, where they served as models for several generations of constitution-framers. While differing in details, these constitutions were surprisingly similar in general form and spirit. Each contained a bill of rights, and created a republic with separate executive, legislative and judicial departments. The legislature, representing the people, was the most *important part of the government in all the states.* *Voters and office* holders were restricted by religious and property qualifications, although many precautions were taken to prevent arbitrary rule. "The people," wrote Jefferson to Franklin, "seem to have laid aside the monarchical and taken up the republican government with as much ease as . . . putting on a new suit of clothes."

Federation of the separate states

The leaders of the movement to separate from the British Empire experienced comparatively little difficulty in setting up state governments, simply because the foundations had already been laid in each colony. To create a national system of government, however, was a much more perplexing problem. To be sure the king and Parliament had exercised general control over the colonies. Besides, many forces in the New World were developing a national spirit. A common language, institutions, ideals and environment fostered a sense of solidarity. Trade and commerce, colonial and Indian wars, schools and the printing-press, tended to knit the colonies more closely together and to teach them lessons of coöperation. The conflict with the British government over their political and religious rights, which ended in armed revolution, taught them the necessity of a closer union to insure their independence. But these integrating forces were offset by disintegrating factors such as a pronounced state pride, sectional differences, racial divergences, and conflicts in economic interest. Moreover the patriot leaders, trained in local politics, found themselves poorly equipped to manage the big problems of national scope. Dire necessity forced them to think of federation. The Articles of Confederation drafted by Dickinson in 1776, and adopted by Congress and sent to the states for ratification in 1777, were the first official step taken for the formal political organization of the American nation. So strong were local jealousies that it was not until 1781 that the last state concurred in the adoption of the Articles. This new national government was far from ideal, but it was the best that could be secured in the face of strong conflicting interests. There was no chief executive and no system of federal courts. A Congress of delegates, in which each state had one vote, performed the few national duties entrusted to it. The assent of nine states was necessary for all important matters and the unanimous approval of the thirteen was required for amending the Articles. Nevertheless, the new American Confederation, with all its weaknesses, served as a bond of union and paved the way for the creation of the constitution of the United States of America

in 1787. At least an experiment in popular government on a large scale had been made — and that was something for the world to think about.

The treaty of peace, made in 1783, announced American independence to the world. It named each state separately. It marked the failure of the attempt to govern the English colonies in America as a portion of the British Empire. It left them free to mould their own future, and face to face with the task of making themselves a new nation. It assigned to them an area one fourth the size of all Europe, with abundant opportunity for expansion, and a position of predominance in the New World. The foundations for a new republican régime in America had been laid. Frederick the Great proved to be a false prophet when he predicted the failure of the new republic, because "a republican government had never been known to exist for any length of time where the territory was not limited and concentrated." With greater truth was the King of Spain informed by his representative that "This federal Republic is born a pigmy. A day will come when it will be a giant; even a colossus formidable to these countries. Liberty of conscience and the facility for establishing a new population on immense lands, as well as the advantages of the new government, will draw thither farmers and artisans from all nations." The Americans, imbued with new political needs growing out of their own environment, were left free to propagate their unique brand of institutions. Independence opened the opportunity to put into practice the ideals of American democracy — local self-government, the legal equality of man, the abolition of privileged classes, and peaceable progress. The success of the American experiment encouraged oppressed peoples throughout the world to attempt to secure their emancipation through revolution or, that failing, to obtain civil liberty by immigration. Franklin was convinced that there would be "an asylum in America for those who love liberty" and proudly boasted: "We are fighting for the dignity and happiness of human nature."* From the viewpoint of world history, the emergence of a young federal Republic with power actually in the hands of the people was the most significant single accomplishment of the eighteenth century. Englishmen had been the first to develop constitutional monarchy; the sons of Englishmen in the United States were the first to establish a constitutional democracy as an entirely new experiment in statecraft. The constitutional system thus set up was merely a conscious effort to create a government harmonizing with the new social institutions which had grown up in America.

Historical significance of the emergence of a federal republic

To understand the American Revolution, one must remember that the colonists of 1776 differed in many particulars from their forefathers. In the first place, they had come into possession of a large share of the material prosperity which western Europe was enjoying in the eighteenth century. Economic well-being engrossed the minds of the best men in the colonies. Prosperity in business claimed their

Explanation of the American Revolution

energies and capitalized their common sense. Political questions, both local and imperial, were interpreted in terms of personal success. In the second place, leadership of public affairs had passed from the hands of the clergy into the hands of more practical men of affairs. In the third place, the more progressive minds, unhampered by traditions, quickly absorbed the teachings of the French rationalists and eagerly looked forward to a new social and political millennium. Thus to English respect for the past and for human experience was added French subservience to public opinion and the rule of the majority: the result was the American system of government. It was not the arbitrary taxation of the English government, nor the denial of the right of representation, nor the alleged tyranny of George III that justified the American Revolution, but the conviction that it was man's right to be governed by his own laws, which he could change and improve to meet his needs, with reason as his guide. These firm beliefs were derived partly from the growth of constitutional government in England and partly from his own experiences in a new country. It was a fact of much significance in world history that constitutional monarchy and constitutional democracy — one in the Old World, the other in the New World — should both develop so noticeably in the Anglo-Saxon race.

Franklin boasted that the Revolution would afford Gibbon material for writing a book on "The Decline of the British Empire." He failed to see that the British government would profit by the experiment with the thirteen colonies in colonial imperialism and thereby within a short time actually strengthen the British Empire. An indication of this change of policy was seen in the treatment of Ireland, which was given free trade in 1780, and enfranchisement of the Roman Catholics in 1793. In fact the American Revolution went far to discredit the old colonial system everywhere. The evils of mercantilism were clearly shown, and generally denounced by European economists. Great Britain now turned her energies for overseas expansion to the Far East and to Australia.

The Movement for a Federal Republic

The need of a stronger national government was felt keenly by many clear-sighted men during the years following the conclusion of peace. To insure freedom, the country must be stabilized politically. To guarantee prosperity, the perils of financial and industrial chaos must be eliminated. The government under the Confederation proved to be sadly incapable of meeting the gigantic problems of reconstruction left by eight years of war:

1. The finances of the country were in a wretched condition. To meet the needs of the war every known device for raising money both by the states and congress had been exhausted. When taxes, loans, and the confiscated property of the Loyalists did not suffice, enormous quantities of paper money were issued. As a result the

currency became almost worthless, and the value of bonds dropped to ten cents on the dollar. Congress was unable to pay either the interest or the principal of the huge national debt. European coins became the only medium of sound exchange.

2. Trade and commerce were in a most unsatisfactory condition. States jealous of their local interests levied protective tariffs against their neighbors. The sacredness of business contracts seemed to be invalidated by the suspension of suits for debts for six months or a year, and by permitting debtors to make payments in goods and even land instead of currency. Times were very hard. The scarcity of good money impeded business. Foreign commerce amounted to less than before the Revolution. Great Britain attempted to exclude the United States from trading with her other colonies. Since congress had no power to regulate foreign commerce, the states sought to do so separately. The utmost confusion resulted. These chaotic conditions opened the eyes of the people and forced them to admit the necessity of a new national constitution to deal with these problems.

Trade and commerce

3. The muddle over the claims of the states to western lands provoked much ill-feeling. At length the states were induced to surrender their lands to the federal government. To rule the vast domain, it was felt that a more efficient body than the Congress of the Confederation should be formed. It was decided in 1785 to sell these western lands and to apply the proceeds to the payment of the national debt, but since the payments were made with almost worthless certificates, little revenue was realized from the sales. As the west filled with settlers from the east, Congress provided for a territorial government for the region north of the Ohio. To the southward, however, the settlers were left for the time to shift for themselves.

Land problems

4. The state governments were weakened by internal politics and threatened with dissolution. They were loaded with heavy debts, and found the people hostile to further taxes. The farmers and debtors were clamoring for more paper money to meet their obligations. The well-to-do, on the other hand, insisted upon stabilizing the currency. In New Hampshire, for instance, the farmers surrounded the legislature demanding the repeal of taxes and the issuance of more cheap money. Shays' rebellion in Massachusetts was a concerted action against taxes, creditors, and the scarcity of money. As a result the states began to feel the need of a strong national government to protect them from mob violence.

Weakness of state governments

Under these circumstances, it is no wonder that leading Americans began to lose faith in the political institutions set up. The three efforts of the national Congress to induce the states to accept constitutional amendments in order to improve the financial and commercial conditions all failed. "The prejudices, jealousies, and turbulence of the people at times almost stagger my confidence in our political establishments," wrote a patriot to Washington. When

Demands of leaders for efficient central government

Washington was asked to use his influence for national reforms, he replied, "Influence is no government. Let us have one by which our lives, liberties, and properties will be secured, or let us know the worst at once." In 1786 he wrote his famous letter urging a stronger union, in which he complained that "Thirteen sovereignties pulling against each other, and all tugging at the federal head, will soon bring ruin on the whole." John Marshall wrote pessimistically in 1787, "I fear . . . that they have truth on their side who say that man is incapable of governing himself. I fear we may live to see another revolution."

The widespread dissatisfaction with the Confederation called forth constructive efforts to secure a stronger national government. Franklin from the very outset had urged the centralization of political authority. Hamilton had attacked the basic weakness of the Confederation and suggested a monarchy as the most suitable form of state for the new nation. Washington became the acknowledged leader of the strong-government party and by personal conference and correspondence urged a change. Young James Madison set about to collect the facts and arguments for the transformation which many saw rapidly approaching. Around these able leaders rallied the business men, the property holders, and the professional classes. Some went so far as to support Hamilton's idea of a monarchy, but the majority thought that a strong republic would better meet the needs of the country. The tendency of the day towards nationalism was seen in the adoption of national constitutions by the Episcopalians and the Methodists, while the pope authorized a national organization for the Roman Catholics. The Presbyterians formed a partial alliance with the New England Congregationalists, and adapted their system to national conditions.

The first steps

Since Congress failed to induce the states to act, several public men like Hamilton, Paine, and Pelatiah Webster, suggested that a special constitutional convention should be called to create a new national convention, very much as the states had formed their own constitutions. As it turned out, however, the first step was taken in 1785 when commissioners from Virginia and Maryland met at Mount Vernon to settle disputes over the navigation of the Potomac River. As a result of the discussion there, Virginia asked the other states to send representatives to Annapolis the next year to consider the general unsatisfactory condition of commerce. Only five states responded, but their delegates were persuaded by Hamilton to ask Congress to call a convention to amend the Articles of Confederation. Congress finally summoned a Constitutional Convention to meet at Philadelphia May 25, 1787, for the express purpose of modifying the constitution to meet the "exigencies of the government," and to preserve the union. Eleven states sent delegates — New Hampshire came in late, and Rhode Island paid no attention to the summons.

This Constitutional Convention was a very different body from any

that had been held previously in America. Among the fifty-five members were America's greatest statesmen and thinkers. All but a dozen of them had served in the Continental Congress. Three of them had sat in the Stamp Act Congress; eight had signed the Declaration of Independence; four had signed the Articles of Confederation; seven had been governors of states; four had been officers in the revolutionary army. They were practical men, sobered by the Revolution and its experiments, who represented the "conservative sentiment of the country." Many of them honestly distrusted popular government and most of them cared less about political theory than good government. The majority were graduates of American or British colleges, and included the best trained lawyers in the United States. The leading champions of states' rights, like George Clinton, Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry, distrusted the intentions of the Convention and hence did not care to attend. The heavy work fell on the shoulders of a few of the solid men: Franklin, old but still shrewd; Hamilton, able and impetuous, whose extreme monarchical opinions caused him to lose influence; Patterson of New Jersey, who spoke for the small states; James Wilson, the keenest constitutional lawyer after Roger Sherman; Charles Pinckney of South Carolina, who had a plan of his own in his inside pocket; Luther Martin of Maryland, who distrusted strong government; Madison, the "father of the Constitution"; and Washington, who presided with dignity and wisdom.

The Constitutional Convention in 1787

The Convention sat behind closed doors and thus assured the most confidential discussion of the problem of a new government for the American nation. From the outset the idea prevailed that it would not suffice merely to patch up the old Confederation — the young nation must be given a new constitution to meet its needs. No body of patriots ever worked more sincerely to harmonize the pronounced difference in plans and ideas that appeared from the very beginning, and seemed to make reconciliation utterly impossible. After a month of controversy, Franklin deplored "the diversity of opinion" and proposed daily prayers "for light." The constitution that resulted from four months of debate was not an inspired document from heaven, but a very practical instrument born of compromise and mutual concessions. There were conflicts of interest between the large and the small states; between commercial and agricultural sections; and between the advocates of a strong central government and a weak central government. By compromise, the small states, to protect their rights, were given equal representation in an upper chamber of the national legislature called the Senate, while the large states, to safeguard their interests, were granted representation in proportion to their population in a second body known as the House of Representatives. By compromise, the election of the executive called president was made by an involved indirect process, and not by the direct vote of the people. By compromise, the slave states of

Work of the Convention

the south were permitted to count five slaves as three free persons, as a basis for representation in the House and also for the levying of direct taxes. By compromise, the national legislature was given power to regulate commerce, but could not prohibit the slave trade for twenty years: Although the constitution and the laws of Congress were made the "supreme law of the land," still the decision as to whether the national government was sovereign, or merely the agent of the sovereign states, was evaded. That question was left for future settlement. A majority of the members of the Convention believed that enough power was given to the national government to make it self-sufficient, but not enough to alienate the states.

Friends and enemies of the new constitution

The new constitution was to go into effect as soon as nine states approved it. The friends of the new political régime created by a centralized federal Republic called themselves "Federalists." Their opponents could think of no better name than "Anti-Federalists." The Federalists were, as Professors Beard and Libby have shown, drawn chiefly from the business and commercial classes of the seaboard area, while the Anti-Federalists were recruited mainly from the rural areas of the south and west. Both sides in books, pamphlets, newspapers, letters and speeches sought to win the country. The most famous arguments in support of the constitution were in a series of letters written by Hamilton, Madison, and Jay in New York newspapers over the name "Federalist," and since often published in book form. The opponents of the constitution declared that Congress would overawe the states, that the president would prove to be a tyrant, that the Senate would breed aristocracy in America, and that the national courts would destroy liberty. Due to the absence of religious tests for office holders, one patriot feared that "pagans, deists, and Mohametans" might sit in the House and Senate. A farmer in Massachusetts complained that the "lawyers, and men of learning and moneyed men," who were responsible for the new order, would "swallow up all us little folks . . . just as the whale swallowed up Jonah." Patrick Henry of Virginia exclaimed: "I will never give up that darling word 'requisition': my country may give it up; a majority may wrest it from me, but I will never give it up till my grave." Gerry and Martin, members of the Convention, refused to sign the constitution, because they believed it to be the document of the "well-born" aristocracy and feared the oppression of the people under it.

ts to

Amendments constituting a bill of rights were promised, however, and ratification began. All the states except Rhode Island called the necessary conventions, and by January 8, 1788, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Georgia and Connecticut had ratified without difficulty. In Massachusetts John Hancock, the president of the Convention, had to be won over by the promise of the governorship and a hint at the presidency of the United States, before the constitution was ratified by the close vote of 187 to 168. Maryland and

South Carolina followed; and New Hampshire on June 21, 1788, completed the requisite nine states. Virginia and New York acted favorably but on close margins, the latter only after New York City threatened to secede and join the new Union. In September, 1788, the old Congress declared that the constitution had been officially ratified, and ordered elections of a president and a Congress to be held under it. When, a year later, the new Congress proposed a bill of rights in the form of ten amendments, North Carolina ratified. Little Rhode Island, still obstinate, gave her approval in the face of a threat to treat her as a foreign nation, and thus completed the roll of thirteen states "for a more perfect union."

6. The New Régime in North America

A new political régime was thus inaugurated in the New World by the Revolution. The American constitution of 1787 was the first successful attempt in modern world history to put the government of an independent state under a rigid written code. All later constitutions both of republics and monarchies were set forth in a written document after the American model. The Federal Republic with the specific plan for the organization of its territorial possessions as provided in the Ordinance of 1787 has been America's greatest contribution to the political science of the world. It is an important landmark in political evolution. It has expanded across the continent, and its frame of government has undergone fewer vital changes than that of any other important and independent country in the world. For more than a century and a quarter the best minds of other nations have been directed to the American experiment as a model of what might be done politically to reconstruct their own states. In one way or another, directly or indirectly, the political institutions of the United States have been either adopted or imitated in Canada, Central and South America, Australia, South Africa, Europe and Asia. From the shores of North America have gone forth influences to spread government by the people around the earth; to proclaim that all political power must be derived from the governed; to urge the election by the people of all officials who make laws or execute them; and to defend the right of national groups to alter their forms of government to meet their own needs and ways of living with due regard of course to the rights of other nations. During the nineteenth century the United States put into practice these ideals of popular self-government. Religious and property qualifications for office-holding and voting were eliminated. Slavery was abolished, and the franchise was extended to the Negro. More recently a wider democracy has been insured by granting the right to vote to women. Jefferson looked upon the national government as chiefly the agent of the states, but since his day in both law and national consciousness the nation has become supreme.

Influence of the American constitution on world history

The young Republic, by the census of 1790, had a total population

of 3,929,625. Of these 697,879 were Negroes, 59,466 being free and the rest slave. Of the remaining 3,172,280 persons the English predominated in all the states. The Scotch-Irish, numbering perhaps 300,000 were located chiefly along the frontier. The 200,000 Germans were found mostly in Pennsylvania, New York and North Carolina. The Dutch in New York, the Swedes in Delaware, and French Huguenots formed small but persistent strains. Philadelphia with 42,444 inhabitants was the largest city, while New York had only 33,131 and Boston 18,038. With the exception of about 125,000 persons, the entire population lived east of the Appalachian mountains. Louisville was the most western town. After the adoption of the federal constitution, the population, both native and foreign, began to increase by leaps and bounds. The west filled rapidly, soon new states were admitted, and the young nation began to reach out to dominate a continent.

Population of the young Republic

The new political régime of democracy was reflected in trade and industry. A large part of the population, both white and black, devoted their energies to agriculture. Many of the large estates owned by the Loyalists, particularly in the north, were confiscated during the Revolution, divided into small farms, and sold in part to former tenants. These farmers, owning their own land, formed an independent and self-reliant class that for decades to come formed the backbone of American democracy. So abundant was the land that every wage-earner who was ambitious and thrifty could easily become a self-supporting tiller of the soil. There was a good demand for handicraftsmen, such as shoemakers, tailors, blacksmiths, harness-makers, carpenters, and masons. Most of the hardest kind of labor was done by slaves, particularly in the south, where large plantations of tobacco, cotton, and rice existed. The cotton crop increased from a few hundred bales in 1790 to 600,000 bales in 1820. Shipbuilding flourished in New England, but prior to 1800 there was little development in manufactures. Small quantities of iron and steel were made with the use of charcoal. Clock making became a thriving industry in Connecticut. Carpet weaving and broom making sprang up. Philadelphia exported from 200,000 to 350,000 barrels of flour each year. The South shipped tobacco, rice, indigo, tar, pitch, turpentine and cotton. The total value of exports and imports amounted to about $20,000,000 each annually. After the Revolution shipping gradually increased. The *Empress of China* in 1784 made the first voyage from the United States to China, and brought home as part of her cargo $300,000 in silver. This was the beginning of a lucrative trade with China, India and Africa. Some 7,000 men were engaged in cod fishing, and several thousand more in whale fishing. The western fur trade was developed and opened opportunities for men like John Jacob Astor, who amassed a fortune of over a million dollars. The merchant class, so badly shattered by the war, once more emerged as a dominant factor in the financial and political affairs of the nation.

Trade and industry

Transportation by sea and land

The excellent harbors of the Atlantic coast and the navigable rivers furnished an opportunity for a lively coastwise trade, but interior trade was greatly hampered by the lack of roads and waterways. About 1790 a fair wagon road was built from Philadelphia through southern Pennsylvania to Pittsburg. Another road was constructed from Cumberland on the upper Potomac to the Monongahela River. The "Wilderness Road," marked out by Daniel Boone, was widened for wagons in 1795, and served as the chief passage to the southwest. Soon "turnpikes," borrowed from England, were built in many parts of America by private individuals, corporations, and states. The more economical plank roads supplemented the earlier turnpikes. Bridges were built across the streams. To repay for the building of these roads and bridges, tolls were collected from those who used them. Canal building began as early as 1793 on a small scale, but the "era of canals" came early in the next century with the completion of the Erie Canal connecting the Hudson with the Great Lakes. The new business boom following the creation of the federal government gave rise to a crop of joint stock companies to promote insurance, banking, road and bridge building, and all sorts of business projects. Many special charters were granted by state legislatures to banks and factories. Few inventions or devices had come into use in America, hence the hard labor had to be done by man and horse power, except in the few instances where wind and water power was utilized. In 1800 there was scarcely a steam engine or a power loom in America, for the great Industrial Revolution taking place in England had not yet reached across the ocean. Yankee ingenuity was showing itself, however, in the manufacture of clocks, and the invention of a power dredge and a nail-cutting machine. John Fitch put a steamboat on the Delaware in 1786, and the next year James Rumsey had a similar craft on the Potomac. Washington predicted that Rumsey's invention would solve the problem of water transportation. The first spinning machinery in the United States was made at Pawtucket, Rhode Island, in 1790, and the first power loom set up at Waltham, Massachusetts, in 1813.

A new economic régime in America

Such were the small beginnings of a new nation in America, which, after becoming independent politically, was forced to become self-reliant, inventive, and creative in industry and commerce. The *natural resources, fine harbors, navigable rivers and lakes* were such as blessed few other nations. With an abundance of native energy, in a free atmosphere where every man had an opportunity to climb as high as talent and industry permitted, and unfettered by the innumerable restrictions and traditions that curtailed the chances of his fellows in Europe, America opened up a new régime in trade and business, not alone to the native born but also to the thousands of foreign born in the Old World, who were to seek those hospitable shores for a better opportunity in life. With these new forces at her

command, the United States was destined to gain a high place among the industrial powers of the world.

The moral and religious changes, which accompanied the Revolution and the creation of the Federal Republic, formed a significant part of the new régime in America. Overbearing harshness, and cruelty characterized the relations in the family, school, shop, army, navy, and especially the jail in the eighteenth century. The father beat the son, the policeman beat the vagrant and idle, the master beat the apprentice, the farmer beat the indentured servant, the planter beat the slave, and the military officer beat the common soldier. Unfortunates such as the poor, the deaf and dumb, the blind, the aged, orphans and cripples were usually neglected. An insane man or woman was treated like a beast — chained, starved, and whipped.

Moral and religious conditions

Those convicted of crime, or even charged with it, were brutalized in stifling, unsanitary jails, which became schools for more crime. Debtors might be imprisoned for life for petty debts. With the coming of the new political régime developed the conviction that these practices, and the ideals back of them, were not only contrary to Christianity but also to the fundamental rights of man stressed by the Revolution and incorporated in the various bills of rights. Out of the great democratic transformation grew a new spirit of humanity and sympathy. Many societies were organized to care for the sick, weak, and helpless. A new sense of the duty of the community to all the people was born. "These liberties are the gift of God," said Jefferson. In many respects America was setting a good example for the whole world. Foreigners were amazed to see how, in keeping with the democratic ideas of equality and fraternity, innkeepers sat down to meals with their guests, and army officers were chosen by their own comrades.

In some respects the Revolution was a movement for religious as well as political freedom. Many of the ideas of self-government came from the various Calvinistic groups in America. The bonds of a common brotherhood and toleration were strengthened. After the Revolution the churches reorganized themselves so as to fit in better with the new national life. As far north as New York at least, the English Church was disestablished and reorganized as the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States with Samuel Seabury as its first bishop. The Methodist Church was renamed the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Francis Asbury and Thomas Coke were elected bishops. The old prejudice against the Roman Catholics was softened, and several states put them on an equal footing with Protestants. With the appointment of a Catholic bishop of Baltimore this church was formally organized on a national scale. The Presbyterians united in "the General Assembly" on a national basis, although the Dutch Reformed Church kept its separate synod. The Congregational churches retained their independent organizations. The United Brethren in Christ adopted a national episcopal sys-

tem. The Quakers, Lutherans, Baptists, Moravians, Dunkards, Mennonites, Universalists, Shakers, and other groups all practiced local self-government. The Jews had their separate synagogues. *Religious freedom* The frontier settlement gave vent to their religious emotions in community revivals called "camp meetings." Perhaps the most significant contribution made by the United States was the complete separation of the state and church, on the one hand, and general religious toleration on the other.

The new cultural life, which was appearing in America through many different agencies, was accelerated by the Revolution and the Federal Republic. The schools of the American colonies closely resembled those of the European countries from which the people came. Hence the Calvinistic communities favored universal education, while the Anglican section clung to an aristocratic conception of education. The Revolution and the years immediately following formed a transition period from European to American ideals. It was natural that a people, having become free politically, should wish to adapt their system of education to their own needs. Out of the Revolution emerged a genuine desire to establish public education. In 1779 Jefferson introduced into the legislature of Virginia a scheme for universal education from district schools to the state college. This ideal was not immediately realized, but in 1796 the legislature permitted each county to provide common schools by taxation. Other southern states soon made similar arrangements. In New York in 1787 a system of public education was begun under a Board of Regents, and two years later the legislature appropriated state funds to supplement local taxes in encouraging elementary schools. In Pennsylvania the state constitution of 1790 declared that the legislature should provide for free public schools as soon as possible. In New England a system of district schools was begun by 1789. Lands were liberally granted for educational purposes. In general, education, responding to the new conditions, was becoming more democratic and less religious and sectarian. The opportunities for education for both boys and girls rapidly increased. *Educational problems*

The next step in the development of national education in the New World was the creation of the academy to prepare boys for college and for professional studies. Franklin was among the first to suggest, as early as 1743, the establishment of an academy, and one was opened in 1750 in Philadelphia. A number of similar institutions sprang up in the middle and southern colonies. The two Phillips Academies of Andover in 1780 and Exeter in 1781 started the movement in New England. For half a century after the Revolution the academy, usually endowed, managed by private corporations, and sometimes subsidized by the state, became the prevailing type of secondary education. High schools developed somewhat more slowly. The practice prevailed in all parts of the country of employing tutors to educate the children of the wealthy. The few colonial *Educational development*

colleges such as Harvard, Yale, William and Mary, Princeton, Dartmouth, Brown, and Columbia (King's before the Revolution) continued to meet the needs for higher education and the professions. The University of Pennsylvania was reorganized in 1790 and put on a collegiate basis. A new type of an institution for higher learning appeared in the University of North Carolina, the first state-supported institution. The earliest professional schools were the two medical colleges in Philadelphia and Boston. The formal education of girls stopped with the grammar school, as a rule, but the establishment of "finishing schools" for girls was a sign of the new conception of universal education.

7. Effect of New Régime in North America on the Rest of the World

The new régime in America affected the rest of the world in the following ways:

The New World an extension of the Old

1. The civilization of the New World with its basic institutions was simply the transplanted civilization of the Old World, but it developed more rapidly in its new environment and in some ways differently. From the outset, the larger, freer life in America with its opportunities for personal advancement and material prosperity, drew larger and larger groups of the ambitious and discontented peoples from Europe. America became in Europe the synonym for political, religious and social freedom. Consequently the persecuted and oppressed, as well as the adventurous and curious, who could manage it, sought homes in the New World. The multitudes unable to leave their old homes, however, were encouraged by reports from their friends across the seas to seek to improve their lot at home in one way or another. Thus America early became an inspiring example to Europe.

2. When the Americans announced to all peoples their grievances against the British government and issued the Declaration of Independence, liberty-loving men all over Europe applauded the act and became champions of their cause. Open encouragement came from Whigs in England like Pitt, Fox and Burke. Silas Deane, "the first American diplomat," in 1776 secured loans from the kings of Spain and France with which to purchase war supplies. Franklin, sent to Europe to aid Deane, was received at the court of Louis XVI with enthusiasm, and the American cause became popular in France. From Poland, Prussia, and Alsace, trained soldiers volunteered their services to the young republic. The French made common cause with the Americans and sent over a good fleet and an army to help them win the war. Spain joined in the war against Great Britain, and Holland sent her fleet to prey upon British commerce. Although the purpose of this aid was the weakening of Great Britain rather than the creation of a free nation in America, nevertheless the presence of thousands of officers and soldiers and sailors, particularly French,

in the New World in close association with the patriotic population inoculated them with American ideas of political liberty and self-government, which were carried back to Europe to spread among the people there. In this way the new régime in America became a cause of the modification or overthrow of the old régime in Europe.

3. The literary output of the period of the Revolution and the federal constitution soon reached the intellectual classes across the Atlantic. Many of the political essays and pamphlets were translated into French and German. The various constitutions created in America were studied with deep interest abroad, and played no small part in the formation of European constitutions during the revolutionary period following 1789. Prominent Americans like Deane, Franklin, Arthur Lee, Jefferson, John Adams, and Paine, sent on diplomatic missions to Europe, found opportunities to meet many prominent Europeans to whom they explained the essential principles for which America stood. At the same time European travellers visited America and thus became acquainted with the newer civilization growing up there, and carried their impressions home. All these influences produced their effect in Europe.

Influence of American political experiments on the world

4. Other American colonies still under the control of European countries, such as Canada and Latin America, watched the evolution of the United States and the development of its institutions with profound interest. When the time came to establish self-government in Canada, or to throw off the European yoke in the Latin-American colonies, the people of these regions turned to the United States as a pattern. Their constitutions, in many instances, were modeled after the federal constitution of the young pioneer Republic. These examples, in turn, left their influence on the rest of the world.

Effect on other European colonies

In these various ways the new régime in America was assisting in pointing out the way for the reorganization and improvement of the old régime in Europe. Great Britain, profiting by the loss of her rich American colonies, thereafter granted to her remaining English-speaking colonies the most liberal self-government in the world, and gradually liberalized her home government.

Even more important for Europe was the epoch-making Revolution of 1789 in France which sought to inaugurate a new era of "Liberty, Fraternity and Equality" and spread its idea all over Europe and other parts of the globe.

8. Latin America, Africa, Asia and Oceania

Latin America in 1789 included not only all of South America, but also the greater part of North America, because what is now the state of Florida, the southern part of Alabama and Louisiana east of the Mississippi, and all of what is now the United States west of that river except the Columbia River basin, belonged to Spain. Brazil was owned by Portugal, but all the rest of Latin America was a part of the Spanish colonial empire. These vast regions were settled by men

Extent of Latin America in 1789

and women seeking new homes, as in the French and English colonies, and by missionaries looking for converts to the Catholic religion, by adventurers eager for wealth, and by soldiers of fortune seeking glory. The natives were induced in large numbers to accept the Roman Catholic faith, and adopted the manners and customs of the Spaniards and Portuguese with whom they freely intermarried. Settlements were made chiefly along the sea coasts and up the navigable rivers, where Latin-American civilization sprang up. In sharp contrast to some of the British colonies, Latin America was saddled with a powerful landed aristocracy, which employed the Indians and Negroes to do the hard labor on the plantations. In culture the Spaniards who went to the New World were not inferior to the French and English settlers, since they had printing-presses and universities at an earlier date. But Latin-American society consisted of half-civilized Indians and Negroes forming a lower class side by side with a highly civilized upper class made up of pure Europeans with a mixed class between them. A solid and prosperous middle class was unknown.

How settled

Aristocracy and culture

The idea prevailed in Spain and Portugal as in other European countries that colonies existed to enrich the mother country and thus increase her power, hence the governmental imperial policy was neither intelligent nor efficient. Greedy and impoverished nobles too frequently were sent out as governors to rule the colonies and they attempted in every way to transplant the corruptions and weaknesses of the old régime at home to the New World. There were no religious freedom, no institutions of self-government, no parliamentary systems, no constitutions, and few opportunities for the poor people to make any material headway. Regions that might have been made as prosperous as the United States, and were to become so later, were exploited and neglected. Abundant excuses were accumulating to justify the Latin-American colonies in throwing off their dependence on the mother lands a generation or two later.

Institutions and industry

Africa, home of the ancient Egyptians and Carthaginians, had little interest for Europeans beyond being a source of profit in Negro slaves, gold, ivory, gums, and spices. The Dutch alone among the European nations had made a settlement on the southern cape. The powers of Europe, engaged in fighting over the supremacy of America and India, had no interest in acquiring Africa. Hence the year 1789 marked a period when,

Africa in 1789

> Geographers, in Afric maps,
> With savage pictures filled their gaps,
> And o'er unhabitable downs
> Placed elephants for want of towns. (Swift)

The interior of Africa was unknown to the world and indeed aroused no interest. The *Encyclopædia Britannica* in the third edition stated that "the Gambia and Senegal rivers are only branches of the Niger."

But the public conscience of Europe and America was awakening to the evils of the horrible African slave trade, and in 1788 the African Association was formed in London to explore the interior of the continent. The Niger was first reached in 1795 by Mungo Park. Except in connection with slavery Africa did not enter into the world problems of the end of the eighteenth century. The partition and exploitation of the Dark Continent was left to the imperialism of the next century.

In 1789 Asia, the mighty Yellow Continent, the largest and in civilization the oldest, was still largely unknown. Turkey, ruling the regions of the Near East, or Levant, as a semi-European power, had been brought into close trade relations with the mercantile nations of the west. The Russians were forcing their way by conquests into northern Asia; and the French and English had taken possession of India. The Portuguese, Dutch, French and English had already made occasional trading trips to China and Japan. Spain and Holland owned islands off the coast of Asia. But to open up China, Japan, Burma, Siam, and other Asiatic regions to the influences of western civilization, to develop lucrative trade relations, to start Christian missionary and educational enterprises, were tasks awaiting the next century. *Asia in 1789*

Australia, a vast island continent, was almost unknown until Captain Cook in 1770 made his famous voyage to Botany Bay. Great Britain thought so little of the possibilities of the place that she used it as a region to which to send her undesirable criminals. The first settlement was made by these exiled British convicts at Port Jackson in 1788. Australia retained the status of a penal station for about fifty years before it became an attractive home for colonists. *Australia*

Many of the islands of the seas were still undiscovered in 1789 and others unclaimed and unsettled by any Europeans. Those near Europe were peopled by fisherfolk and small farmers belonging to the different nationalities. In the New World Spain and England controlled most of the islands of any consequences. The Dutch, Spanish, and English took possession of groups of islands like the Philippines and East Indies off the coast of Asia, but little attention was paid to the islands in the south Pacific and the south Atlantic. *Oceania*

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

The New Régime in North America

E. Channing, *A History of the United States*, Vols. I–III (1902–1905); * C. L. Becker, *The Beginnings of the American People* (1915); C. L. Becker, *The United States an Experiment in Democracy* (1922); * C. L. Becker, *The Declaration of Independence* (1922); C. M. Andrews, *Colonial Self-Government* (*American Nation* Series, Vol. V, 1904); * C. M. Andrews, *The Colonial Background of the American Revolution* (1925); E. B. Greene, *Provincial America* (*American Nation* Series, Vol. VI, 1905); G. L. Beer, *British Colonial Policy, 1754–1765* (1907); * C. H. Van Tyne, *The Causes of the War of Independence* (1922); C. H. Van Tyne, *The American Revolution* (*American Nation* Series, Vol. IX, 1905);

C. L. Becker, *The Eve of the Revolution* (1918); W. E. H. Lecky, *The American Revolution* (reprinted, 1912 from his *History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, 8 vols. 1878–1890); J. Fiske, *The American Revolution*, 2 vols. (1891); Sir G. O. Trevelyan, *The American Revolution*, 6 vols. (1899–1914); * S. G. Fisher, *The Struggle for American Independence*, 2 vols. (1908); E. B. Greene, *The Foundations of American Nationality* (1922); H. L. Osgood, *The English Colonies in the Eighteenth Century*, 4 vols. (1925); A. M. Schlesinger, *The Colonial Merchants and the American Revolution* (1918); J. B. Perkins, *France in the American Revolution* (1911); A. Nevins, *The American States, 1776–1789* (1923); J. Fiske, *The Critical Period of American History* (1888); A. C. McLaughlin, *The Confederation and the Constitution* (*American Nation* Series, Vol. X, 1905); * M. Farrand, *The Framing of the Constitution* (1913); * C. A. Beard, *An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States* (1913).

South America, Africa, Asia, and Oceania

H. C. Morris, *The History of Colonization* 2 vols. (1900); W. R. Shepherd, *Latin America* (1914); B. Moses, *The Spanish Dependencies in America* (1917); W. S. Robertson, *History of the Latin American Nations* (1922); Sir H. H. Johnston, *The History of the Colonization of Africa* (1913); V. A. Smith, *The Oxford History of India* (1920); Sir R. K. Douglas, *Europe and the Far East*, 1506–1912 (1913).

PART II

EFFORTS TO ESTABLISH A NEW RÉGIME IN EUROPE

CHAPTER IV

THE OLD RÉGIME IN EUROPE

1. Political Conditions in the Various States

Europe in 1789 was made up of a medley of states, large and small, strong and weak, dependent and independent. In the west, Great Britain, France, Spain, Portugal and Holland had about the same boundaries as at present, but Belgium belonged to Austria. In the north, Denmark and Norway were united, and Sweden included Finland. In central Europe, Prussia was the rival of Austria within the Holy Roman Empire, a loose confederation of several hundred small German principalities and free cities. To the south of it lay Italy also broken up into about a dozen kingdoms, duchies and city states, with the Papal States in the center. Between Germany and Italy the Swiss cantons maintained an independent existence. Eastward from Prussia and north of Austria was Poland, a country larger than either of them; and east of Poland was mighty Russia comprising the greater part of the continent. The small Balkan states, as we know them, were in 1789 all under Turkey whose European territory extended northward to the borders of Austria and Russia.

The states of Europe

There was no uniformity in political institutions in Europe, for every kind of government was represented. On the continent the most powerful states were all autocratic monarchies. Various types of republics existed in the smaller and weaker states — federal republics in Holland and Switzerland; aristocratic city republics in Venice and Genoa; a republic with an elective king in Poland; and the free cities of the Holy Roman Empire. A truly democratic state in the modern sense did not exist in the Old World on the eve of the French Revolution. All "agencies of popular government" such as the States General in France and the Cortes in Spain had long been inactive in 1789. The vast majority of the people lived under absolute monarchs and had no voice whatever in governmental matters. Great Britain, a constitutional monarchy with a representative Parliament and a limited franchise, had the reputation of being the freest country in the Old World. But in 1789 George III, an obstinate, tactless, autocratic monarch who had been king for thirty years and was destined to rule as many years more, was opposing Parliament and seeking to rule personally like his brother sovereigns on the continent. In this ambition he found ready tools in the Tory party, who had replaced the more progressive Whigs, and controlled the government well into the nineteenth century. The lack of statesmanlike

Wide variety in governments

vision of George III and Lord North provoked the American colonies *to revolt and threatened* the principle of self-government at home. Whig leaders like Pitt, Fox, and Burke gloried in the rebellious spirit of the colonists, and felt that their success saved parliamentary rule at home. Although French thinkers regarded the British government as a model, the French government was its inveterate foe. France aided the victorious American colonists and scored a profitless *revanche* for her losses in the French and Indian War (1754–1763). *Revolutionary France, whether republican or Napoleonic, found* in Great Britain its most determined enemy. The spirit of reform seemed in 1789 as promising in Great Britain as in France, but it was frightened away by the tumult across the channel and did not return for several generations.

A. *Holy Roman Empire*

The Holy Roman Empire

The Holy Roman Empire in central Europe, commonly called Germany, consisted of about 360 states, large and small, loosely held together by the Hapsburg emperor chosen by nine electors. Most of the little states, owned by nobles and church officials, held their titles directly from the emperor. The more than fifty free cities managed their own affairs directly under imperial authority. Certain states, like Bavaria, Württemberg, Saxony, and Hanover, were of some consequence, but Bavaria was a traditional ally of France; the electors of Saxony often had the doubtful honor of being kings of Poland; and Hanover was ruled by a regency under George III of England. Only two states in the whole Empire, Prussia and Austria, were of first-class importance in the affairs of Europe. The result was, that, in spite of its grand titles of "Holy" and "Roman" and its large size and population, the Empire was one of the weakest political organizations in the Old World. Its emperor was a gorgeous figurehead reflecting past splendors, but with no power to secure obedience at *home or to play a forceful part abroad. The imperial Diet, represent*ing the princes and free cities, met regularly, but its voice was as weak as that of the emperor, while the imperial tribunal was little more than a name. Except in the free cities, the people had no share in either local or imperial government. The princes alone knew how to profit by the national prostration of Germany. Having robbed the imperial government of power, they set up petty tyrannies with their own *little armies, filled their palaces with scraping attendants, and* crushed their subjects with burdensome taxes. These German princelings were jealous of their own rights and eager to annex their neighbor's territory by marriage alliances or war. There was little national consciousness or patriotism, and less desire for the realization of German nationality under any one state. Indeed Germany had to wait nearly a century before the transformation came. To make matters worse, each of the two larger states in the Empire

sought to rule and to take advantage of the chaotic state of affairs in Germany for its own selfish ends.

B. *Kingdom of Prussia*

The Kingdom of Prussia in 1789 ranked eighth in size and sixth in population among the European states. It had been cemented together around Brandenburg under the Hohenzollerns whose policy, transmitted from one ruler to another, was to increase their dynastic power by breaking down all opposition at home and by uniting and enlarging their domain at the expense of their neighbors. In this way Prussia became larger and larger, and the government grew more and more autocratic, while the army was increased and the economic resources of the country expanded to the utmost limits. Frederick II, called the Great, ended his long reign in 1786. Through a series of wars he doubled Prussia in size and population, industries were encouraged, marshes were drained, forests cleared for farms, and over 200,000 immigrants were induced to settle in 800 villages on the reclaimed lands. The code of laws was recast and religious freedom was granted to all persons, even to the Jesuits who were driven out of Catholic countries. This monarch took a keen interest in literature and learning, invited thinkers like Voltaire to visit his court, and founded elementary schools for his subjects; but his greatest pride was in the army, disproportionately large for a state of such limited resources. It enabled him to seize Silesia from the young queen, Maria Theresa, and to add by conquest a part of Poland. "My soldiers were ready; my purse was full," he boasted and summed up his political morality in these words: "Take what you can; you are never wrong unless you are obliged to give back." "If there is anything gained by it, we will be honest; if deception is necessary, let us be cheats." "Form alliances in order to sow animosities" and break them when it "suits your interest." It should be said, however, in justice to Frederick II, that this moral standard was typical of the rulers of Europe at that time. His government was an absolute, though "enlightened," despotism. "There is only one person in the kingdom, that is myself," he wrote, "whose duty it is to see, to think, and to act for the whole community." His statement "I am the first servant of the state," shows a conception of government widely different from that embodied in Louis XIV's supposed declaration that he was the state. This autocracy was supported by a powerful privileged nobility, while the masses were rigidly excluded from all share in government — except the payment of taxes and a place in the ranks of the army. Frederick William II who succeeded to the throne in 1786 was well educated, deeply religious, and at the outset of his rule popular with the people because he lightened taxes, favored internal improvements, and encouraged German as the literary language instead of French. But his ministers were incompetent, religious freedom was curtailed, the army was neglected, and the foreign

The Kingdom of Prussia

policy was weak. He had neither the ability nor the character of Frederick the Great, and his private life, like that of many rulers of the day, was grossly immoral.

C. *Austrian Kingdom*

Austria under the Hapsburgs had played a conspicuous role in European history for centuries. There was no Austrian nation, no national patriotism, and no territorial unity. The Hapsburg dominions were widely scattered over Europe and included 24,000,000 Germans, Hungarians, Bohemians, Italians, Poles and Netherlanders.

The Austrian Empire and Joseph II

No other country in Europe, except Turkey, contained such a mixture of different racial groups with their own self-conscious interests and institutions. To add to the political complications, part of the Austrian monarchy was within and part without the Holy Roman Empire, of which the Austrian archduke and king of Bohemia was also the head. Despite these drawbacks, the Hapsburg house in 1789 was a powerful factor in European affairs. Under an absolute rule, it hid its weaknesses and paraded before the world as one of the great powers.

For forty years prior to 1780 Austria was ruled by Maria Theresa, a wise, politic sovereign, an ardent Christian, and a pure woman in an age when loose morals were fashionable. She sought to preserve her domain against the greed of Frederick the Great, and was tempted to participate in the shameful partition of Poland in 1772 to offset her loss of Silesia to Prussia. She welded together an efficient army. The papal bull suppressing the Jesuits was enforced and the privileges of the religious orders were reduced in the interest of strong government. An elaborate system of elementary and secondary schools was projected and the universities were reorganized. The work of internal reform was begun but its completion was left to her son, Joseph II, who succeeded her in 1780. He had been emperor of the Holy Roman Empire since 1765 but was now free to become a genuine ruler. He was perhaps the best type of a "benevolent despot" in all Europe. Widely read, acquainted with Europe through extensive travel, and experienced in governmental matters, he ascended the Austrian throne with convictions that set him apart as the most modern monarch of his day. Frederick the Great described him as ambitious and capable of setting the world on fire but one who always took the second step before he took the first. Although a champion of absolutism, yet he was a friend of religious toleration, and wished to reduce the power of the church, to relieve the oppressed peasants of their feudal burdens, to continue the educational reforms of his mother, and to bring happiness and prosperity to his people. He meant to be a wise despot acting for the good of all. The tremendous reform program which he sought to carry out during his reign of ten years was a revolution by royal edicts. It included the following:

Reign of Maria Theresa

Reforms of Joseph II

1. Politically, he meant to get rid of local assemblies and to unite all portions of his Empire under the imperial government. Hence he divided his dominions into thirteen provinces, each under a military commander, with counties and townships as administrative subdivisions but managed from Vienna. German was proclaimed as the official language of the realm. The Hungarian crown of St. Stephen was carried to Vienna. These changes encountered local hostility at once, which showed itself in revolts in the Austrian Netherlands and the Tyrol, and angry protests from Bohemia and Hungary. *Political reforms*

2. Socially, he endeavored to curtail the powers of the nobles and to uplift the lower classes, so that all should be equal under his benevolent guidance. He decreed that all serfs should become free men with the right to marry without the lord's consent, to sell their lands, and to pay fixed rents instead of feudal dues and forced labor. The burden of taxation was placed on nobles and peasants alike. Every child was to be given a free elementary education. Industry and trade were encouraged. All were to live contentedly under his fatherly care. The nobles complained that they were being robbed of their property and privileges, and the peasants failed to appreciate what was being done for them. *Social reforms*

3. Territorially, he desired to extend his dominions eastward to the Black Sea and southward to the Adriatic, while he planned to exchange the distant Austrian Netherlands for near-by Bavaria. The first project led to a series of disastrous wars and the second was checkmated by Frederick the Great. *Imperialism*

4. He sought to subject the church to the state by confiscating ecclesiastical lands, by nominating bishops, by altering the forms of worship, and by training the clergy in secular schools. At the same time Jews and Protestants were given the same civil rights as Catholics. These acts aroused the defiant opposition of the clergy at home and of the pope at Rome together with many of the faithful laity. *Religious reforms*

The result was that the excellent reform measures of Joseph II, interfering with old customs and practices, produced discontent in all parts of the Empire, while his foreign policy of aggrandisement awakened the suspicion of neighboring states. When he died in 1790 it was said that he was loved by none and hated by many of his subjects. Abroad he met military disaster; at home his people were in a state of rebellion. On his deathbed the defeated imperial reformer, deserted by officials and relatives alike, lamented: "After all my troubles, I have made but few happy and many ungrateful." He ordered the recall of most of his reforms and dictated as a suitable epitaph for himself this sad statement: "Here lies the man who, with the best intentions, never succeeded in anything." But he accomplished more than he thought for some of the edicts on serfdom were positive gains and the people were led to think of a better civilization for Austria, although they had to wait nearly a hundred years for its realization. *Results of reform efforts*

D. *Italy in the Eighteenth Century*

Conditions in Italy

Italy, even more than Germany, was only a "geographical name" — a collection of small states without any unity and almost unconscious of a sense of nationality. These little states were the constant prey of powerful neighbors like Spain, France, and Austria. The people were brow-beaten, timid, and hopeless, and consequently had little love for their own governments except possibly in Piedmont, Tuscany, Genoa, and Venice. In 1789 several states were under dynasties imposed upon them from abroad, which of course irritated and alienated the people. For a period of thirty-five years prior to 1789 Italy enjoyed a period of peace under her petty paternal despots. During that time industry was encouraged, and some experiments were made in economic reforms. In Lombardy, for instance, under Austrian rule, agriculture was improved, taxation reformed, and education increased, while a degree of local self-government was granted to the nobles and the clergy. Joseph II hoped to include this region in his scheme for modernization, and did abolish feudal privileges, diminish clerical power, render criminal law more humane and eliminate torture. In Tuscany under the Hapsburg prince, Leopold, farming was patronized and swamps reclaimed. Parma and the two Sicilies were ruled by Charles III, a Spanish Bourbon. Genoa and Modena were under the protection of the French. The Papal States under a feeble ecclesiastical rule occupied the center of Italy. The only feeling of unity in Italy was in her glorious past. The ferment of ideas which preceded the French Revolution was felt by a few patriots. "The day will come," said Alfieri, the hater of tyrants, "when the Italians will be born again, audacious on the field of battle." Beccaria urged the reform of the barbarous criminal code. Volta gave the world his experiments in electricity. Political economists in Tuscany were pointing the way towards the Industrial Revolution. Historians were extolling the heroic epochs of former days. A French writer observed: "The Italians are far more remarkable because of what they have been and because of what they might be than because of what they now are."

Hope for liberation

E. *Russian Empire*

The Russian Empire

Russia, the last nation of Europe to emerge as a great power, was in 1789 the largest and most populous, but also the least advanced, of all the countries. The Russian Slavs, partly orientalized by the Asiatic Mongols, threw off the yoke of their masters and in turn became the conquerors of northern Asia. Under Peter the Great (1672–1725) they were brought into touch with western civilization. By 1789 Russia was one of the states that had to be taken into account in all European affairs. Catherine II, a German princess, who had married the half-insane Tsar Peter III, connived in his deposition and murder, and assumed the crown herself. She was a strong-willed, witty

woman of loose morals, who learned the Russian language, became a member of the Orthodox Church, and slighted her German relatives to ingratiate herself with the Russian people. For thirty-five years she ruled with a firm hand and continued the work begun by Peter the Great. She patronized learning and literature, invited literary men such as Diderot to her court, and had a passion to westernize Russia. She ruled autocratically but in a modern spirit, made excellent administrative reforms, subjected the church to the state, and followed an aggressive foreign policy. The outlet on the Baltic Sea was safeguarded. Poland was utterly destroyed by dismemberment, the largest share going to Russia. Constantinople, the "open window" on the south, was not secured, but Catherine obtained the Crimea, and the northern shores of the Black Sea from the Dniester to the Caucasus. The submerged Balkan nationalities looked to Russia for deliverance, and a treaty in 1774 gave her the right to protect Christians throughout the Ottoman Empire, a pretext found convenient in future years for interference in Turkish affairs. With this treaty begins the problem of the Near East.

F. *Spain*

Spain in 1789 had just come under the rule of Charles IV (1788–1808), whose father, Charles III (1759–1788), was one of the most sincere and most successful of the "enlightened despots." Throughout the latter's long reign he devoted himself to advancing the material prosperity of his people. Roads and bridges were built, swamps were drained, immigration from other lands was encouraged, industry and shipping were developed, and the oppression of the peasants by the nobility was checked. The dense cloud of sloth and ignorance that had settled down on the land was lifted and Spain was moving forward rapidly to a prominent place in world affairs. The Jesuits were expelled, restrictions were placed on the other religious orders, and the Inquisition was subjected to the secular courts. Charles III was an autocrat and the people were excluded entirely from all share in government. His foreign policy was less wise than his domestic policy. Disliking England and desiring to recover Gibraltar, he entered the "Family Compact" with the king of France and in 1761 and again in 1778 he joined France in war against Great Britain. In the latter conflict he recovered Minorca and Florida, but the creation of the Republic of the United States incited a desire for independence in the Spanish colonies. In sharp contrast to his great father, Charles IV was stupid, and despotic without being intelligent. The reform program was abandoned and all liberal tendencies were suppressed. The French Revolution dissolved the "Family Compact" and left Spain weak and helpless in foreign relations. The next century saw little improvement.

Spain under Charles III and Charles IV

G. *Poland*

Poland in 1789 appeared on the map to be a large and populous state. Nominally it was a Republic with a representative parliament and an elective king, but its political institutions were weak and unstable rendering it an easy victim to the three grasping monarchies surrounding it. Its boundaries were unprotected; its population was a mixture of Poles, Jews, Lithuanians, Cossacks, and Ruthenians; and four religions divided its people into bitter factions. But worst of all the land was owned by the great nobles, called magnates, who lived in luxury, selfishly guarding their own interests, while the people were degraded into a state of wretched serfdom that scarcely had a parallel in all Europe. To add to these difficulties, the political institutions were illiberal and pernicious. The aristocracy monopolized all power and had no thought for the welfare of the nation. The reign of every newly elected monarch was disfigured by foreign intrigues and domestic squabbles. The nobles secured bribes for themselves and wrung from the king-elect such concessions as reduced the kingship to an impotent figurehead. The absurd "liberum veto" of the constitution permitted any single magnate to veto any act of the parliament which he believed prejudicial to his interests. This *virtually permitted any one of 40,000 nobles to refuse to obey a law* he did not like and amounted to political anarchy. When patriotic Poles sought to reform the constitution, Russia, Prussia, and Austria intrigued to prevent it.

Sad condition of Poland

Under these conditions it was an easy matter for these three powers to agree deliberately upon the first division of their helpless victim in 1772, when about one fourth of Poland was divided among *them. For awhile this penalty for their weakness stung the Poles to* attempt political reforms, but their greedy despoilers blocked every effort. In 1793 occurred the second and most criminal of all the partitions by Russia and Prussia, and with a third partition in 1795 Poland disappeared from the map of Europe. Bravely and desperately did the Poles resist, but "freedom shrieked when Kosciusko fell." These typical acts of eighteenth-century diplomacy, were plain theft and political villainy of the most offensive kind. Poland continued to be the "sorest spot" in Europe and all men everywhere, who loved justice, wished to see the crime of 1793 avenged by the restoration of a Poland strong and free.

Partition of Poland

H. *Scandinavian Countries*

Sweden at the beginning of the eighteenth century was one of the great powers of Europe whose territories almost made the Baltic a Swedish lake. By the close of the century, however, she had lost all her lands east and south of the Baltic to Russia and Prusssia and had become a second-rate power. In 1789 Sweden was a limited monarchy like Great Britain with a constitution that vested supreme power in

Sweden

the Riksdag representing the four estates of nobles, clergy, burgesses, and peasants. To protect the lower orders, laws had to have the consent of three of the four estates. A secret committee of the estates exercised supreme executive, judicial, and legislative functions. The king was little more than a crowned puppet. Two powerful factions, the "Caps" representing the people and the "Hats" the aristocracy, contended for mastery in the country. In 1789 the king was Gustavus III (1771–1792), an able monarch, who before his death held the balance of power in his own hands. He reserved the right to summon the estates and to dismiss them, and to indicate measures for their discussion; but the Riksdag levied taxes and granted money, which guaranteed it a certain amount of independence. The Act of Union and Security in 1789 gave the king a free hand in foreign affairs, and command of the army. Accused of seeking to ape the absolute monarchs of the day, he was removed by assassination.

Denmark and Norway in 1789 were joined under one hereditary, absolute monarch, but the latter with its 700,000 free peasants was regarded as a dependency. Christian VII (1766–1808), a semi-idiot, left the government in the hands of a council of state composed of the progressive Crown Prince Frederick, and a group of able, enlightened men like Bernstorff and Reventlow, who introduced a whole series of excellent reforms. In 1788 serfdom was abolished and the peasants became independent farmers. The Negro slave trade was forbidden. Jews were granted civil rights. The whole system of justice was changed so as to give the poor people an opportunity to defend their rights. The Danish press was the freest on the continent. Commerce was stimulated by free trade. *Denmark and Norway*

I. *Holland*

Holland in 1789 was in name a federal Republic ruled by an hereditary stadtholder, William V (1766–1795), and a representative body called the States General. But the machinery of the constitution was creaking with age and the republic was on the verge of being replaced by a monarchy, when the French Revolution swept it away. *Holland*
For some years prior to 1789 Prussian arms, with the consent of the British government, protected William V against the discontented Dutchmen. The towns and states enjoyed a large measure of self-government, and sent their representatives to the States General. The people were comparatively prosperous. Serfdom was practically unknown and the peasants were free to choose their own ways of living. The press was free, and education was widely distributed among the people.

J. *Switzerland*

Switzerland in 1789 had the honor of being the oldest Republic in the world. It was a confederacy of thirteen cantons and its population consisted of Germans, French and Italians, divided into two

Switzerland

religious camps, Protestant and Catholic. Since the separate cantons were sovereign, the national Diet was so weak that it was impossible to make much progress. Aristocratic tendencies were strong, and the right to vote and to hold office was in the hands of a small class. For instance, 69 out of 360 burgher families in Berne formed the ruling oligarchy in 1789. The cities despised the rural districts, deprived them of political rights, and levied taxes on them. Nevertheless, compared with other countries, the Swiss were freer, happier, and enjoyed religious liberty and freedom of speech to a greater degree than any other people on the continent. Moreover Switzerland was a place of refuge for the political exiles of other lands and the resort of scholars like Gibbon and Voltaire.

K. *Summary of Political Institutions*

A survey of the political conditions of Europe in 1789 shows:

1. That all the states were governed either by autocrats or by aristocracies. Nowhere had a true popular government been established. Everywhere the few ruled for the good of the few and not for the welfare of the many. The modern idea that government is instituted for the advantage of all the people might have been found in the writings of some of the scholars, but it was not put into actual practice. On the contrary the belief prevailed that it was the primary concern of the state to enlarge its territories, to increase its power, and to secure the welfare of the princes and the privileged classes.

Government autocratic

2. That national finances were grossly mismanaged. There was of course no scientific budget such as all modern states have, and no accounting to the people of the receipts and expenditures. England alone had a budget. On the continent most taxes provided certain forms of exemption for the nobles and even the middle class. The crushing burden fell upon the common people, who could least afford to pay. The funds were too often spent for extravagant courts, palaces, servants, pensions, diplomacy, armies and navies, and foreign wars as well as for the legitimate governmental expenses. Under this system deficits were common, and were met by loans at high interest rates, which helped to eat up the income. The whole financial system was vicious, unjust, and demoralizing; and the peoples were groaning in despair under the burden.

Unscientific finance

3. That international relations were conducted on the lowest moral plane. Diplomacy was an unprincipled and unscrupulous game. The state stood for power, not justice and right. The greatness of a state was judged by its extent, its colonies and wealth, and the size of its army and navy, and not by its character, its general prosperity, its free institutions, and the intelligence of its people. To take advantage of the helplessness of a neighbor by seizing its land was justified as shrewd politics. To combine with other rulers to rob a state was wise statesmanship. "He who gains nothing, loses," wrote Catherine the Great; and Frederick the Great thought that it

International morality low

was a "mistake to break your word without reason" simply because it gained you "the reputation of being light and fickle." Interest, not honor, dictated the making and breaking of international agreements. Land-grabbing was developed into a fine art. No state was secure so long as it was not strong enough to defend itself against any foe, for no state had any rights which other states were duty bound to respect. The European monarchs claimed to rule by the authority of Almighty God — "divine right" it was called — but their statecraft, their secret alliances, their aggressive wars, their jealousies and suspicions of one another, their broken promises, and their robberies lead one to conclude that their rule was by "satanic right."

4. That under the old régime in Europe everything rested fundamentally on force and the whim of the sovereign, not on law, justice, and right. Hence the smaller and weaker powers were always at the mercy of the larger and stronger. In principle the upholders of the old régime professed to respect the established order, and indeed it was in the preservation of these very institutions and traditions that their own safety lay, yet they were the very ones who violated them. Silesia was stolen by Prussia, with the aid of France, not only in open violation of the legal rights of Austria, but in direct violation of promises to preserve them for no other reason than that Frederick the Great wanted it. In the crime of Poland, Prussia, Russia, and Austria shamelessly dismembered one of the largest states in Europe, merely because it was too weak to defend itself against their greed. Napoleon had many illustrious precedents to warrant his continuance of these practices.

Status of the weaker states

2. European Society

A. *The Nobility*

Society in Europe in 1789 was so different from what it is today that the conditions then are difficult to describe. The people on the continent were feudally stratified into nobility, clergy, burghers, peasants, partly free and partly serfs, and day laborers in the cities and villages.

Society feudalized

In importance the nobility ranked next to the ruling princes. All Europe was subdivided into estates of varying sizes which belonged to members of the ruling families and to the nobles. The mediæval manor and the feudal lord still characterized the civilization, and formed a showy and vital part of it. Although these noble landowners in France and Spain had been subjected to royal authority and largely shorn of their political power, nevertheless they clung more tenaciously to their hereditary social and personal rights and privileges, which distinguished them from the common people, and too often became tyrants over the serfs or tenants on their estates. The noble class numbered 100,000 in France, 180,000 in Poland, and possibly 750,000 in all Europe. A traveller going from Paris to Rome

Importance of nobility

or from Madrid to Moscow would seldom be out of sight of the castles of the nobles, and would see them at all important gatherings dressed in their velvet coats, silk stockings, feathered caps and high-heeled boots, carrying swords and presenting a lordly bearing.

English nobility

In England the feudal castles had been converted into country dwellings of the aristocracy. The law did not give to any nobleman, however blue his blood or long his pedigree, special privileges not enjoyed by every freeman. The lords as a distinct noble class formed but a small part of the 14,000,000 people in 1789. The peers included all those whose title permitted them to sit in the House of Lords and to transmit this right to their eldest sons. But these peers paid taxes and were subject to the laws like any other subject. Only the eldest son of such a noble inherited his rank and property, while on the continent as a rule all the children of a lord belonged to the noble class and shared in the family property. Thus in England the number of nobles was restricted, and their social rank aroused but little hatred, although their enormous holdings in land caused much complaint. The petty nobles, or landed gentry, except for an occasional "Sir," without any titles like "von" and "de" on the continent or special privileges, were more numerous and still constituted an important social and economic factor, because they gradually drove out the small farmers or yeomen. The nobility and gentry monopolized the important offices in the county and borough governments as well as those in the army, navy, church and state.

Nobility in France

The French nobility constituted a privileged class, exempt from some of the heaviest taxes on the ground that they paid their taxes with their swords. They enjoyed a preference in royal appointments to honorable and lucrative positions. They still retained many of the feudal dues of their mediaeval ancestors. Since traditional class distinctions excluded them from ordinary business, although they might enter the learned professions, they claimed a certain social superiority and showed it in their dress, manners, and speech. Unlike the English, the French lords cared little for life in the country, so all who could afford it turned their estates over to overseers and lived at the royal court, where they gave themselves up to pleasures and to scheming for pensions and profitable sinecures. Few of the noble families could actually trace an unbroken line back to the Middle Ages, but had secured their titles from the king for some service or had bought an office that carried with it a noble rank.

Nobility in central Europe

In central Europe, however, the German nobles more nearly resembled those of mediaeval times than anywhere else. The emperor was too weak to deprive them of political power as had been done by the stronger monarchs of France and Spain. Hence throughout the Holy Roman Empire, except on the Prussian and Austrian royal domains, the local lords were the real rulers. Thousands of them — powerful counts, barons, margraves, and the lesser nobles known as knights, some with an estate no larger than a good-sized farm, lived

in their strong castles, levied taxes, collected their feudal tributes, held courts, coined money, kept their little armies, and ruled with a strong hand. Most of their time was consumed in fighting with their neighbors. In Prussia and Austria the nobles had lost much of their political power, but were exempt from many of the taxes, and still played an important role.

Elsewhere in Europe — in Russia, Poland, Italy, Scandinavia, and Spain — the status of the noble class was somewhat similar to that already described and constituted an important part of the old régime. In all these countries the king was the chief noble to whose favor almost all lords owed their titles, rank and privileges, consequently they were as a rule loyal to him and to his policies. No doubt there were many good nobles scattered over Europe, who were deeply interested in their people and sought in various ways to help them, but usually the attitude of the common people towards them was one of hatred for the advantages that blood or office gave them and for the heavy burdens that had to be borne to support the social drones. In Hungary and Poland the feudal lords were harsh and exacting. In Russia the noble families numbered 140,000, and the lords secured all the good offices in the army, church, and state, enjoyed certain monopolies, and enforced their despotic will over the serfs with the knout and threats of banishment to Siberia.

Nobility elsewhere in Europe

B. *The Middle Class*

The middle class in Europe in 1789 was coming into more prominence every year. In England it was composed of (1) the younger sons of the peers, who entered business or secured an office or took up a profession, and their sons; (2) the country gentry whose property gave them a place between the nobility and the working classes and enabled them to become the ruling power in politics and business if not in society; and (3) the merchant classes who by thrift and frugality, or a stroke of good fortune, were able to accumulate enough wealth to be fairly independent and to give their sons a still better start in the world. Nowhere on the continent did a middle class exactly like that in England exist. In Holland, Norway, Sweden, the free cities of the Holy Roman Empire, Switzerland, Genoa and Venice, the burghers, consisting of the tradespeople and the professional men, formed the dominant class. In France the middle class included the bankers, manufacturers, shop keepers, traders, lawyers, doctors, literary men, and many governmental officials. They were not large numerically although much more numerous than the nobles, but many of them were wealthy and through their wealth powerful. Again and again they were called upon to lend money to the impoverished king and nobles, and thus were able to obtain special favor for themselves. Not a few of them, by purchase or appointment to office, secured noble rank and with it privileges. At times the daughter of a rich banker or lawyer might even marry into the family

The middle class in England

Middle class on the continent

of a nobleman to save it from bankruptcy. It was this class rather than the poor peasants in France that brought on the French Revolution and guided it through its earlier and later stages. In Russia, Hungary, Prussia, Austria, and Spain an influential middle class scarcely existed.

Towns and cities

The middle class lived in the cities and the towns, many of which were much the same as in the Middle Ages, except larger in population. The streets were narrow, crooked, unpaved or paved with rough cobblestones, darkened by day with overhanging buildings huddled together, and scarcely lighted by night. Arthur Young reported that in 1787 the mud in the streets of Paris was six inches deep, there were no foot-pavements, and it was impossible for women to get about. Berlin in 1800 had no sidewalks, pavements or sewers. England and Wales had only 106 cities with more than 5000 people and but 15 with 20,000 or more, whereas a century later there were 622 of the former class and 106 of the latter. Only 17 per cent of the people lived in the cities above 20,000 in 1801; today 80 per cent live in cities over 10,000. London now is ten times larger than it was then with 500,000 inhabitants, and Berlin in 1819 had only 201,000. Birmingham and Manchester had only about 20,000 each. Horses, cows, pigs and geese roamed the streets of the cities and towns, and bad odors were common in even the best quarters. Many of the old walls built for protection against the attacks of feudal lords were still standing. Sedan chairs and hackney coaches took the place of motor busses, automobiles, and tramways. There was no water system, and the policing of the cities was so inadequate that gentlemen abroad at night carried arms. Although Paris with its 660,000 people had outgrown its old walls and had some beautiful boulevards and parks, still the city was so poorly drained that after a rain the water flowed through the middle of the streets. Lyons was the only city outside of Paris with 100,000 residents. Vienna was somewhat larger than Berlin, and boasted of a hundred street cleaners and street lamps lighted every night, even when the moon was shining. The Italian cities, full of beautiful buildings, were still crowded within their old walls.

C. *The Working Classes in the Towns*

Working classes

The working classes in the cities and towns made up the bulk of the population. Those not born there had drifted in from the country. With the exception of most of the large class of servants, who were brought in from their estates by the nobles, the laborers were free to sell their services for wages, to come and go as they pleased, and to regulate their own lives. They did the hard work necessary in every community, and were the carpenters, stonemasons, blacksmiths, clerks, gardeners, and skilled and unskilled workmen of all sorts. Long hours, small pay, and a wretched existence was for the most part their lot. Unless by chance they had quarters with some noble or

rich burgher, they lived in cramped homes in the poorer parts of the city. The more able and thrifty among them were gradually climbing upward into the middle class, but the great mass of them continued to live from hand to mouth the victims of a vicious social system.

Little machinery had as yet been invented to save labor and to increase the industrial output. Things were done and built much as they had been for centuries. All sorts of articles were fashioned in little shops and when completed offered for sale, or were made to order. The owners of these shops confined themselves to a particular trade, such as tailoring, shoemaking, tanning, baking, bookbinding, candle-making, and hair-dressing; or making wigs, artificial flowers, swords, knives, hats, and carriages. Those in the same line of business were organized into guilds to prevent others from making or selling their articles. The guild often limited the number of master workmen who might open shops of their own as well as the number of apprentices they might employ. Competition was likewise curtailed by making the period of apprenticeship seven or even nine years before the apprentice became a journeyman, who might never become a master with his own establishment unless he had money and influential friends. *Character of industry*

This guild system, which was inherited from the Middle Ages, regulated the life and opportunities of the working classes all over the industrial sections of Europe. In England in the regular trades the apprentices served seven years, as a rule, while in Sheffield a master cutler could have but one apprentice, and in Norfolk and Norwich master weavers were limited to two. No master hatter could have more than two. Encouraged by the government, in France the guilds were better organized and more influential than in England. In central Europe the system was still more widely extended and more rigidly regulated as to apprentices, workshops, and the sale of goods. Once in a guild, the workman had to stick to his trade. If a sword-maker should make a knife, or a hatmaker a wig, or a shoemaker a saddle, he might be fined or even expelled from his guild. A hatter in Paris had his whole stock destroyed, because he ventured to make hats from wool mixed with silk, on the ground that the rules mentioned wool only as material suitable for hats. Each guild kept a close watch on other guilds to prevent encroachments on its monopoly. The goldsmiths watched the clockmakers, the money changers and those who set precious stones. Cobblers and tailors who mended shoes and clothes could not make new articles. The makers of artificial flowers could not sell them. These strict rules may have brought the master workmen prosperity, but they increased prices, hampered business, and prevented the brighter and younger workmen from rising. *The guilds*

These guilds differed in several ways from modern trade-unions. In the first place, the guild was an organization of owners and employers rather than of laborers, for only those who were master

Guilds differed from trade-unions

workmen and journeymen were members. Secondly, the rules of the guild were enforced by the government. Finally, the guilds were confined to those industries that were conducted in a comparatively small way in the master's house or shop. The newer industries such as the making of silk, cotton goods, fine glassware, porcelain, and pottery were under the control of companies independent of the guilds and protected by the state. Much hostility arose against the guilds on the ground that they hindered freedom of trade and of the right to work. The whole system was to be swept away by the Industrial Revolution.

D. *The Peasants*

Peasants made bulk of population

The peasants or farmers, who usually lived in the little huddled villages on the estates of kings, nobles, bishops and monasteries, and not in isolated houses on the land like American farmers, made up the vast majority of the people of Europe. In 1789 Europe was a continent of farmers, for nowhere did industry claim the chief attention of any country. In France over nine tenths of the population lived in the country, and in England eight tenths tilled the soil. If a peasant of the time of Columbus had returned to Spain, or Italy, or Germany, few strange sights would have greeted his eyes, since the life of the common people had undergone little change in four centuries. The monarch lived in splendor and the noble in idleness at the expense of the peasants, who grubbed and sweated to support them and to eke out a miserable existence for themselves. In Spain, Austria, Prussia, and Russia remnants of mediaeval serfdom still existed in 1789 and it persisted in some sections well into the nineteenth century. The serf was in a sense the property of the lord on whose estate he was born, lived and died, and for whom he worked much as his ancestors had done for many generations. The land was tilled with tools not unlike those used by the Romans: grain was cut with the clumsy sickle, grass with an awkward scythe, threshing was done by hand, and the carts were heavy, rickety vehicles. The peasants' houses were small, poorly lighted, badly ventilated, with dirt floors and thatched roofs, and often connected with the barn for the horses, cows, chickens and pigs. Women and children worked in the fields with the men from daylight to dark during the summer and spent most of the winter in the woods getting out timber and firewood.

The serf

Peasant life

Peasant life in the eighteenth century was one of simplicity, hard work, and small gain, it is true, yet the peasant was not so unhappy as one might think. His range of interests was narrow, for no daily newspaper told him of the world outside the manor, and his desire for recreation was easily satisfied by the dances, parties, weddings, baptisms, festival days for games and picnics, and church service, at which functions he met his neighbors to talk over matters of common concern and to gossip about the affairs of the community. Neighbor-

hood visiting was quite common; and invitations to the lord's manor house were occasions for feasting and drinking. Besides there was the village inn, where the peasants could exchange ideas over a glass of wine or a mug of beer. Then, too, it was a great event, when the crops were harvested, to take the surplus produce to the markets in the near-by towns for sale.

In England the peasant farmer was probably better off than in France and other continental countries. Serfdom had completely disappeared and left no traces of feudal dues and forced labor. If he was a tenant, the peasant paid a definite sum of money in rent for the use of the land; and if an owner, he paid to the state fixed taxes, which were not so heavy as on the continent because the nobles bore their share of the burden of taxation. Many of the English farmers supplemented their earnings from the land by weaving and spinning, and other work. But the peasant still doffed his cap to the neighboring lord, was restricted in his hunting and fishing rights, and might be punished by the country squire if caught poaching on the lord's game preserves. Though legally free, yet his "poverty and economic dependence" subjected him to demands that were galling. He lived in a poor hut and his standard of life was low. In one respect the English farmer suffered more than his neighbor across the Channel. The lords and landed gentry gradually increased their holdings until by the end of the eighteenth century the independent farmer peasant had almost ceased to exist. *English peasant*

In France the old type of serfdom had largely disappeared. About 20,000,000 peasants owned their own farms, or were renters, or agricultural laborers, while only 1,000,000 were serfs — chiefly in eastern and northern France. Indeed nowhere else on the continent did so many peasants have their own land, which they could sell at will without consulting their lords, and remove to the cities or buy new farms in better localities. Nearly one half of the farm land in France belonged to these independent farmers, chiefly in the south. Others cultivated the land of the lords on shares or rented farms. Although the peasants were free to regulate their own lives and to dispose of their holdings as they pleased, their farms were not clear of all obligations except such taxes as the state might levy, but were still subject to a large number of dues and services inherited from the feudal system. These feudal dues and services were perfectly legal charges against the farms and were clung to tenaciously by the nobles, who depended upon them largely for their incomes, although the peasants complained bitterly against their injustice. These feudal charges, while exorbitant in some instances, were vexatious rather than heavy, though during the eighteenth century, the nobility, being sadly impoverished, were inclined to insist upon their rights, and were constantly digging up old dues which had been allowed to lapse. They varied so greatly and were so numerous that the lawyers of the day confessed that they were not acquainted with all of them. *French peasants*

Feudal dues

The chief ones were: (1) a fixed annual rent payable either in money or produce; (2) a sales tax collected when the land was sold; (3) an annual tax on the produce of the farm; (4) a small fee for the use of the lord's mill, bake-oven, wine-press, bull, or stallion; (5) tolls on the ferries and highways; and (6) the use of the peasant's land as a hunting preserve for the lord. Then the church stepped in and collected the tithes. Finally the state demanded (1) the income tax and (2) a surtax on all incomes; and (3) the poll tax from all citizens. At the same time the peasant, in common with all other classes, paid indirect taxes. When all of these obligations were met, the peasant ofttimes found insufficient means left on which to support his family adequately.

German peasants

In Germany the greater part of the peasants carried a heavier load and had a harder lot than in France, although conditions varied in different provinces and states. In the Rhine valley, in Austria, and on the slopes of the Alps not much serfdom existed, still as in France feudal dues and services had to be met by the owners of the lands. In the provinces of Cleves and Mark in Prussia most of the peasants were free. But in the rest of Germany and in Prussia, particularly east of the Elbe, the peasants were in a state of abject serfdom differing little from the Middle Ages. They did not own their land, could not sell such rights as they had in it without the lord's consent, and in their feeble old age might be evicted and replaced by younger and stronger tenants. On the royal Prussian domain, however, the peasants were somewhat better off, and those who had served in the king's army were granted special privileges. While the German peasants had less freedom than the French, those in Prussia, at least, did not suffer so much from the burden of direct state taxes, although the indirect taxes on tools, clothes, sugar, and tobacco were heavy. In Hungary the peasant was little more than a slave for he was landless and bound to the soil. One complained that he owed four days out of each week to the lord in labor, spent the fifth and sixth in hunting and fishing for him, gave the seventh to God, and hence had nothing left for himself.

Lot of peasants compared

Looking at Europe as a whole in 1789 it may be said that the peasant farmers were better off in England, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, a few favored parts of Germany and Austria, and northern Italy than they were in France. On the other hand, the peasants in Ireland, Spain, most of Germany, Poland, Hungary, Russia, and central and southern Italy were in a far worse condition than in France, where, largely emancipated, they felt their bonds to be all the more irksome, and hence welcomed the Revolution.

3. Religious Conditions

The religions of Europe in 1789 were the Christian, Jewish, and Mohammedan. The Mohammedans, whose Bible was the Koran, were confined to the Ottoman Empire. The Jews were pretty well

Religions of Europe

scattered all over Europe, but lived chiefly in the cities and larger towns, where they were assigned to "quarters," restricted in their rights and privileges, and forbidden to enter most trades and occupations. As a result many of them were forced to become peddlers and money changers. Joseph II of Austria in 1781 permitted them to learn handicrafts, to become farmers, and to enter the universities. An ordinance of the same year enjoined that they be considered as "fellow-men" and given equal rights "with the Christian inhabitants." In England and Holland they were better treated than elsewhere, and in many other places they had acquired certain privileges either by favor of the crown or by purchase. Under the leadership of Moses Mendelssohn (d. 1786) a certain faction of Jews began to adapt themselves to the conditions of national life among the Christians. Their synagogues were erected in most of the large cities by the close of the eighteenth century. Napoleon in 1807 called a Jewish assembly in Paris, which outlined a policy adopted in France and other countries giving them religious freedom.

The Jews

Christianity was the faith held by most of the people in every country in Europe, even European Turkey. The Christians were divided into three main groups: (1) the Roman Catholics found in Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, Ireland, Austria, Poland, Belgium and Germany; (2) the Greek Orthodox in eastern Europe; and (3) the Protestants in northern Europe. The head of the Roman Catholic Church was the pope, chosen by a college of cardinals, and living in his ancient capital Rome. An army of higher and lower clergy helped him rule the church. As God's direct representative, he claimed jurisdiction over the earth, a claim that was denied by large groups of Christians. To pay its numerous officials and to carry out its many worthy enterprises, the Roman Church did not rely upon voluntary contributions from its members, but enjoyed the revenues from large domains, consisting of possibly one fourth of Catholic Europe, which pious kings, nobles and burghers had from time to time given it. In addition to the income from its lands, the Catholic Church had the right, like the state, to collect a regular tax called the tithe from all persons in Catholic countries whether members of it or not. Of all the institutions in Europe, the Catholic Church had experienced the fewest changes in the past four hundred years. In some countries it still pretended to fine, or imprison, those whom it convicted of heresy or blasphemy. It controlled the schools in Catholic countries and thus brought up the children in the orthodox faith. It conducted the hospitals and asylums for the unfortunate, and registered all births and deaths, while no marriage without its consent was legal. The monasteries were still numerous and rich. For instance a map of Paris in 1789 showed 68 monasteries and 73 nunneries within its walls.

Christian sects

The Roman Catholic clergy were divided into two classes: the "Regular" or the monks, and the "Secular" or higher clergy and

Roman Catholic clergy were a privileged class

priests. The higher secular clergy included cardinals, archbishops, bishops and abbots who were chosen largely from the noble class. In France the last bishop of the third estate was elected in 1783. The higher clergy lived in palaces like the lords, with a large number of servants and tenants, collected feudal dues, frequented the court of the king, and presided at important ecclesiastical ceremonies. Some of the rulers tried to tax the clergy, but as a rule they were exempt from all direct taxes and thus like the nobles formed a privileged class. The lower clergy consisted of the priests, monks and nuns, who were recruited mostly from the common people. They were also a privileged class since they paid no direct taxes, but because of their small salaries they were poor. They had as little love for the higher clergy as the common people had for the lords, and thus the interests and sympathies of these two groups were united throughout Catholic Europe.

Little religious freedom

In Italy, especially in the Papal States, Austria, Spain, and Portugal, the clergy and monastic orders enjoyed more privileges than in France. But religious freedom, as it is known today, giving a man the right to belong to any church or no church as he pleases and to criticize religion without fear of loss of citizenship or death, was practically unknown in these countries. The Catholic Church was the only one recognized by the state and its rights were defended by state laws. In France prior to 1787 the Protestants had lost their

Protestants in France

civil rights, and those who assembled to worship outside of the Catholic Church might lose their property, the men being sent to the galleys and the women imprisoned for life. Thus Protestants were outlawed, their children were illegitimate, and they were refused burial in Catholic cemeteries. Nor could they legally inherit or bequeath property. Jean Calas, a Protestant, in 1762 had his bones broken on the wheel in France on the charge of having murdered his son who was about to join the Catholics. And in 1766 a young nobleman, Chevalier de la Barre, was condemned to death for having insulted a religious procession.

Censorship of the press

Books and pamphlets were carefully censored and any one who wrote, printed, or distributed any work attacking the church or the king, could be punished by death. Many such writings, burned by the common hangman, were printed in Geneva, London, or Holland, or secretly printed at home, notwithstanding the severe laws. In Spain and parts of Italy the censorship of the press was still more stringent than in France. It should be added, however, that then as ever, censorship actually suppressed very few books, and merely gave wide advertising to many that were condemned. Clever persons were able systematically to exploit the censors in this fashion.

Greek Catholic Church

The Greek Orthodox Church, with many followers in the Turkish Empire and Poland, had its stronghold in Russia. In its organization, rites and ceremonies, clergy and teachings, it resembled the Roman Catholic Church in many ways, but it was ruled by several patriarchs

instead of one pope, and differed in some other respects. In south-eastern and eastern Europe it played an important role in moulding civilization, but had little influence on the west. In Russia it formed a powerful ally of the autocratic government and set its face against all reform measures.

Protestants in northern Europe

The Protestants predominated in north German states, the Scandinavian countries, Switzerland, Holland and Great Britain. They were not united under any common leadership as in the Roman and Greek Churches, but were divided into Lutherans, Calvinists, Anglicans, and other sects. In Germany and the Scandinavian countries the Lutheran Church was in a sense the state church, although some of the German princes recognized the German Reformed Church as official, and since the beginning of the seventeenth century, all religions, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish, had received equal recognition from the Prussian government. In England the Anglican Church was the established state church and had retained something of the form of government of the Roman Catholic Church. While both Catholics and Protestants sought to abridge religious freedom in every way possible, and laws were to be found to this effect in most countries, considerable progress towards freedom was being made.

"Dissenters" in England

Thus in England the "Dissenters," that is, those who opposed the English Church as established by law, whether Roman Catholics or Protestants or Jews, were legally liable to fines and imprisonment, and in earlier days many of the Protestant "Dissenters" such as the Congregationalists, Presbyterians, Baptists, and Quakers as well as Romanists suffered severely and fled from England either to the continent or to America to secure greater religious liberty; but after 1689, they were allowed to hold services in their own way, although they were still supposed to be excluded from government offices and could not obtain degrees from the universities. But the laws against the Roman Catholics were as harsh as ever. They were forbidden to enter England, to celebrate mass, and were also excluded from all public offices. As time passed, fortunately less attention was paid to the enforcement of these laws. Church courts still existed in England to try laymen for not attending church, for heresy, and for immoral acts, but they too had fallen into disuse. The press was free in England and men could write books without obtaining the consent of the government. In Catholic France, likewise, where public opinion was very enlightened and would not have tolerated religious persecution, no serious attempt had been made to enforce the harsh laws for many years.

4. Cultural Conditions

The educational institutions of the old régime in Europe were still mediaeval in form, but some progress had been made in their spirit. The educational system was fairly well organized at the top, but poorly at the bottom. In 1789 the universities were numerous

and found in every country, even Russia. Many of their graduates were entering the services of the church and state, and constituted the lawyers and doctors, the professors and literary men of the day.

Educational Institutions

The courses of study had not changed much since the Renaissance and the Reformation, and the students were almost exclusively the sons of the rich or the noble. There were no free, secular, public secondary schools, but good academies and "grammar schools" abounded to prepare the children of the aristocrats and the wealthy burghers for the universities. Such elementary schools as existed were attended by the children of the well-to-do, and not by the offspring of the poor. Indeed the masses of the people in every European country were without education and such a thing as a public school system supported by the state to teach all children so that they might grow up as good citizens was unknown. To make matters worse, education, such as it was, was in the hands of the clergy in all Catholic countries and to a considerable degree in the Protestant lands as well. Only a few men like Rousseau, Kant, and Pestalozzi by 1789 had gained the vision of modern educational systems.

Art

Art was an educational agency encouraged by kings, nobles, bishops, and wealthy burghers, who patronized artists by bestowing upon them commissions, pensions, and lucrative offices. Fine buildings — temples, theaters, churches, monasteries, townhalls, castles and palaces — some of them of the period of the Renaissance, others going back to feudal days, and still others reaching even to Rome and Greece, were still found in various parts of Europe to be studied and admired by the people. About 1789 Europe was in the midst of what is called the "Neo-classic period" of art in which there was a literal copying of the art of Greece and Rome without any attempt to show much originality in its use. Churches, public buildings, and homes were built with ancient edifices as models, and the Doric and Ionic columns were attached to many structures with utter disregard of propriety. The Royal Exchange and Bank of England in London; the Brandenburg Gate in Berlin; the Grand Theater in Bordeaux; and the church of Francesco di Paoli in Naples were examples. The same spirit of imitation characterized painting, and especially David of France. Angelica Kaufman in Germany; Sir Joshua Reynolds, Gainsborough, Romney, Raeburn and Lawrence in England; and Verhagen in Belgium were the most famous painters of this period. In sculpture, Canova of Italy, stands out most conspicuously as the representative of the classical school. His most famous pupil was Thorwaldsen of Denmark. Claudet, Bosio, and Pradier carried on the work in France. Some noteworthy art galleries and museums were founded in the large cities.

A new science was created in Europe by 1789 to counteract much that was mediaeval in ideas and institutions. The foundations of physics, chemistry, astronomy, botany, geology and electromagnetism

were laid but little application of them was made to human welfare. People quite generally were keenly alive to the deficiencies of the past and of their own day; and they had faith to believe that things could be made better. The new science opened up this hope for the future by showing how the wisest of the ancients were mistaken about many things, and by pointing the way through patient experiment and discovery to almost unbelievable advancement. Wise men like Francis Bacon, Descartes, Sir Isaac Newton, Galileo, Copernicus, and Leibnitz had already changed men's minds about the earth and the universe by the discovery of certain natural laws. In the eighteenth century kings and nobles encouraged scientists, as they did poets and artists, with pensions and gifts to continue their work. Galvani and Volta in Italy followed Franklin in electrical experiments. Priestley, Lavoisier, and Cavendish labored in the chemical laboratory, discovered oxygen, and first decomposed water into its elements. Hunter and von Haller made important discoveries in surgery. Jenner discovered the process of vaccination for combating the scourge of smallpox. Captain Cook and Louis de Bougainville carried on geographic explorations in the south Pacific. Buffon and Linnaeus made important contributions in the fields of zoology and botany. Observatories with clumsy telescopes were built to study the heavens. Numerous scientific societies were organized to promote the work in these fields, and numerous books and encyclopædias were published giving the results of the experiments and discoveries. Even polite society throughout Europe began to dabble in science and a new group of "savants" came into fashion.

Rise of the new science

As a result of the new knowledge and new points of view gained, certain groups of thinking men began to believe that science might be used to free the world from vice, disease, ignorance, poverty and superstition, if the state, church, and society were studied with a view to their betterment. This attempt to improve the mind and the lot of man by the use of reason and knowledge was called "rationalism." The philosophers of the eighteenth century were both "empirical and rational" and believed in "progress, justice, toleration, liberty, fraternity, the sovereignty of the people, the rights of man and humanity," as within human reach. The fact cannot be too strongly emphasized that the doctrine of progress, which is taken for granted now, was a new thing then. It was this new vision that led nobles like Lafayette, Rochambeau, De Kalb, and Steuben to volunteer to help free the American colonies. Following the work of Englishmen like Francis Bacon, who first proved man's capacity for development, and Locke, who desired to popularize government, abolish religious superstition, and proclaim toleration, men like Voltaire, Rousseau, Montesquieu, Diderot and D'Alembert in France attacked the old institutions of their day and became the pioneers of a new order.

Doctrine of progress

The American Revolution was not an isolated event but one of world-wide significance. The same ferment which produced it was

Liberalism in America and western Europe

working in many lands. That the outbreak occurred in the western colonies of the British Empire was due to favorable conditions. The middle-class mind in western Europe during the latter part of the eighteenth century was thinking in terms of liberty, equality, and humanity. Much was said about a "free humanity;" and cosmopolitanism, rather than nationalism and patriotism, engrossed the attention of thoughtful people. Leagues for perpetual peace were proposed by Kant and others. Rousseau and his followers were searching for a form of government which would assure "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." Every country in Europe had its group of middle-class thinkers, reformers and philanthropists who were urging the improvement of the lot of mankind by a return to a "state of nature." The Physiocrats were demanding liberty in industry as well as freedom in politics. Essentially the same forces which produced the Declaration of Independence in 1776 led Adam Smith in the same year to print his epoch-making book on the *Wealth of Nations*. As a middle-class Scotchman, who had lived in France in intimate contact with the Physiocrats, he belonged to the "cosmopolitan *intelligentsia*" of the time. He urged free trade as essential to man's civil liberty. Thus the concept of liberty became economic as well as political, particularly for the middle class, for the poor were scarcely taken into account. It must be remembered, however, that these advocates of the modern political and economic theories were leaders of thought and not leaders of men. In very few instances did they work with their fellows in a practical way to realize their ideals in new institutions. That mission was left to others.

Middle-class thinkers

Adam Smith

The poor neglected

The literature of this age was confined largely to the writings of the men mentioned above. Their poems, essays, pamphlets and books criticized the injustices and inequalities of the old régime and provoked an insistent demand for reform. In England this was the period of Hume, Goldsmith, Samuel Johnson, Burke, and Gibbon, while Lessing, Schiller and Goethe were the leading literary men of Germany. The theater, as a source of amusement and instruction, was widely used. San Carlo at Naples, La Scala at Milan, and La Fenice in Venice were the finest in Europe, but the theaters of Paris, London, and Vienna were well known and widely patronized by the aristocracy. In England the right to run theaters like Covent Garden and Drury Lane was a monopoly like so many things of the period. In Paris the actors formed a guild. In the world of music this was the age of Bach, Gluck, Haydn, Mozart, and Cherubini.

Literature

5. The Industrial System

Towards the close of the eighteenth century the industrial system of Europe was undergoing a pronounced revolution. Large cities like London, Paris, Amsterdam, Hamburg, Frankfort, and Vienna had grown up and the small villages had increased in size until on the

continent there were 78 towns with over 10,000 inhabitants in 1787. These cities and towns, nourished by industry and commerce, began to lose their mediaeval character to some extent. Industry was coming to mean something more than making clothes and hats, shoes and swords, articles of furniture and implements of agriculture. It became national and international, and meant the production of goods like cloth, clocks, dishes, and weapons on a large scale to supply far-away markets. The guild system was declining in England, although it was still in active operation on the continent. With improved tools and methods of farming agriculture was revolutionized. The paternal states devoted more attention to the regulation of industry by law. In 1787 it was said that the French rules concerning manufacturing filled eight large volumes. Men eager to establish new industries and open up new fields of trade secured from the king special trading privileges, large grants of money, exemptions from taxation, and other favors. Large companies like the East India Company, the Hudson's Bay Company, the Dutch East India Company, and the French Company of India still monopolized much of the foreign trade. Under these trading corporations, favored by protective measures, commerce with the Americas, Africa and Asia grew out of all bounds, and enriched the middle class, particularly in France and England. The foreign commerce, which in 1700 amounted to $60,000,000 in England and $40,000,000 in France, had probably increased threefold by 1789. The system of protective tariffs against foreign competition was in operation in the larger states, although internal customs duties and tolls, and poor roads and slow transportation, still hampered trade within the states.

Growth of cities and towns

Changes in industry

Trading companies

That remarkable movement called the Industrial Revolution, which will be studied later, was already under way in England and was destined to transform the world. The improvement in spinning and weaving, the new processes in producing iron, the use of steam and water power to drive machinery, and to transport goods and persons, the changes in the methods of cleaning cotton and of dyeing cloth, and the rise of more practical methods of finance were altering the very foundations of the society of the old régime and marking a departure in world history. They created the "capitalist class" and the new type of day laborers; they stimulated both national and world trade; they founded colonial empires for world markets and raw materials; they built large manufacturing cities; they set up new standards of living; and they produced a series of critical social problems. The middle class — the business men, bankers, and professional men — assumed a new significance and took political leadership away from the nobles and clergy, first in England, then in France, and later in other European countries. When the French Revolution broke out, it is not surprising, therefore, that this class took the leadership in the attack on the old régime.

The Industrial Revolution

Between us and this eighteenth century stands the French Revolu-

tion directed against its injustices and inequalities. Such a movement may easily focus our attention on its evils and shortcomings, but if we consider what has just been said of literature, economics, philosophy, science and the beginnings of industry and world commerce, we can realize that it was a truly great century to which we owe much that we think of as the peculiar achievements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER READING

The Old Régime in Europe

A. Hassall, *The Balance of Power, 1715–1789* (1907); * A. H. Johnson, *The Age of the Enlightened Despots, 1660–1789* (1910); * H. E. Bourne, *The Revolutionary Period in Europe, 1763–1815* (1914); W. E. H. Lecky, *A History of England in the Eighteenth Century*, 8 vols. (1878–1890); W. Hunt, *Political History of England, 1760–1801* (1905); A. L. Cross, *History of England and Greater Britain* (1914); * E. F. Henderson, *A Short History of Germany*, 2 vols. (1902); W. F. Reddaway, *Frederick the Great and the Rise of Prussia* (1904); G. M. Priest, *Germany since 1740* (1915); * A. Rambaud, *History of Russia*, English translation by Leonora B. Lang, 2 vols. (1878); E. A. B. Hodgetts, *The Life of Catherine the Great of Russia* (1914); R. N. Bain, *Scandinavia: a Political History from 1513–1900* (1905); F. Rousseau, *Règne de Charles III d'Espagne, 1759–1788* (1907); M. A. S. Hume, *Spain, its Greatness and Decay, 1479–1788* (1898); * H. W. Van Loon, *The Fall of the Dutch Republic* (1913); H. D. Traill and J. S. Mann, (editors) *Social England*, 6 vols. (new edition 1904); * J. A. R. Marriott and C. G. Robertson, *The Rise of Prussia* (1918); Brazley, Forbes, Birkett, *Russia from the Varangians to the Bolsheviks* (1920); J. E. Thorold Rogers, *History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, 7 vols. (1866–1902); K. Biedermann, *Deutschland im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*, 2 vols. (1867–1880); J. Mavor, *An Economic History of Russia*, 2 vols. (1914); G. Desdevises du Dezert, *L'Espagne de l'ancien régime*, 3 vols. (1897–1904); F. Nippold, *The Papacy in the 19th Century*. Translated by L. H. Schwab (1900); W. Walker, *History of the Christian Church* (1920); W. Barry, *The Papacy and Modern Times* (1911); P. de Crousaz-Cretet, *L'Église et L'état, ou les deux puissances au XVIII^e siècle, 1713–1789* (1893); J. H. Overton and F. Relton, *A History of the Church of England, 1714–1800* (1906); H. W. Clark, *History of English Nonconformity*, 2 vols. (1913); F. P. Graves, *A Student's History of Education* (1920); G. Compayré, *Histoire critique des doctrines de l'éducation en France*, 2 vols. (2d edition 1881); F. Paulsen, *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts* (1885); J. Jaurès, *Histoire socialiste*, 12 vols. (1901–1909); W. Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times*, 3 vols. (5th edition 1910–1912); Sir H. T. Wood, *Industrial England in the Middle of the Eighteenth Century* (1910), G. Martin, *La grande industrie en France sous le règne de Louis XV* (1900); G. Steinhausen, *Geschichte der deutschen Kultur* (2d ed. 1913); Sedgwick and Tyler, *History of Science* (1919); R. A. Gregory, *Discovery, the Spirit and Service of Science* (1916); F. H. Garrison, *History of Medicine*, (2d edition 1923); * J. B. Bury, *The Idea of Progress* (1921); A. C. McGiffert, *Protestant Thought before Kant* (1915).

CHAPTER V

THE FRENCH REVOLUTION: ITS INFLUENCE ON OTHER PEOPLES

I. The Old Régime in France

During the latter part of the eighteenth century four significant changes were taking place in world history. The Commercial Revolution was undermining the feudal order, forming a powerful middle class, and stimulating the rise of national states. The Industrial Revolution was transforming business and social relations. The American Revolution was experimenting with the first democratic federal Republic, and was the preliminary skirmish of a conflict that was to cover Europe and Latin America. The French Revolution, directed by the middle class, was ending the economic and social remnants of feudalism and replacing irresponsible, royal despotism with constitutional self-government. These forces were hastening the transition of the feudal world to the modern democratic world.

Four changes in world history

The French Revolution differed from the English Revolution of the seventeenth century and the American Revolution in that it was to a greater degree a social as well as a political movement. In Great Britain the middle class by a process of internal assimilation gained political power without forcibly displacing the aristocracy, which was constantly recruited from the best men of the middle class. Indeed the aristocracy itself had become to a degree middle class in its ideals and interests. The American Revolution, having little to destroy, was a demonstration of the right of revolution and a rather successful experiment in the newer political and social ideals of the eighteenth century. To a considerable extent it was economic as well as political. The men who led it had long enjoyed personal freedom and knew the value of political liberty. It directly concerned only a few millions of people, and they were separated from the Europeans by the Atlantic Ocean. The French Revolution sought to abolish class distinctions based on birth and blood, and special privileges for the few. It stressed equal rights and opportunities for all men. It is called French but its effects have been felt around the globe. It began in France, not because the people there were more oppressed than elsewhere, but because, like the Americans, they were more advanced and better off than any other national group in continental Europe. It covered the period from 1789 to 1799 but its roots run back further and its influences have not yet ceased. Through it the middle class in France gained most in wealth and power at the

French Revolution different from English Revolution and American Revolution

Nature of French Revolution

expense of royalty, the nobility, and the clergy, while the lot of the peasantry was notably improved. A more detailed survey of the institutions of the old régime in France will explain the French Revolution as a force in world history.

The absolute monarchy

The French people were ruled by an absolute, hereditary king, responsible for his actions to God alone. The monarch's will was the source of all law, justice, honors, and appointments to office. He could levy taxes and spend the money as he pleased without rendering an account to the public. He could contract foreign alliances, plunge the nation into war, and make peace without consulting his subjects. With a stroke of his pen he could imprison any one without a trial. "This thing is legal because I wish it," said Louis XVI on one occasion, and on another, "The sovereign authority resides exclusively in my person. To me alone belongs the power to make laws. . . . The rights and interests of the nation rest solely in my hands." In short, the entire life of the nation — political, social, industrial, educational and religious — centered in the autocratic monarch. To dazzle the eyes of his subjects, he lived in lavish splendor, surrounded by a host of courtiers and servants, at Versailles, a city of 80,000 people, located twelve miles from Paris. His mammoth palace built by Louis XIV with its endless rooms, costly furniture and decorations, beautiful parks, fountains, and artificial lakes, had cost $100,000,000, a sum wrung from the people in taxes. The court consisted of 15,000 persons, including both the Swiss and French regiments and all civil officials, costing a twelfth of the revenue of the state. Attached to the queen alone were 500 servants. The royal stables, containing thousands of horses and more than 200 carriages and sleighs, cost $4,000,000 yearly. Louis XVI planned to reduce the number of horses from 6,000 to 1,800. For the king's table another $1,500,000 was spent. The total expense of the luxury, pomp, and pageantry of the royal court was probably $20,000,000 a year. No ruler on earth could match the French court in size, costliness and gaiety. Louis XVI and his consort, however, at least set a higher moral standard than the immoral Louis XV.

Monarchy inefficient, unjust, and extravagant

Bureaucracy

The people might have continued to tolerate the absolute government with all its extravagances and glittering mockery, had it been really efficient, just, and heedful of their welfare. On the contrary, it was unwieldy and inefficient. Since no country so vast could be ruled by a king alone, he had created five councils to assist him in framing laws, managing finances, and conducting foreign affairs. The privy council of about 100 members was the most important of these bodies and supervised all weighty matters. Since these councils made laws and enforced them in the king's name, the actual government of France was an autocratic bureaucracy. In theory France was a highly centralized kingdom, but not in reality. The numerous codes of local laws, — nearly three hundred — the different systems of taxation, the varying weights and measures, caused conflicts, and the overlapping of authority, and threw the government

into a chaos of practices. In central France thirteen provinces had free trade without customs houses, while elsewhere tariffs were collected on goods from other provinces. These irritating local diversities and territorial units showed how many remnants of the Middle Ages had survived in France. The people were not unified into one nation with a common patriotism and a common law such as had grown up in England, but regarded themselves as Bretons or Parisians, or Alsatians rather than Frenchmen. The task of creating a national spirit was accomplished by the "Fraternity" of the French Revolution.

Conflicting laws

No nationality

France had three types of local government: (1) There were the bishoprics with their own officers and courts. (2) The thirty-eight provinces, remnants of former independent duchies and kingdoms, had been united to form France. Those in central France had no self-government, while those on the borders had assemblies of three estates with power to consent to taxation. A governor-general, usually a noble, appointed by the king, ruled over each province. (3) The thirty-five *generalités*, which approximately coincided in territory with the provinces, were ruled by *intendants*, for the most part lawyers and men of the middle class, who were also named by the king. They were the real local rulers of France and, as the direct representatives of the absolute monarch, played the part of little despots. In the modern sense, local government did not exist, for the pettiest details were determined at Versailles. If a stream needed a new bridge, or a church a new roof, petitions had to be approved first by the central authority before the work could be done. This caused annoying delays and stupid indifference to local needs.

Local government

The national finances were in a most precarious condition and for half a century or more the nation had been on the verge of bankruptcy. Although the government collected millions annually in taxes, and received large sums from the church and from the sale of offices, yet each year closed with a deficit. These deficits were simply added to the national debt. Louis XVI borrowed money until the wealthy bankers and business men became alarmed and refused to make further loans. The financial load was heavy, but France was rich and abundantly able to meet it. The difficulty lay in extravagance and in the unscientific handling of funds. There was no public budget, such as modern states provide, and the burden was so unequally distributed that those most able to pay large taxes either were exempt or evaded their share. Thus the royal princes, who should have paid an income tax of $500,000, managed to reduce it to $40,000. A certain marquis, whose land tax was legally $500, escaped with paying $80; while a middle-class man, who should have paid $14, had to pay $152. The common people, who owned two fifths of the land, paid four fifths of the direct taxes. Careful investigations have indicated that the peasant's tax might well be about 50 per cent of his total income, which was quite enough to explain why wide-

National finance

Taxation

spread discontent and rebellion were awaiting only the occasion and leadership to overthrow such an unjust system of taxation. The taxes themselves as a whole would not have been so heavy, if equitably distributed. In England the taxes were greater than those in France but more easily paid because better apportioned to the capacity to pay.

Direct taxes

The state collected two kinds of taxes, direct and indirect. About half of the national income consisted of direct taxes levied on land, personal property and income. From most of these taxes the nobles, clergy and some of the middle class were exempt, hence the load fell heavily upon the common people. The other half of the national income was raised from indirect taxes such as the salt tax, the tobacco tax, the excise on wine and cider, duties on exports, and a stamp tax. The collection of these revenues was so abominable that they were hated as much as the direct taxes. Wealthy speculators, or companies, called the farmers of taxes, paid the state a lump sum for the privilege of collecting certain indirect taxes. They expected, of course, to squeeze out of the people large profits in addition to their original outlay.

Indirect taxes

Law courts

The courts of law consisted of a supreme court at Paris and twelve inferior courts, in different cities, together with numerous local tribunals. The judges inherited or bought their offices, though they included some men of ability. They were selfish and unprogressive, and upheld privileges against the king and reforming ministers under Louis XVI, but the very fact that they opposed the crown gave them great popularity. Since no law was valid until registered by these courts, they insisted, more and more, especially the *parlement* of Paris, that they had a veto on royal edicts. But the king had the power to force the court to register his edicts. This court in Paris also had the power to seize printed books and if found injurious to public policy to sentence them to be burned. The lower courts were more corrupt, and dispensed justice in the interest of the privileged classes.

Lettre de cachet

Bribery was common. The *lettre de cachet*, or secret letter, signed by the king, which could not be opened without breaking the royal seal, was the most flagrant abuse of liberty and justice. It ordered the arrest of a certain person, who might be imprisoned without knowing the name of his accuser or the nature of his offense. If poor and without friends, such a victim might spend years in prison without trial. Yet the number thus arrested has been exaggerated. There was an average of sixteen a year under Louis XVI, mostly at the request of relatives. Striking and arbitrary cases of arrest aroused the public wrath.

Criminal law

The criminal law was harsh and cruel. Torture was used to force confession of crime. No lawyer was allowed to defend the accused, and the examination of his case was conducted in private. Witnesses were called only after the culprit had testified, and thus he was liable for perjury. The death penalty was common for trivial offenses, and barbarous methods were used to execute criminals.

The church was a sort of a state within the state, for it had its government and officials. It owned from 1 per cent to 40 per cent of the land in different sections of France[1] and collected tithes from all the people. This sum, supplemented by the revenue from its own property and from gifts, gave the church a huge income for its work estimated to have been as high as $100,000,000 yearly. Although protected by the state in its rights, yet it was free from secular taxation. From time to time the church voted a voluntary contribution to the royal treasury, but that sum fell far short of what would have been paid had the church been taxed on its property and income. Thus the church was a protected, privileged corporation ranking in power next to the state itself. The only justification for collecting tithes from Jews and Protestants, as well as Catholics, was found in the fact that the money was used in part for the support of the poor and unfortunate. Since the tithes were paid in farm produce instead of money, they were one cause for the backward condition of agriculture. Had the church discharged its spiritual duties more zealously, managed its own land better and spent more of its income for the welfare of the people, it might have held their loyalty to a greater degree.

The church

A privileged body

The higher clergy, numbering perhaps 6,000, included 18 archbishops, 117 bishops, and numerous abbots, abbesses, "little abbés," priors, and canons. Although the pope had a veto on the nominations, the king actually appointed the higher clergy mostly from the younger sons of the nobility. Some of them lived in worldly extravagance while they neglected obvious duties. The archbishop of Strassburg had an income of possibly $200,000 to squander on his costly palace and sumptuous court. He entertained lavishly, and his guests at times numbered 200. The abbess of Remiemont in Lorraine held feudal rights over 200 villages and astonished the people with her splendid gowns. Members of her convent must have nine generations of noble blood in their veins. The average income of the archbishops and bishops was $35,000, and some of them, like the feudal lords, preferred to reside at Versailles. Hence absenteeism was a crying evil in the church as well as the state. Men of immoral lives and inferior intellects, who cared little for religion, were not uncommon among the higher clergy. "The archbishop of Paris must at least believe in God," dryly remarked Louis XVI, when he was urged to appoint Brienne to that position. Voltaire urged an atheistic friend to accept an office in the church on the ground that he would have a fat living and yet might believe as he pleased. These conditions explain why the Revolution was directed against the existing church as well as against the state.

The higher clergy

The 120,000 members of the lower clergy came from the common people. The priests numbering about 60,000 lived mostly in the vil-

[1] See, *La France Économique et Sociale au XVIII^e Siècle*, thinks that the total possessions of the church were about 6 per cent. Rabaut Saint-Étienne estimated them at 20 per cent.

The lower clergy

lages, beloved by the people. They conducted the religious services, educated the children, and shared the joys and hardships of their parishioners. Neglected and paid wretched salaries, they hated their superiors. When the Revolution began, they heartily supported the cause of the people against the king, the nobles and the bishops. Although they belonged to the privileged class, since they were exempt from direct taxes, nevertheless their sympathies were with the unprivileged class.

No religious freedom

There was no religious freedom in France. Legally Jews and Protestants were members of the Roman Catholic Church and subject to its control. Moreover, they were excluded from civil offices. At death Catholic relatives might claim their property. Their marriages were illegal, and their children illegitimate. Fortunately, however, as the Revolution approached, these laws were not widely enforced. The last execution for heresy in France took place in 1762 and in 1777 the last prisoner for conscience's sake was released from the galleys. The liberal men of the day urged freedom of worship, and in 1787 Lafayette proposed the restitution of civil rights to all Protestants. Such a royal edict was drawn up, but the clergy were strong enough to defeat it. Most of the thinkers of the day, clergy as well as laity, no longer accepted the creed of the Catholic Church without question.[1] A Paris curate, who was asked whether the clergy really believed the doctrines they taught, replied: "There may be four or five who do." At a dinner in Paris the Englishman, Hume, chanced to remark that he had never met an atheist. "At the present moment," replied his host, "you are sitting at the table with seventeen of them."

Social inequality

France inherited from the Middle Ages the principle that men are not born free and equal. Hence society was organized on the basis of privilege and inequality. Some were high, others low; some rich, others poor; some noble, others ignoble; some privileged, others unprivileged. The privileged class included the royal family, the nobility, the clergy, and the richer business and professional men. The unprivileged class consisted of the poorer middle class, the artisans in the cities, and the peasants in the country, and formed the vast bulk of the nation. Under this antiquated system one person in fifty belonged to the favored few, who reaped most of the rewards and escaped most of the burdens of life. Yet these class distinctions were not so rigid as to prevent a man by some stroke of fortune, or by thrift and ambition, or by the purchase of an office, from climbing from a lower to a higher rank. With these inequalities in mind, one may better understand why the French Revolution took for its watchwords, "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity."

The nobility, including children, numbered about 140,000 members, and supplied one noble family for every 800 people.[2] They

[1] Cf. *Cath. Encyc.* "France," vi, 184.

[2] See gives 80,000 noble families and 400,000 members.

owned perhaps one fourth of the soil of France which varied from 11 to 40 per cent in different localities. If in the United States every lawyer were a nobleman with a huge estate, or an official holding a title of nobility, one would get an idea of the number and power of the nobles in France. The higher clergy and the nobility owned almost one third of the soil of France, had as their tenants a large number of the peasants, and received a fourth of what the people produced. Like the clergy the nobles were divided into two classes — the old and the new nobility. The old "nobility of the sword," once the equals of kings, claimed that they paid their taxes with their swords. If sufficiently wealthy, they lived a brilliant life at the king's court, pulling wires for favors, or if too poor, they resided in the provinces. The new "nobles of the robe" had either bought their titles to nobility, or had received an office carrying with it noble rank. As a source of income, kings sold such offices very much as a modern state raises money by selling bonds. These offices were inheritable and transferable like any other property. The old nobles despised the new nobles, but as the Revolution approached the two groups had begun to be merged by many advantageous marriages.

The nobility

When the king absorbed the political powers of the nobles, they clung more tenaciously to their social and economic privileges. These consisted of the higher offices in the army, church and state; exemption from certain direct taxes; feudal dues, market and hunting rights; and certain minor local honors and appointments. Most of these privileges were regarded as property rights which could be sold or bequeathed to heirs. Ordinarily the eldest son inherited two thirds of the estate, while the younger heirs received the other third. It was laughingly said that the younger children of poorer nobles received "part of a pigeon, a rabbit, and a hunting dog." Some of the nobles whose wealth had been swallowed up by absenteeism, debts at Versailles, gambling, and lack of business ability, were jokingly called "The high and mighty lords of a pigeon-house, a frog pond, and a rabbit pen." Here and there nobles were no better off than their peasants. Arthur Young in his travels through France heard of nobles in the south who had to live on an income of $125 a year. In 1789 several Poitevin nobles went to their electoral assemblies dressed like peasants and without sufficient money to pay their hotel bills. The chief reason for the unpopularity of the nobles in late eighteenth-century France lay in the fact that by this time they had become practically a nuisance. In the Middle Ages they had possessed real political and juristic as well as economic and social functions. These services had later become absorbed by others and before 1750 the nobility was but an irritating and expensive anachronism.

Privileges of the nobility

The third estate, numbering about 24,500,000 persons, included every layman not a noble of blood or office from the richest banker and the most famous literary man down to the poorest peasant

Third estate

and most miserable beggar. Like the clergy and the nobility, the third estate likewise was divided into two classes: the middle class, and the town workers and peasants. The middle class comprised all persons not clerics who did not toil with their hands, such as lawyers, physicians, literary men, heads of guilds, merchants, bankers, artists, actors and government officials. They lived in the cities and towns, included less than 2,000,000 persons, and represented the wealth, brains, and business ability of France. For two centuries they had been exerting more and more influence through their monopoly of commerce, industry, science, literature and philosophy. Such public opinion as existed in France was guided by them. They loaned money to the government and to the nobility, held important offices, and had become the actual masters of the destiny of the nation. Although forced to share the burdens of the state and church, yet they had no political rights and were made

Middle class

in many ways to feel their social inferiority. Fearing national bankruptcy, they demanded the right to inspect the king's accounts and even to regulate his expenditures; and made discontented by existing institutions, they urged social and political reforms. Many books and pamphlets set forth their cause. Quite a few of the estates of the nobility fell into their hands through forced sales. Indeed many a blue-blooded noble was glad to improve his worldly lot by the marriage of a daughter to the son of a wealthy banker or soap-maker. The land owned by the middle class was far from inconsiderable. Thus ability and money were bringing the *bourgeoisie* to the level of the nobility before the Revolution occurred. When that movement did begin, it was under the leadership of this able group, who guided it through its unsteady course. It must be remembered that the middle class under the old order also profited by special privileges, particularly in trade and industry. In Normandy, Flanders, and Picardy the large farmers formed a rural middle class.

The fourth estate

The fourth estate was made up of the peasants and town workers. The town workers, numbering perhaps 2,500,000, or one person in ten, had little opportunity to improve their lot. Some of the artisans were organized in guilds under rigid rules and sought to monopolize certain branches of industry and to curtail freedom of labor. This selfish system had to be broken down before the new order

The town workers

could come in. Outside of the guilds were thousands of persons who did all sorts of odd jobs and hard labor for low wages but were not organized. These workmen, with a hope for better things in their hearts, formed the revolutionary mobs and played an exciting part in the great transformation.

The peasants

The peasants, approximating 20,000,000, or four fifths of the nation, lived in the country villages mostly on the estates of the nobility. Of these possibly 1,000,000 were still serfs, mostly in Alsace and Lorraine, but this number was being gradually reduced by 1789. The rest were legally free to come and go, to buy and sell, and

to control their own lives. By 1789 at least two fifths of the land belonged to these free peasants, and peasant farms were constantly increasing. Some writers even affirm that the number of peasant proprietors was as large in 1789 as today. The peasants who did not own lands lived on the estates of the crown, the nobles and the church. But these free peasants were still saddled with heavy taxes by the state, with vexatious feudal dues by the lords, and with tithes by the church. Not only did they have to support idle bishops and spendthrift nobles, but from their meager earnings they were forced to bear an unfair share of the cost of the state. If the men of the middle class were justified in their insistence upon a new social and political system based on justice and equality, the peasants, who were the burden bearers of the old régime, were trebly justified. Of course their condition varied — some were well-to-do, while others were so poor that a bad harvest caused famine and serious illness entailed misery. In general, however, the peasants in France were freer and more prosperous than most peasants in Europe except those in England, the Netherlands, and northern Italy. Moreover the conditions were gradually growing better rather than worse. The *mainmorte* was abolished on the royal domain in 1779. Competent observers just prior to the outbreak of the Revolution give, on the whole, a favorable account. Jefferson in 1787 reported that the peasants had enough to eat and appeared happy and comfortable. Arthur Young after three extended tours wrote in his diary descriptions of prosperity and contentment alternating with wretchedness and destitution. Dr. Rigby saw "few of the lower classes in rags, idleness and misery." Voltaire, who knew Europe thoroughly, thought that the French peasants were fairly well situated. Rousseau was constantly praising them for their morality and joyous rural life. Compared with the American farmer of today, the lot of the French farmer before 1789 was certainly bad, but it was not so bad as that of the Russian, Chinese or Japanese farmers even now. The very fact that the peasants were mostly free and were becoming more enlightened, caused them to realize the evils and injustices of the old régime. It was not so much misery and oppression, but new ideas and discontent, that aroused in them the spirit of revolt. As they became enlightened, they branded their feudal lords as robbers, and demanded an efficient government to guarantee them equal rights and the protection of the fruits of their own industry.

Favorable conditions

Despite the handicaps under which trade and industry were placed there were some favorable conditions. To encourage internal communication a school of engineering and a corps of trained engineers with a budget of about 7,000,000 francs for bridges and roads were organized. In 1788, 12,000 leagues of highways had been built and that many more laid out. Great thoroughfares ran from Paris to all parts of the kingdom, but they were intended more for military purposes than to encourage trade. The smaller roads leading off from

the main highways were in a wretched condition, and were the occasion for numerous complaints. After 1770 considerable attention was given to interior navigation of rivers and canals particularly in the north. The means of transportation left much to be desired. It took from 18 to 20 hours to travel by water from Paris to Rouen, and to go by land from Paris to Marseilles consumed eleven days. A letter sent from Lyons to Bordeaux had to be sent by way of Paris and arrived in about eight days. The cost of transportation of merchandise was about three times less by water than by land but was hampered by frequent drawbacks. The seaports were numerous and used by little "barques" of from 50 to 100 tons. Commerce overseas was in a fairly flourishing condition. It was encouraged by banks and the institution of credit. The Council of Commerce tried to encourage trade, and reforms and commercial treaties with other states sought the same end. These favorable treaties stimulated trade with other nations, particularly the United States, England, and Italy. In supplying the Levant with her manufactured articles France held first place. The Company of the Indies was doing a flourishing business, and the colonial trade was considerable. The seaports on the Atlantic were filled with ships but those on the Mediterranean were less prosperous. In 1787 the imports were valued at over 634,000,000 francs and the exports at nearly 439,000,000 francs. In the three quarters of a century before the Revolution French foreign commerce had quadrupled and had exercised a tremendous influence on the growth of industry because much of the *surplus capital had been invested at home.*

Trade and industry

The Council of Commerce devoted much attention to the stimulation of factories in France. The inspectors of business instituted by Colbert were continued to the Revolution. The royal factories of tapestries, porcelains, and other articles were subsidized by state funds, and even by provinces and municipalities. With the rise of the *laissez-faire* theory the rigid state control of industry was relaxed and in consequence the number of industries increased. What might be called a rural industry sprang up under local capitalists; and when they began to unite, as was true in a number of instances, the foundations of the modern industrial system were laid. This transformation was accelerated by the invention of machinery first in the silk mills and then in the manufacture of cottons. English machines were introduced at an early date on a small scale. In the making of paper, notably at Annonay, machinery was substituted for hand labor. The Society du Creusot, established in 1787, and a few other companies were using the modern method of producing iron. In its coal mine in 1789 the Company d'Anzin was employing 4,000 men and 600 horses together with 12 steam engines. However by 1789 the factory system based on machinery was in its infancy in France, and the small industries predominated everywhere.

Beginning of the factory system

The government might be despotic and the social system absurd,

yet the industrial system of the old régime had brought greater material prosperity to France than to any other country in continental Europe. Of the steadily increasing population, four fifths were tilling the soil, and only one tenth was engaged in business. There was a good supply of livestock, and large quantities of grain and grapes were grown. But local duties and export customs on farm products hindered the development of agriculture. The total value of manufactured goods was $212,000,000 annually. The royal restrictions on industries were greater than those that hindered farming. Although foreign and colonial trade was not so prosperous as in England and Spain, yet the exports amounted to $108,000,000 and the imports $113,000,000 yearly. Consequently a national budget of $150,000,000 then weighed as heavily as $600,000,000 now, and a public debt of $1,000,000,000 in 1789 was a larger load than $4,000,000,000 in modern France. Trade and manufacturing were hampered by the royal practice of selling monopolies to increase the royal income. The numerous guilds with their special monopolies fettered business, made France a nation of small industries and caused much discontent among the workers, who organized and fomented strikes until the government forbade all combinations of employees. In spite of the hostility of the guilds and of royal edicts which opposed inventions and improvements, factories increased sixfold from Colbert to Necker. In 1789 soap to the value of $2,600,000 and hair powder to the value of $5,000,000 were produced — an interesting commentary on the life of that day. Loud were the outcries against the low wages, against the internal customs and fees, against the export duties on farm produce, and against the monopolies of the guilds. Freedom of industry and free trade with other nations were demanded. The exchange of goods was hampered by an almost infinite variety of weights and measures.

Industrial system

The educational system was based on the belief that only those at the top of society should have trained minds. Education for the masses, it was thought, might prove dangerous. Twenty-two universities prepared the chosen few for law, medicine, and theology. There was a college in every city, and a grammar school in nearly every district, for the children of the *bourgeoisie*, but few primary schools existed. In some places elementary instruction was free and even compulsory, but there was no public school system in the modern sense. Such a thing as an annual state budget for educational purposes was unheard of. Nevertheless, in general, the French were better educated than most of the European peoples. In 1790, 47 per cent of the men and 27 per cent of the women were able to sign their names to the marriage registers. The educational system was in the hands of the clergy who were not over-zealous to improve the intelligence of the people. Rousseau wrote much on the training of the young, and Turgot urged Louis XVI to establish a national school system for both sexes, but it was left for the Revolution to introduce

Educational system

such a change. No freedom of the press existed, and hence one of the best means of instructing the people was carefully restricted. The number of newspapers increased towards the Revolution, but editors had to be cautious. Books and pamphlets were available, however, in spite of the censorship, and did much to arouse the people to a realization of the new era dawning in the world.

The old régime in France may be summarized as follows:

Summary of old régime

1. The government was autocratic and inefficient, and encouraged injustice and inequality. The king's will was law, while the people, even the clergy and nobles, had little voice in national affairs. There was neither civil nor political liberty. The rights of free speech, assembly, and the press were denied. Arbitrary arrests were common, jury trial unknown, and no writ of *habeas corpus* was permitted. The laws lacked unity, uniformity, and were unwisely administered. National taxation was arbitrary, unfairly distributed, and corrupt. National funds were not spent solely for the welfare of the nation. Government officials were oppressive and open to bribery. Favoritism to the few, extravagance, and vain display characterized royal rule. Attempts were made to crush such traces of local government as remained under the powerful machinery of absolutism.

2. The church, wealthy and mighty, was closely allied with the autocratic state, and reflected its policies and practices, while its own obvious duties and opportunities were too often neglected. Freedom of worship was denied. Disbelief was rampant more especially among the scholars, higher clergy and nobles.

3. Society was based on the class distinctions and special privileges of an outgrown feudalism. The nobles and higher clergy enjoyed their feudal rights and prerogatives without giving adequate services in return. The middle class through its wealth and intelligence was emerging as the dominant power in the nation. The common people, having gained their emancipation from serfdom to a large degree, were galled and irritated by the arbitrary acts of the government and by the remnants of feudalism associated with the church, society, and the land system.

4. Economic evils accompanied a bad government and a vicious social system, and hindered industrial progress and national prosperity. Poverty and misery resulted. The peasants and town workers had to bear the brunt of the hardships of the old régime, and the parish priests suffered but little less.

5. National education was sadly neglected, and such as did exist was in the hands of the clergy. The press was closely censored, and books and pamphlets had to secure special permits for publication.

6. In short, the old régime had become but a hollow shell — a system which had come down beyond its time. Against the conditions it perpetuated, the murmur of the people increased in volume and vehemence as time passed, until, under the leadership of the middle class, it finaly broke forth in the Revolution.

2. The Genesis of the Revolutionary Spirit Prior to 1789

Conditions as described in the preceeding section were prevalent in all of western Europe during the second half of the eighteenth century: in some countries mediaevalism and feudalism were more firmly intrenched than in others, and conditions varied widely in different parts of the same country; but on the whole, western European culture was a unit. At the end of the century a great convulsion spread over Europe which was to put an end to this state of affairs, commonly called the old régime, and to substitute for it the new Europe of the nineteenth century. This Revolution first appeared in France in the last years of the eighteenth century, but in the following years it was spread over all of western Europe by the armies of Napoleon. When this military conqueror was finally defeated in 1815, the partisans of the old régime who attempted to restablish conditions as they had existed twenty-five years earlier, found themselves completely unable to do so.

If the old régime first broke down in France, this was not because the people of that country were worse off than others; in general, they were better off. It was the bankruptcy of the government which brought ruin to the old régime in France. The wars of Louis XIV had dissipated the wealth which that monarch had enjoyed in the early years of his reign; the frivolous and immoral Louis XV, acting on the theory of "after me the deluge," had done nothing to improve the finances of his country, and much to make them worse; and the well-meaning but stupid and lazy Louis XVI inherited a constantly increasing deficit which neither he nor any one else could check.

At the same time that the government was thus finding itself unable longer to carry on because of financial difficulties, popular criticism of the government became ever more powerful. Literary men, through their criticism of existing abuses, sent a wave of revolutionary ideas over France and the world. Many of their ideas were borrowed from England and America. They compared French institutions with those of other lands, and held up the glaring abuses at home to public scorn. They gave the people a vision of a new heaven and a new earth and fired them with a deep craving for a realization of the magic words "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity."[1] These thinkers gave France at that time the intellectual leadership of the world:

Literary men give people a new vision

1. Montesquieu, a nobleman and judge, made an open attack on despotic kings. In his *Spirit of Laws*, which ran through twenty-two editions, he contended that states were the creation of history and denied the doctrine of the divine right of kings to rule. The English government was praised as the best in the world because it guaranteed liberty to all its citizens. He urged the separation of the executive, legislative and judicial powers of government. The federal

Montesquieu

[1] This motto was first used during the Revolution.

constitution of the United States and the state constitutions embody many of his theories, and France in developing her constitutions was greatly indebted to him.

Voltaire

2. Voltaire, who came from the middle class, knew what it was to spend a year in the hated Bastille and to be beaten almost to death at the instigation of an outraged nobleman. For a time he was the favorite of the court, then, a fugitive from the clutches of royal power, he lived in England. He visited the court of Frederick the Great in Prussia. His scorn for the old régime with its injustices and inequalities was deep and scorching. His satire was biting and witty; his invectives lashed the hypocrisies and bigotries of his day; and his versatility made him the most accomplished writer of the age. Feeling that the old order must be swept away before the new régime could start, destruction became his supreme task. Hence he aimed his hardest blows at the Roman Catholic Church and attacked the abuses of the state. He himself caught no vision of democracy, for he said that he would rather be ruled by one lion than by a hundred gutter rats, but he set thousands to think about it. He gave his own name to the period — "the Age of Voltaire" — the best commentary on his influence.

Rousseau

3. Rousseau, the son of a Geneva watchmaker, was the constructive prophet of the old régime. His contempt for the evils of the ancient order was as great as that of Voltaire, but he urged the complete reorganization of human society. As an unsuccessful member of the unprivileged middle class, he wandered over Europe poor and discontented but with the conviction that "to love God above all things, and your neighbor as yourself, is the sum of the law." He dreamed of a past, when all were free and equal; when all owned the land; and when there were no wars to kill, no taxes to oppress, and no philosophers to mislead. Civilization, he said, brought selfish greed, private property, servitude, and tyranny. These ideas were popularized in a little book called *The Social Contract* in which, ignoring the facts of history, he pictured the state as originating in a voluntary democratic agreement of all the people. Hence he advocated a republic, based on "popular sovereignty," and ruled by the will of a majority, as the best form of government. This idea spread over the world like a new Gospel. It had much to do with the American Revolution and its results, and helped to establish a republic in France fourteen years after his death.

Diderot

4. Diderot, another influential thinker, associated with himself the most distinguished scientists and scholars to gather all human knowledge together in an *Encyclopedia*. This work became the program of the revolutionists in their attack on the political, ecclesiastical, and social institutions of the old régime and supplied the facts on which men might attempt to reconstruct civilization. It set forth the world point of view. "All lands of all men," said Diderot, "have become necessary to one another for the exchange of

the fruits of industry and the products of the soil." Autocracy, intolerance, slavery, the harsh criminal law, unfair taxes, and feudalism were all assailed by the Encyclopedists.

5. Quesnay, the *bourgeois* court physician of Louis XV, gathered about him a group of men known as "Economists" or "Physiocrats," to study trade, commerce and finance. They assailed the economic evils and advocated a series of reforms. Believing that agriculture is the only source of national wealth, they urged the removal of all restraints on it. A single tax on land was declared to be the most equitable and scientific mode of taxation. According to their theory, called *laissez-faire*, the production and distribution of goods should be left to follow the natural laws of supply and demand unhampered by governmental regulations. Free trade, as the basis for national prosperity, was their goal. This new political economy was reflected in England by Adam Smith in his famous book, *The Wealth of Nations*. Turgot, one of their number, as minister of finance, attempted to put into practice some of their recommendations. Thus, from another standpoint, the Physiocrats were also arousing the spirit of revolt against the industrial and financial system of the old régime.

Quesnay

It should not be supposed, however, that any of these men were republicans, revolutionists or radicals. Most of them admired more than anything else the constitutional monarchy of England and all abhorred revolution and violence. But their critical ideas helped to create the unrest and ferment that led to revolution.

The success of the American Revolution likewise appeared to many Frenchmen as the realization of those liberal ideas for which they were contending at home. Furthermore thousands of young men had gone to America to help the colonists secure their independence. There they saw those ideas, which had been given to the world by their own daring thinkers, triumph in the new political and social institutions of the American Republic. They returned to France with their minds full of the sentiments of the Declaration of Independence, and proud of having helped to create a new and a free nation. As they scattered over their own country, boasting of the régime of liberty they had inaugurated across the seas, they could not avoid comparing what they had seen and felt in the New World with what they found in the Old World. All France, in fact, had been watching with deep interest the experiment across the sea. Its success served as a powerful stimulus in inciting the spirit of revolution in France.

Influence of the American Revolution

The "Enlightened Despots" of Europe also studied the schism in the British Empire, read the works of the French reformers, conferred with some of them at court, and honestly sought to improve the most flagrant abuses in their realms. Ancient laws were replaced by modern laws. Many of the privileges of the nobility were curtailed. The power and wealth of the church were reduced. Factories and commerce were encouraged. But there was no thought of

Efforts of the "enlightened despots"

establishing popular, representative government. These few reforms merely called emphatic attention to the remaining evils, and aroused greater popular discontent. At the same time the changes angered the privileged classes and caused them to cling more tenaciously to their rights. The example of other European countries reacted on France and further encouraged the spirit of revolt. "Liberalism" became a social fad. When, in a popular play, a great noble was told that all he had done to deserve his special privileges was "to be born," all the nobles laughed and cheered. They saw the impending storm without appreciating its significance.

Influence of the British constitution

The British constitution and the absence of feudalism in England challenged the admiration of intelligent Frenchmen. Many of them had travelled, and some had lived for years, in England. Such political writers as Locke were read by the French thinkers, who were continually pointing out the contrasts between their own country and England, and urging imitation. The popularity of English ideas and institutions was followed by the adoption of English fashions — such as horse-racing, short stirrups, plain clothes, linen dresses, bread and butter, and social clubs.

Summary of new forces

An intellectual revolution, based on the scientific observation of facts, on experimentation, and on the new inventions, was breaking down veneration for the past and leading people to look hopefully to the future for better things. In the face of a hostile church, the scientists boldly studied man, nature, the earth, and the universe. Natural laws were discovered; and thinkers dared to assert that by the use of human reason the state, church, society, and other institutions could be improved. This new hope inspired men to attempt to better existing conditions. The spirit of progress was surely undermining the old forces. The new science, supplementing the bold stand of the law courts, the destructive and constructive criticism of the literary men, the example of the American Revolution, and the labors of the enlightened despots, was arousing in France a passion for change. Some were content with reform; others desired to sweep away entirely the mediaeval institutions and begin civilization anew on a higher grade. Segur, reflecting on the Revolution wrote: "We believed that we were entering a golden age of which past centuries gave no idea, and in the future we saw only the good that could be secured for humanity by the reign of reason. We were disciples of new doctrines. . . . Voltaire charmed our intelligence and Rousseau touched our hearts." Another contemporary said: "The chiefs of the Revolution imagined that they were assembled to correct every fault of the past and every error of the human mind, and to secure the happiness of future generations."

Comment of Segur

In 1774 the young rulers, Louis XVI and Marie Antoinette, ascended the French throne — a throne undermined by an intellectual revolution. The new monarch was ignorant of Europe and did not understand France. His ideals were high, but he was irresolute and

incapable. The queen was vain, frivolous, and indiscreet. She was mocked as a stupid foreigner, and court gossips tried to blacken her character. Under these sovereigns national finances were in the utmost disorder. The people were grumbling about the heavy taxes. At first, the big man among the king's advisers was Turgot, minister of finance, who sought to save the country from bankruptcy and at the same time equalize the burden of taxation. His reform program included the consolidation of the national debt, a scientific budget, simplification of taxation in the direction of a single tax on land paid by all classes, the abolition of internal customs and substitution of free trade, freedom of the serfs, the overthrow of feudalism, dissolution of the guilds, a new code of criminal law, the restoration of local and national assemblies, freedom of the press, and religious toleration. This remarkable scheme might have saved France from the Revolution, but all those who profited from privileges, pensions, and offices turned their guns against Turgot. "Do not forget, Sire," he cautioned Louis XVI, "that it was weakness that put the head of Charles I on the block." The vacillating monarch dismissed Turgot saying "Alas! there are but two men in the whole nation who really love the people — Monsieur Turgot and myself." When Voltaire heard the news, he lamented, "Nothing is left for me now but to die."

Louis XVI and his queen

Turgot's reforms

Necker, a wealthy Swiss banker in Paris, was called to succeed Turgot. He announced his intention to balance the budget by reforming the methods of taxation and by borrowing money to restore public confidence. His proposed reforms brought a storm of protests from the nobility and clergy. They denounced him as a foreigner and a Protestant. The queen insisted upon his dismissal. Before leaving office, however, he published a little book called *Compte rendu au roi* (Report to the King), which revealed the actual state of public finances and proposed certain reforms. Over 80,000 copies of this work were soon in the hands of eager readers, who for the first time saw the inside of the finances of the autocracy. Within seven years Necker was recalled to power. Meanwhile the king entrusted the national finances to Calonne, a dashing courtier, whose foolish policy was to bolster up the embarrassed monarchy by loans. In four years he borrowed $300,000,000. Soon the treasury was empty and no more fools could be found to fill it. Then the spendthrift turned reformer. "Why this is sheer Necker," was the king's comment on his scheme for reforms. "It is the best that can be done," blandly answered Calonne. In desperation, the king, in 1787, called the Assembly of Notables, composed of the most prominent persons in the state and church. When the Notables learned from Calonne that the national debt had been increased by $80,000,000, they demanded his recall. At the same time a series of sweeping reforms was recommended. When Lafayette urged the convocation of the States General, the count of Artois, the president of the Notables, cried: "What! Do you

Necker's reforms

Calonne

Assembly of Notables

demand the calling of the States General?" "Yes, Monseigneur," answered Lafayette, "and even more than that." Bailly remarked that the Notables merely postponed "the evils to a greater day."

States General demanded

When the king sent the reform decrees to the court of Paris for registration, that body approved of all of them except the land tax and the stamp tax. It declared that "Only the nation assembled in the States General can give the consent necessary to the establishment of a permanent tax." It humbly begged the king to summon that body. This was little short of rebellion and recognized as such by the monarch. He exiled the Paris court, thereby causing a popular uproar until the court was recalled after consenting to register a general tax in place of the two objectionable ones. Soon another royal edict, which authorized loans for five years, was protested. In anger the king sent for the minutes of the court and tore out the protest. In 1788 he replaced all the courts with a new judicial system, but a threatened uprising of the people, who regarded the courts as the bulwark of their liberties, forced the monarch to restore them to power. Another victory was won against absolute monarchy. The reform programs proposed before 1789 were excellent. Had Louis XVI possessed the foresight and will to see them enforced, the old régime might have been transformed into the new régime gradually and without violence. But he was lacking in courage, if not conviction and gave way to the demands of the privileged classes before anything worth while could be accomplished. Hence it was left to the gigantic sweep of the Revolution to tear up the evils by the roots and cast them aside in the interest of progress and humanity.

Louis XVI unequal to the task of reforming France

Bankruptcy thus brought the old régime in France to ruin. In desperate need of filling his empty treasury, the king was at last driven to accept Necker's advice and to summon the States General, in the hope that the people of the kingdom, represented in this body, would contribute the funds which the nobility had refused. But the majority of the members of the States General were members of the middle class and were inspired by the idealism of their class and day. They absolutely refused to perform the one service asked of them and dissolve; they insisted, instead, upon extensive reforms in the government of France, and reluctantly the king gave in. When the flood gates had thus once been opened, and reform had swept into the land, no man could close them again until the Revolution had run its course.

3. The Summoning of the States General

States General called

The States General was an old feudal body which had not been assembled for 175 years. It was composed of three estates, or chambers, representing the clergy as the first, the nobility as the second, and the rest of the people as the third estate. Necker was too indolent specifically to exclude the fourth estate, so many of the lower classes voted to elect the representatives of the third estate. This was the

first approximation to universal suffrage in human history. Each estate had one vote, hence the privileged estates might outvote the third estate on every proposed reform. This situation was discussed widely. The leaders of the third estate, differing greatly from those of 1614 who addressed their sovereign on their knees, demanded a reorganization of the methods of representation and voting, while the privileged orders clamored for their sacred rights. When the court of Paris favored the old organization of the States General, it lost all its popularity. Finally Necker who had been recalled to power compromised by giving the first and second estates 300 representatives each, and the third estate 600, leaving the method of voting unchanged. During the stirring election of 1200 members of the States General, the king had asked the different orders to draw up lists of abuses needing correction, and of advisable reforms. These documents, called *cahiers*, of which some 60,000 have been preserved, reflect the ideas and feelings of the people. They show that most of the evils were due to autocratic government, but none of them asked for a republic. Nor was a voice raised for the political enfranchisement of the lower classes. Some demanded a constitution with regular meetings of the States General. Some of the *cahiers* of the privileged order were remarkably liberal. Those of the third estate were most emphatic in demanding the abolition of feudal dues. As a whole they show that the nation was eager for a reformation of the social, economic, and political systems, but gave no hint of a violent upheaval.

Representation and voting

Cahiers

Dressed in costumes of 1614, which the king had ordered to be worn, the deputies of the States General gathered in one of the royal palaces at Versailles on May 5, 1789 for the opening session. From his throne, with the queen at his side, Louis XVI welcomed them in an address that he had rehearsed like a schoolboy. Necker's message was three hours long. After its delivery, the royal pair left the hall amid cries of "*Vive le roi.*" Several significant incidents irritated the third estate. In the first place, after being sent into the hall through a back door, they were kept standing until the clergy and nobles were seated.' Secondly, the king, after this speech, reseated himself and put on his hat. The nobles and clergy then put on their hats. The commoners started to do the same, when cries of protest arose. In the confusion, the king settled the trouble by removing his hat, and all followed his example. Nothing was said about the reforms which the third estate had expected, and the tone of the king was patronizing. Finally, the privileged orders filed out behind the rulers leaving the representatives of the people to find their way out the best they could. Thus a bad impression was given to the third estate at the outset.

Opening session

The nation had been asked for more taxes, but the vital question of voting had not been settled. Over that issue a deadlock of six weeks resulted. At last on June 17, by a vote of 491 to 90 the third

Victory of Third Estate on voting

estate, actually representing 96 per cent of the nation and knowing itself to be the real power in France, declared itself to be the National Assembly of France. That was the first step in the French Revolution. The second step was taken on June 20, when this new Assembly, finding their hall closed to them on a rainy morning by order of the king, rushed into the near-by royal tennis court and took an oath "never to separate . . . until the constitution of the kingdom shall be established." A few days later Louis XVI sanctioned the usurpation of legislative power by the third estate. He ordered the nobles and clergy to join the Assembly and to vote by individuals and not by orders. The first phase of the Revolution had been won by the middle class supported by the nation. The National Assembly now changed its name to National Constituent Assembly, and appointed a committee to frame a new constitution.

4. The National Constituent Assembly

The court "ring," realizing how much autocracy and privilege had lost, began to plot for the overthrow of the Assembly. German and Swiss troops were located near Paris and Versailles to suppress uprisings in case the Assembly should be dissolved. The immediate withdrawal of these troops was demanded by the Assembly. Alarmed by the danger threatening the Assembly, the people of Paris decided to arm themselves. Seeking arms for this purpose, a motley mob attacked and tore down the old Bastille, as this fortress had been one of the state prisons. Their act presently was regarded as a symbol of resistence to tyranny of the old régime. The day, July 14, is still celebrated in France as the great French national holiday. This outbreak in Paris was followed by the creation of a new form of city government, the *commune*, or municipal council, elected by the wards. At the same time a national guard under General Lafayette was organized to preserve order and to protect the city against royal troops. The king, tired out by a day's hunting and in bed, when informed of what had happened in Paris, asked: "What? Has there been a riot?" "No, Sire," replied the courier, "a revolution." The next day, unattended, he hurried to the Assembly for advice and protection. He promised to recall Necker and to remove the foreign troops. Two days later, after making his will and partaking of the holy sacrament, accompanied by 200 deputies he went to Paris. There he donned the tricolor cockade, and approved all the changes the people had made. A new political régime was emerging, and the king seemed to be giving it his cordial approval. Almost as important as this revolution, was the sweeping administrative revolution which came a little later. The ancient and confused local administrative divisions of France were abolished and replaced by the departments, districts, cantons and communes which still constitute the basis of French local government.

Fall of the Bastille

Paris Commune

King in Paris

Meantime the country districts by the end of July were swept

by a wave of social revolution. The peasants, gathered in the parish church, or on the village commons, were abolishing the feudal dues. The "war on the châteaux" began and many of the feudal castles were sacked to destroy the records of feudal obligations. A committee of the Assembly reported early in August that in addition to the destruction of castles, millers were hanged, tax-gatherers drowned, warehouses torn down, and salt depots burned. Thus a radical revolution was marching much more rapidly without the Assembly than within. This report opened the eyes of the deputies to the necessity for immediate action. Seeing the handwriting on the wall, it was moved, in the famous night session of August 4–5, that feudalism in France be abolished.[1] This motion carried. The clergy also agreed to surrender their tithes, and the priests and judges their fees. The old game laws were swept away. Exemption from taxes were "forever abolished." Offices and honors were opened to all citizens "without distinction of birth" and all undeserved "pension, favors, and salaries" were suppressed. Manorial courts were abolished. Never in the world's history had such a thing occurred. The altruism and the voluntary nature of the decisions of this famous night session have, however, been greatly exaggerated. The clergy and third estate abolished the feudal dues; and the nobility and third estate abolished the tithes. The man who moved the abolition of the feudal system — the vicomte de Noailles — was a notorious pauper and dead-beat, son of a younger branch of the family, and was popularly dubbed "John Lackland." The duke d'Aiguillon, who seconded the motion was certainly not the richest man in France, or anything like it. Moreover, by these decrees, the nobles lost only what had already been taken from them.

Social revolution spreads to the country

Feudalism abolished

Tithes surrendered

Within four months two momentous revolutions had occurred — one, political, destroying absolute monarchy; the other, social, abolishing feudalism. Louis XVI bowed with good grace to the loss of autocratic power. But thousands of nobles and higher clergy outside the Assembly refused to accept the social revolution. Some, like the count d'Artois, the king's brother, fled to foreign lands after the fateful fall of the Bastille to secure help from the champions of autocracy. Those left in France urged the feeble monarch to veto the decrees of August 4–5. As the months passed without royal approval, and as poor harvests were followed by ugly rumors of royalist counter-plots, the rabble of Paris became active. On October 5 a mob of several thousand women and some men of the lower class set out from Paris to demand bread of the king. Lafayette slowly followed with the national guard, and found the mob camped for the night in front of the huge royal palace at Versailles. Next morning the mob killed some of the royal guards, broke into the palace, and forced the king accompanied by the dauphin and the queen to appear on a balcony before the people and to promise to go to Paris to live. "Bring the

Flight of the nobles

Paris mob goes to Versailles

[1] On this subject one should consult S. Herbert, *The Fall of Feudalism in France* (1921).

king and the Assembly to Paris," advised one of the journals, "and the price of bread will go down."

Funeral procession of the old régime

At one o'clock on October 6 the funeral procession of the old régime began. The royal family dubbed "the baker, the baker's wife, and their son," surrounded by the rabble carrying on their pikes the heads of the slain guards, drove back to Paris, and took up their residence in the Tuileries, virtually prisoners of the Parisians. In about two weeks the Assembly held its first session in the capital. Many persons believed that the Revolution was now over. In reality only a new phase had begun. The old States General, summoned to save France from bankruptcy, had transformed itself into a modern legislative body. The representatives of the third estate, under the lead of the middle class, had forced a new method of voting in the Assembly by means of which they held the majority of votes. Paris had set up a new type of city government. The peasants had forced the Assembly to abolish feudalism and to equalize taxation. Finally the Paris mob had forced the monarch and Assembly to go to Paris, where the populace exercised more and more power over them. The transfer of the Assembly from Versailles to Paris marked the beginning of a new era in the Revolution. It meant the gradual but sure development of violence and mob rule under the growing domination of the Paris masses. The events of October 6 led straight to the excesses of the National Convention and the Jacobins.

Declaration of the Rights of Man

Meanwhile the committee named to draft a constitution occupied itself with its task. French writers had praised the English constitution. Franklin, when minister to France had the American state constitutions translated, and the federal constitution of 1787 was well known. The court of Paris had talked a good deal about "fundamental laws," the *cahiers* demanded a constitution as one of the chief tasks of the States General, and in the Tennis Court Oath the third estate had sworn to give the nation a constitution. The committee began its work by first drafting a Declaration of the Rights of Man. In doing so they had the advice of the author of the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson, then in Paris as the American minister to France. Just before the storming of the Bastille, Lafayette, who was familiar with the American bills of rights, introduced into the Assembly a draft of such a document. Another deputy urged the adoption of "the noble idea of the Declaration, conceived in another hemisphere." It was not until August 26, however, that the Declaration was completed. The tragic events of October 5-6 forced the king to sanction it. The chief provisions of the document were: (1) "All men are born free, and equal in rights." (2) The purpose of government is to preserve the "natural rights of man." (3) The nation alone is sovereign. (4) "Liberty consists in the power to do anything that does not injure others." (5) "Law is the expression of the general will." (6) "Every man is presumed

innocent until he has been pronounced guilty." (7) Freedom of conscience, speech, and the press is guaranteed so long as it does "not derange the public order." (8) All public officials are accountable to the people. (9) Property is a "sacred and inviolable right." (10) Taxes should be paid by all in proportion to their ability to pay. Setting forth the principles of modern, democratic government, this Declaration, to the present time, is a part of the fundamental political *beliefs of the French people.*

The Constitution of 1791

This statement of principles formed the preamble of the new constitution which was slowly elaborated from 1789 to 1791. Like the constitution of the United States, it was a compromise between the conservative and liberal forces, and was based on two ideas: (1) the sovereignty of the people, and (2) the separation of governmental powers. It created an hereditary, constitutional monarchy similar to that of England. The "King of the French," whose person was "sacred," was subjected to the laws of the nation. He could appoint and dismiss his ministers, but they were required to report their expenditures to the legislature. He had a "suspensive veto," by which a law not approved by him remained inoperative unless passed by three successive legislatures. He conducted foreign affairs, and was the head of the army, but could neither declare war nor make peace. He was the servant of the people's will but had no share in forming this will. The legislature was a single house of 745 members elected for two years by all male citizens who paid taxes equal to three days' labor. By this provision about 3,000,000 men were not given the right to vote, and political power was placed in the hands of the middle class. The legislature's functions and powers were very extensive. Judges of every rank were elected by the voters. For purposes of local government, France was divided into 83 departments, which, in turn, were subdivided into districts, cantons, and communes. "All of the peculiar privileges" of the provinces were swept away and replaced by "the laws common to all Frenchmen." All local officers were chosen by the people.

Church revolution

The political and social revolutions were accompanied by an ecclesiastical revolution. Many of the *cahiers* had demanded radical changes in the church. The decrees of August 4–5 had abolished the feudal rights, tithes, and fees of the clergy. The Declaration of the Rights of Man established religious freedom, and deprived the church of the right of censorship over the press. On November 2, 1789, the Assembly took the drastic step of confiscating all church property, but agreed to pay the salaries of the clergy and to provide for poor-relief from state funds. This was followed by the dissolution of the monasteries. The confiscated church lands were sold to finance the national government, now in the direst straits for money. The Civil Constitution of the Clergy was adopted on July 12, 1790, to reorganize the propertyless church. The 117 old bishoprics were

reduced to 83 to correspond with the departments. The clergy became civil officials elected by the people. The nominal headship of the pope at Rome was recognized, but in reality the new French Church had become nationalized. Before taking office the clergy must take an oath, like civil officers, pledging loyalty to the national constitution. Protestants, Jews and atheists might join with loyal Catholics in electing catholic officials. The pope, bishops, priests, and monks openly attacked these changes; thousands of laymen, who had supported other phases of the Revolution, displayed their hostility to these measures. When the Assembly ordered all clergy to take the required oath within a week, only four bishops and one third of the priests did so. The "non-jurors" were branded as "disturbers of the peace" and treated as having resigned their offices. Hence the clergy joined the dissatisfied nobles and plotted for the overthrow of the Revolution. And the king, who felt that he had violated his conscience in signing the laws, became a more bitter foe of the Assembly.

The "non-jurors"

One of the most disastrous policies of the Revolution was indirectly associated with the church reforms, namely, the financial policy to which the confiscation of church property gave rise. Large issues of paper money or *assignats* were authorized with the expectation that they would be redeemed by the income from the sale of these church lands. But so unpopular was the new ecclesiastical policy that few would buy the land offered for sale, and much of the money derived from the sale was diverted through graft. Hence, the paper money became more and more worthless, and was issued in ever greater quantities. It depreciated even more than the notorious continental currency in our Revolutionary War, and this financial policy for the time being ruined the credit and finances of France and constituted one of the chief problems which had to be met by the Directory and Napoleon.

The assignats and the ruin of the French financial system

The "emigration" of the nobles was accelerated by the attack on the church. These frightened and despoiled *émigrés*, living at the courts of neighboring countries and burning with a desire for revenge, were plotting to embroil Europe in war with the new government of France. They urged the king to flee from France and to appeal to his brother monarchs to restore his absolute power. The Assembly retaliated by confiscating the property of the *émigrés*. It proclaimed them traitors punishable by death, and, as a final blow, abolished all hereditary titles of nobility. As a virtual prisoner in Paris, Louis XVI at last resolved to join the *émigrés*, hoping to return with an army to crush the Revolution. On the night of June 20, 1791, the queen dressed as a Russian countess and the king disguised as her valet, fled from the Tuileries. At Varennes the king was recognized by his prominent nose, and three members of the Assembly were sent to bring the royal family back to the capital, where they were held prisoners on their own thrones by their own subjects. The king's

Émigrés urged war on Revolution

Retaliation of Assembly

Flight of the royal family

betrayal of the constitution was proved by the royal decree, which he had left behind him, annulling every act of the Assembly since June 23, 1789. Now for the first time the word "republic" was heard openly on the streets, and a republican party began to form. The Constitutional Assembly adjourned on September 30, 1791, after having passed 2,500 laws, which had transformed France from an absolute to a limited monarchy under the rule of the middle class, reorganized society on the basis of equality, and nationalized the church.

Republic now openly urged

5. The Legislative Assembly

Meanwhile the election of the Legislative Assembly created by the new constitution was held. Since a self-denying ordinance, passed by the Constituent Assembly in its last days, prevented any of the members of the old National Assembly from taking seats in the new body, the 745 members chosen reflected the wishes of the people but were absolutely without training or experience in self-government. Among them were more politicians and literary men and fewer lawyers, nobles, and clergy. They came mostly from the younger middle class, and were divided into two distinct parties: (1) The Right, or Constitutional Monarchists, who at first had a large majority, felt that the Revolution had gone far enough and that France should begin to live her new life under the constitution of 1791. (2) The Left, or Republicans, were hostile to the monarchy and eager to carry the Revolution a step further. These 240 deputies formed two groups: the Jacobins and the Girondists. The former represented the political clubs of Paris and the provincial cities, and, although few in number, spoke emphatically in favor of a more democratic government. The Girondists, though most of their leaders came from Bordeaux, represented the country districts, hated and feared the Paris mob, and dreamed of an ideal republic.

The Legislative Assembly

Parties

The first problem to attract the attention of the Legislative Assembly was the hostility of the clergy and the nobles. Since the clergy were fomenting insurrection against the public welfare and conspiring with the enemies of the nation, they were ordered to take the oath to obey the constitution or lose their offices and pay, and be liable to imprisonment. The king's veto of this act aroused a storm of opposition in the republican ranks. The nobles continued their efforts to overthrow the Revolution. On the German border they had an army of 20,000 ready to invade France. The count of Provence, the brother of Louis XVI, proclaimed himself "Regent of France" on the ground that the king was a prisoner. Coöperating with the clergy the *émigrés* induced the peasants of the province of Vendée to rise in revolt. In the face of these menaces, the *émigrés* were proclaimed guilty of "conspiracy against the fatherland" and punishable by death. When the king also vetoed this decree, the Assembly abolished the terms "Sire" and "Your Majesty" in

Progress of revolution under the Legislative Assembly

addressing him, and proceeded, in defiance of the constitution, to usurp executive power. In the meantime business in France was in a hodgepodge. The paper money, which was issued on the security of confiscated church lands, depreciated in value every day, and the cost of living mounted. Many of the business men said that the Revolution had resulted in more evil than good.

From the outbreak of the French Revolution the absolute monarchs of Europe were alarmed lest the wicked example might spread to their own countries. When Leopold II of Austria, the brother of Marie Antoinette, heard of the arrest of the royal pair at Varennes, he declared that "the honor of all sovereigns and the security of every government" were compromised by that illegal act. Hence he suggested to his brother monarchs that they combine to restore "the liberty and honor of the most Christian King and his family, and place a check upon the dangerous excesses of the French Revolution, the fatal example of which it behooves every government to repress."

Alarm of European monarchs

Declaration of Pillnitz

The king of Prussia alone was won over by this appeal. At the instigation of the count of Artois, these two monarchs issued on Aug. 27, 1791, the famous Declaration of Pillnitz. Since the cause of Louis XVI was that of all European rulers, it stated, they were ready to reinstate him in his rights, provided others were willing to join them. As it was certain that England would not then coöperate, this Declaration meant nothing, and was drawn up merely to placate the count of Artois; but to the French people it seemed a threat, and therefore made them more suspicious of the king and queen, and led the radicals to assert that it was the duty of Frenchmen, who had destroyed tyranny at home, to aid other peoples in securing their liberty.

For months the possibility of war with the absolute monarchs of Europe gripped men in France. The fiery Jacobins and eloquent Girondists threw the nation into a patriotic fever. People donned the red cap of liberty, and wore the long trousers of the workingmen as emblems of equality and fraternity. The war spirit, capturing all parties in the Assembly, led to the declaration of war on Austria on April 20, 1792. Only seven men dared to vote against it. Robespierre said that it would aid only the rich, while the poor would have to bear the brunt of it. These pacifists were howled down by the assertion that this was a war of defense, not conquest; a war against despots, not peoples; and a war to insure the rights of "a free nation." The war marked a new phase in the French Revolution. It was a clash between the new régime in France and the old régime in Europe; between "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" and privileges, injustices, and inequalities. It resulted in the destruction of the monarchy and the creation of a republic in France. It spread the ideas of the French Revolution all over Europe. At the same time it began a generation of wars that ended in Napoleon and the restoration. Prussia now joined Austria "to put an end to anarchy."

Revolutionary France declared war on Austria

The invasion of France by two monarchical enemies produced an

immediate reaction. The Assembly ordered the non-juring clergy deported to the penal colonies, and sold the estates of the *émigrés*. The nation was called to arms to drive out the invaders. The Paris *commune*, under the direction of the dynamic Danton, incited a mob to attack the royal palace on August 10, and the next day forced the Assembly to suspend the king from office and call a new Constitutional Convention to be elected by universal manhood suffrage — the first example in modern history. Danton was made the head of a provisional executive council. The king and queen were imprisoned, and a number of suspected persons were arrested. Marat's newspaper, "The Friend of the People" urged the death of all "enemies of the state." The Paris *commune* usurped the powers of the national government and brutally massacred 1,200 of the 3,000 prisoners — priests, aristocrats, and *bourgeoisie*. "We march upon the enemy, but leave behind no brigands to slaughter our wives and children" was the explanation made to the rest of France. The lie was given to all those noble sentiments of the Revolution about the rights of man, liberty, and freedom of opinion. To the credit of the more humane members of the *commune*, it should be said that they sent a letter to the country repudiating the massacre. Under these stern measures the French military line stiffened, the foreign foe was checked one hundred miles from Paris, and within a month driven off French soil.

France invaded by Austria and Prussia

Massacre of "enemies of the state"

6. The National Convention

The National Convention met September 20, 1792 with the Girondists and Jacobins in control. Of the 782 members 89 had been members of the States General and 181 had sat in the Legislative Assembly. Of the three parties in the Convention the Girondists, representing the *bourgeoisie* and the rural districts, had 165 members, but no effective leadership. They believed that the Revolution should be worked out in a strictly legal manner, and hence disapproved of the recent massacres in Paris and feared the *commune* under the control of the Jacobins. They wanted a federal republic based on the 83 departments. The Jacobins or the Mountain, who drew their strength from Paris and other large cities, defended the dictatorship of the *commune*, and advocated a strongly centralized republic to preserve order and liberty. They were well organized, ably led by Danton, Robespierre and Marat, and supported by the lower classes of Paris. Between these two groups sat the Plain, which, by voting with one side or the other, was able to determine the majority. In the contest for control in the Convention the Jacobins won and the Girondists went down to defeat and death.

Girondists and Jacobins

The first act of the Convention was to vote unanimously "that monarchy is abolished in France" and to decree that "the French Republic is one and indivisible." Thus within three years France had been transformed from an absolute monarchy into the First

Creation of the First Republic

French Republic. The trial of "Louis Capet" for conspiracy against the nation followed as a "logical necessity." "The kings of Europe challenge us," thundered Danton. Let us hurl the "head of the king" at their feet as our challenge. Out of 721 votes 387 were for death. The conviction was made easy by the discovery of a secret casket containing treasonable correspondence between the royal family and the *émigrés* and foreign princes. On January 21, 1793, Louis XVI mounted the scaffold saying, "May my blood assure the happiness of France." The rulers of Europe promptly accepted the challenge of the Republic, and England, Spain, Holland, and the smaller states of Germany and Italy allied themselves with Austria and Prussia to punish "this democratic firebrand, which threatens to set Europe aflame." Republicanism was arrayed against autocracy, and had to conquer on the field of battle to live. A wave of crusading zeal surged over France. The Convention voted to aid all oppressed peoples to overthrow their rulers. Other peoples were to have the liberties which the French had come to possess. A crusade to free the world from monarchical absolutism was widely discussed. The greedy allies secretly discussed the partition of France. For over twenty years this terrific struggle went on, in one way or another, until in 1815 a British ship carried Napoleon Bonaparte to his island prison.

War with Europe

To meet the enemies of the Republic at home and abroad, the Convention on January 4, 1793, formed the Committee of General Security with subcommittees throughout the nation. As conditions grew worse, the first Committee of Public Safety was appointed on April 6 to "establish the despotism of liberty in order to crush the despotism of kings." A Revolutionary Tribunal was created with power to punish those who were disloyal to the Revolution. Such was the strong, despotic machinery devised to safeguard the Republic. In the hands of the extreme Jacobins, it led directly to the Reign of Terror. Universal military service was decreed. Frantic efforts were made to secure foreign allies both in Europe and America, but in vain. Single-handed, France was forced to meet her foes. Inspired by a new militant nationalism, the republicans began to talk, in the language of Louis XIV, about their "natural boundaries" — the Alps and the Rhine River. Hence the conquered districts in Belgium and Germany were annexed to the Republic after the people had given their approval, and transformed by the new political and social ideas. When the Girondists, as advocates of law and order, sought to block the impetuosity of the Jacobins, the Paris mob forced the Convention to vote the expulsion and arrest of their leaders. The rabble of the capital had usurped the sovereign power of the nation and left the Jacobins supreme in the Convention. Outside of Paris, however, there was so much hostility to Jacobin rule that civil war was threatened, and meanwhile the foreign invaders once more had come within a hundred miles of Paris. Never did men in control

Creation of strong government

Fall of the Girondists

of a national government exhibit more marvelous energy in meeting a menacing situation.

The Convention had been called to draft a new constitution for the Republic on a representative basis but radical in content. This so-called constitution of 1793 asserted that government is instituted to guarantee equality, liberty, security and property; and the freedom of employment, speech, press, assembly and worship. Liberty means "*Do not do to another that which you do not wish should be* done to you." The state should provide for the jobless and unfortunate. "Let any person who usurps the sovereignty" of the people "be put to death." Education should be placed "at the door of every citizen." Each generation should be permitted to make its own constitution. When governments violate the rights of the people, they may exercise their sacred right of revolution. This constitution was intended to placate the hostile departments by safeguarding their rights against the dictatorship of the Parisians. Apparently it accomplished its purpose, for the people almost unanimously ratified it. But it was never actually put into operation, because the war emergencies demanded guidance by a strong hand.

New Constitution

The Convention under the Jacobins now assumed dictatorial power to save the Revolution from defeat at the hands of the European monarchs. The instruments used to strike terror and fear in the hearts of its opponents were more despotic than any used by the Bourbon monarchy:

Government by Terror

1. The Committee of Public Safety composed of twelve men, exercised supreme legislative and executive power. Located in the king's palace, with insane energy it issued countless decrees, sent thousands to the guillotine, fired the patriot-army to repel the foreign invaders, and bullied the masses into enthusiastic submission. The committee acted in the name of *liberty*, but its weapons were tyranny, injustice, force, fear, and terror.

Committee of Public Safety

2. The Committee of General Security was a group of twenty-one men whose duty it was to maintain order throughout France. It arrested suspected persons, and threw them into prison, or haled them before the courts.

Committee of General Security

3. The Revolutionary Tribunal served as a special criminal court for the speedy trial of traitors and conspirators. Its judges, whose decisions were final, were appointed by the Committee of Public Safety. The trials became so numerous that the judges were divided into four courts, and all were overcrowded with work.

Revolutionary Tribunal

4. The Representatives on Mission, chosen by the Committee of Public Safety from the members of the Convention, were sent out to the departments and armies as little tsars to administer the laws and to intimidate the people.

Representatives on Mission

5. Local Jacobin Clubs and committees of surveillance were used by the Committee of Public Safety to terrorize every nook and corner of France.

Jacobin Clubs

This arbitrary governmental machinery was devised to meet a serious national crisis. It was but an example of the inevitable tightening up of a social system in the face of a crisis — a mobilization of national sentiment for war. To prevent the loss of all that had been gained through the Revolution, it was thought that stern measures were necessary. This system was soon perverted from its original, national aims, and employed to satisfy personal spites, and to carry out the whims of men greedy for power, thirsty for blood, and insane from fear and jealousy. In justification of the Reign of Terror, tireless leaders like Danton, Robespierre, and Carnot could point to the defeat of the counter-revolution within France, and to the huge citizen army of 750,000 men, which had checked the invading foreign foe. The famous law of "suspects" of September 17, 1793, was so sweeping that every person who had "done nothing for liberty," as well as those who had openly committed treasonable acts, might be hurried to the guillotine. Terror became the watchword of the day. Lyons, Toulon, Marseilles and other cities were condemned to destruction. The province of Vendée was treated with special severity. For weeks guillotines were kept busy cutting off the heads of *émigrés*, priests, generals, rich business and professional men, and the Girondists. Well might Madame Roland exclaim as she mounted the scaffold, "O Liberty! What crimes are committed in thy name!" Many of the leaders of the Legislative Assembly met tragic ends, their bodies being found in forests gnawed by dogs.

The Reign of Terror

The Paris *commune*, gaining control over the Committee of Public Safety and the Convention, hoped to complete the Revolution by forcing through the latter a series of radical changes. A new republican calendar was created, making the "Year One" begin on September 21, 1792. The year was divided into twelve equal months, with such names as Fog and Frost, Snow and Rain, Flower and Meadow, Heat and Fruit. The month was made up of three weeks of ten days each, the tenth day being a holiday. Each day had ten hours instead of twenty-four. The holidays were no longer dedicated to saints but to the cow, the grape, the onion, the pitchfork, and the sickle. The Christian religion was abolished and replaced by the worship of Reason. Church bells were melted into coins. Heaven and Hell were eliminated and death was declared to be "but an eternal sleep." Churches became "Temples of Reason" and were used for theatrical performances on rest days. Old terms of address such as Monsieur and Madame gave way to "Citizen" and "Citizeness." The names of towns, streets, public squares, and even families were changed. Monsieur Rolet became Citizen Fall of the Bastille, and Madame Jounot took the name of Citizeness August Fourth. New fashions in shoes, trousers, caps and dresses; and in meals, drinks, jewelery and dishes, were introduced to conform to democratic simplicity. Among other changes were: the metric system; the regulation of the prices of fuel, food and clothing; the abolition of

Radical and fantastic changes

Worship of Reason

slavery in the colonies; and heavy taxes on the rich to equalize wealth. Even the butchers were denounced as "an intolerable aristocracy."

When the first danger of invasion was safely passed, the revolutionary leaders took to quarreling among themselves. Danton, who had heartily supported the Terror to save the Republic, now urged the return to legal methods of government, and his enemies took advantage of his speeches to send him to the scaffold. For four months Robespierre, in supreme control of the revolutionary machinery, ruled as a dictator. He opened the Christian churches for worship saying, "If God does not exist, we shall have to invent Him." He decreed a system of universal public education. In short he dreamed of a new civilization for France, but the means to realize it was the Terror. Executions increased until they numbered 200 a week. The slightest criticism of the government was made punishable by death, and soon under the "great Terror" 150 were sent to the block in a single day. It is one of the great ironies of history that this monster should have regarded himself as the true apostle of that mild and timid philosopher, Jean Jacques Rousseau. The Terror under Robespierre accomplished its own destruction. His associates, fearing for their own lives, conspired against him and on *July 27, 1794, the Convention, shouting "Death to the Terror"* voted his arrest. His own execution quickly followed. Within a few months moderate republicans were in control of France.

Dictatorship of Robespierre

For three momentous years the Convention had ruled France. It had proclaimed the First Republic and had drawn up two constitutions. It had put the king and queen to death, and instituted the Terror, which has made thousands of men suspicious of democratic government. It had abolished privilege and proclaimed equality; and it had refashioned religion and announced toleration in faith. It was carried away by lofty dreams of an ideal society, and went through an orgy of ridiculous changes. Much of the bad it did perished with it; and much of the good it accomplished remains as the heritage of these days. Some of the visions held by its leaders were realized later. Danton declared that "next to bread, education is the first need of the people." A splendid scheme for primary and secondary schools was drawn up but not carried out for lack of funds. The Republic was saved from both its internal foes and external enemies. *Its ideals provoked advocates and denunciators all over* Europe. If one shudders at the horrors of the Reign of Terror, he should remember the constructive work of the Convention.

Summary of work of the Revolution

The constitution of 1795, the third formed within six years, was the work of the moderate group of middle-class men in the Convention. Experience taught them the necessity of adding a list of duties to the Declaration of the Rights of Man. Suffrage was limited, as in 1791, by a tax qualification. The democratic legislature consisted of two houses: the Council of Elders, and the Council of

The Constitution of 1795

Five Hundred — the latter to enact laws, the former with the power to veto them. As executive a president like that of the United States was proposed, but France was suspicious of one-man rule and hence created a Directory of five members, elected by the Councils and each in turn to be president for three months. Those who formed this *bourgeois* government, based on property, to prevent the return of either monarchy or anarchy, decreed that two thirds of both houses must be chosen from members of the Convention. The new constitution was approved by an overwhelming vote. Both radical democrats and royalists were dissatisfied, however, and consequently incited an insurrection against the Convention. General Barras, charged with the defense of the government, turned the real work over to a young artillery officer named Napoleon Bonaparte, then twenty-five years of age. With a "whiff of grapeshot" he scattered the insurgents, killing more people than were slain on August 10, 1792, when the monarchy was overthrown. The Convention dissolved itself on October 26, 1795, and made way for the Directory.

7. The Directory

The first problem which demanded the attention of the new government was the war with Europe. During the summer of 1795 Prussia, Spain, and Holland had made peace with the Convention, but hostilities still continued with England, Austria, Piedmont, and the lesser German states. France was in a strong military position.

Directory forced to continue war in Europe

Her ring of foes was broken. The republican army of France was probably the best in Europe. France was in possession of the Austrian Netherlands (Belgium), occupied the west bank of the Rhine, and held Nice and Savoy. Holland had been changed into the dependent Batavian Republic. Since Austria was the most menacing enemy, the Directory planned to defeat her by two invasions — one through southern Germany under Generals Jourdan and Moreau, and another through northern Italy under General Napoleon Bonaparte. Soon the eyes of all Europe were centered upon the brilliant

General Bonaparte

Italian campaign of General Bonaparte. The king of Piedmont was easily defeated, and forced to cede Nice and Savoy to France. Then the Austrians were beaten, and General Bonaparte started for Vienna, but when within eighty miles of that capital, the Austrian emperor sued for peace. The treaty signed at Campio Formio was typical of eighteenth-century diplomacy. It stipulated that Austria should cede what is now Belgium to France and aid her in securing the west bank of the Rhine. The small states of northern Italy were organized as the Cisalpine Republic under the "protection" of France. In return for these concessions, Austria was given the ancient Republic of Venice, which General Bonaparte had seized on the flimsiest pretext — an act that can be compared only with the diabolical partitions of Poland by the greedy despots of Europe. In sharp contrast to these triumphs, Jourdan and Moreau had been defeated

and driven back of the Rhine. Within a year General Bonaparte, after fighting eighteen big battles and fifty smaller ones, had forced two enemies to sue for peace. He not only paid his own way from contributions levied on captured cities, but sent $6,000,000 home to the national treasury. He robbed northern Italy of 399 masterpieces of art to enrich the museums of Paris. He returned to France in a blaze of glory, as a mighty hero.

Napoleon Bonaparte was destined to create an era of his own and to play a larger role in world history than any man since Charles the Great a thousand years before. Since his island home, Corsica, was a French possession, he was by birth a Frenchman although by blood an Italian. He always spoke French with a marked Italian accent. His father was of the poorer nobility and had to practice law for a living. Born in 1769, Napoleon was sent with his elder brother, Joseph, to France to be educated for the army. Of his schoolmates, young French nobles, who made fun of his foreign speech and his countrified clothes, he wrote his father: "I am tired of exposing my poverty, and seeing these shameless boys laughing over it, for they are superior to me in wealth only, and far beneath me in noble sentiments." At sixteen he was graduated as a second lieutenant of artillery on meager pay. Through neglect, he lost his commission. He took a deep interest in the Revolution, but apparently never sympathized with its highest ideals, and in 1792 was restored to a position in the republican army. General Barras, one of the directors, became his friend and patron. He married the charming widow of General Beauharnais, who had lost his head in the Terror. At the time of his Italian campaign he was only twenty-six years old. But five feet two inches tall, slender, sallow-faced, and sickly-looking, he took charge of an army of trained soldiers, commanding generals much older than himself. His military genius soon made him the idol of the army. Modern physicians believe Napoleon to have been an example of that interesting and rare type of man, the epileptic genius.

Early life of Bonaparte

Upon returning to Paris exalted by victory, he was ambitious to become one of the directors, but saw, as he explained later, that "The pear was not ripe." Since England alone was at war with the Republic, he convinced the Directory that the best way to defeat her was to occupy Egypt and thus destroy her eastern commerce. He would be a new Alexander the Great and conquer India on the back of an elephant, and should a new coalition be formed against the Republic, he might be recalled to save it. The Directory readily agreed to his plan. With characteristic zeal he soon had an army of 40,000 fine troops, a strong fleet, and an adequate company of scientists and engineers, for the great adventure. The expedition sailed from Toulon, narrowly escaped attack by an English squadron under Nelson, and on July 8, 1798, reached Alexandria. The Turkish troops were easily defeated, and Egypt lay at his feet. Meanwhile Nelson had annihilated the French fleet. Cut off from France by sea, Bona-

General Bonaparte in Egypt

parte decided to carry war to Turkey and return home through Asia and Europe. Defeated at Acre, with his army suffering from the plague, he was forced to return to Cairo. Meanwhile news reached him that a new coalition had been formed against France and that the Republic was threatened with an invasion. He secretly deserted his army, and taking with him his best officers, returned to France. The people went wild with joy at his return. The pear was ripe. The inefficient Directory had lost the confidence of the nation. The country was on the brink of economic ruin. Vendée was again in revolt and other sections were threatening to follow. The cry for a change in government fitted well with Bonaparte's ambitions. Taking in the situation at a glance, he forced the Councils to vote the abolition of the Directory, and to create a Consulate with himself at its head. The strong man on horseback was master of France. The era of Napoleon had begun.

He returns to France

Creation of the Consulate

Ten years before, the Revolution had started as a moderate reform movement under middle-class leadership. Then it moved to the radical innovations of the Jacobins, and finally swung back to a more conservative basis under the republican *bourgeoisie*. An absolute monarchy was transformed into a limited monarchy, which in turn was displaced by the Republic. For seven years the Republic had endured, then it was overthrown by the autocratic Consulate headed by General Bonaparte.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

Efforts to Establish a New Régime in Europe

1. *General Works Covering the Period 1789–1815*

J. H. Rose, *The Revolutionary and Napoleonic Era, 1789–1815* (1895); * H. E. Bourne, *The Revolutionary Period in Europe, 1763–1815* (1914); W. Oncken, *Das Zeitalter der Revolution, des Kaiserreiches, und der Befreiungskriege*, 2 vols. (1884–1886); A. Sorel, *L'Europe et la révolution française*, 8 vols. (1885–1904); J. Jaurès (editor) *Histoire socialiste, 1789–1900*, 12 vols. (1901–1909); E. Lavisse (editor) *Histoire de France contemporaine depuis la révolution jusqu'à la paix de 1919* (1905–1922); A. T. Mahan, *The Influence of Sea-Power upon the French Revolution and Empire*, 2 vols. (1898).

2. *The Old Régime and the Revolutionary Spirit Before 1789*

E. Lavisse (editor), *Histoire de France*, vols. VIII, IX (1909–1910); A. de Tocqueville, *The Old Régime and the Revolution* (1856); H. Taine, *The Ancient Régime* (1875); * E. J. Lowell, *The Eve of the French Revolution* (1892); C. Gomel, *Les causes financières de la révolution française*, 2 vols. (1892–1893); A. Sicard, *L'Ancien clergé de France*, 2 vols. (1893–1894); * E. Levasseur, *Histoire des classes ouvrières et de l'industrie en France avant 1789*. 2 vols. (2d edition 1900–1901); M. Kovalevsky, *La France économique et sociale à la veille de la Révolution* (1911); F. Rocquain, *L'esprit révolutionaire avant la Révolution* (1878, English translation 1891); H. Higgs, *The Physiocrats* (1897); A. Sorel, *Montesquieu*, English translation by G. Masson (1887); L. Say, *Turgot*, English translation by by M. B. Anderson (1888); J. Morley, *Rousseau*, 2 vols. (1883); *Diderot and the Encyclopedists*, 2 vols. (1891); *Voltaire* (1923); Henri Sée, *La France économique et sociale au XVIII^e siècle* (1925).

3. *The Revolution, 1789–1799*

H. Belloc, *The French Revolution* (1911); * S. Mathews, *The French Revolution* (new edition, 1923); * L. Madelin, *La Révolution*, (1911). Also in English translation,

The French Revolution (1917); H. von Sybel, *Geschichte der Revolutionzeit von 1789*, 3d edition, 5 vols. (1865–1879); H. Morse Stephens, *A History of the French Revolution*, 2 vols. (1886–1891); A. Aulard, *Histoire politique de la révolution française*, 1789–1804, 3d edition (1905), English translation by B. Miall, *Political History of the French Revolution*, 4 vols. (1910); W. M. Sloane, *The French Revolution and Religious Reform* (1901); P. de la Gorce, *Histoire religieuse de le révolution française*, 4 vols. (1909–1922); P. Sagnac, *La législation civile de la révolution française, 1789–1804*, (1898); * S. Herbert, *The Fall of Feudalism in France* (1921).

4. *Biographies*

F. M. Fling, *The Youth of Mirabeau* (1908); L. Barthou, *Mirabeau* (1913); *J. H. Clapham, *The Abbe Sieyès: an Essay on the Politics of the French Revolution* (1912); E. D. Bradby, *The Life of Barnave*, 2 vols. (1915); H. Belloc, *Marie Antoinette* (1909); *Robespierre* (1901); *Danton* (1899); * L. Madelin, *Danton* (1914); J. Claretie, *Camille Desmoulins* (1875), also in English; C. A. Dauban, *Étude sur Madame Roland et son Temps* (1864); B. Mallet, *Mallet du Pan and the French Revolution* (1902);

5. *Influence of the French Revolution*

* C. D. Hazen, *American Opinion of the French Revolution* (1897); G. P. G *Germany and the French Revolution* (1920); W. E. H. Lecky, *History of Englan Eighteenth Century*, 8 vols. (1878–1890); *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Cent* (1892); W. P. Hall, *British Radicalism, 1791–1797* (1912); W. T. Laprade, *I the French Revolution* (1900); P. A. Brown, *The French Revolution in English His* A. Aulard, *Le christianisme et la révolution française* (1925).

CHAPTER VI

THE NAPOLEONIC ERA AND ITS INFLUENCE ON OTHER PEOPLES 1799–1815

1. The Consulate 1799–1804

Constitution of the Year VIII

General Bonaparte, as first consul, immediately assumed the leadership of France and used the other two consuls as his clerks and messengers. A new constitution, that of the "Year VIII," was drawn hastily by Consul Bonaparte, with the aid of Sieyès and the legislative commissions, and ratified by all but 1,500 voters. Under this constitution, with certain changes, France was governed until 1814. It perpetuated the name "French Republic" and seemed to provide for participation by the people in the government. Four houses were created — one to propose laws, a second to discuss them, a third to vote on them, and a fourth to decide their constitutionality. The first body, called the Council of State, was the most important, because in addition to proposing laws it administered them, conducted foreign affairs, and ruled the army. Hence Bonaparte, who presided over it, called to it men of brains from all parties. Local government was placed in the hands of prefects, sub-prefects, and mayors, all appointed by the first consul. The new constitution, in fact, was a sham and a deception, for it centralized governmental power in France to a greater degree than had been the case under the Bourbons. Revolutionary idealism was now displaced in France by militant statesmanship. "We have done with the romance of the Revolution," said Napoleon.

First Consul Bonaparte defeats the Second Coalition

The First Consul next turned his attention to the second coalition formed against France by England, Austria and Russia. He induced Russia to withdraw and even to assume an attitude of armed neutrality against England. Meanwhile haste was made to deal Austria a fatal blow. Following the plan of 1796–7, General Moreau was sent to attack Austria on the Rhine, while the First Consul himself hurried over the Alps to meet the foe in Italy. Within six months Austria a second time sued for peace, which was concluded by the treaty of Lunéville February 9, 1801. It reaffirmed the terms of the treaty of Campo Formio. Once more England was left alone in her war with France. For eight years war had lasted between these two nations without a decision. The English people were tired of the war and grumbling about the heavy taxes. Therefore with the fall of Pitt, the treaty of Amiens was concluded in March, 1802. It recognized the new French state, restored all French colonies ex-

cept Ceylon and Trinidad, promised the evacuation of Malta and Egypt, and tacitly recognized the treaty of Lunéville. For the first time in ten years Europe was at peace.

First Consul Bonaparte now gave his undivided attention to the reconstruction of French institutions, which had been so badly shattered by the Revolution and foreign wars. The nation was yearning for stability and prosperity after a decade of confusion and hard times. Professing himself to be "the son of the Revolution" and the heir of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity," he told the people that he was determined to maintain the fruits of the Revolution — the Republic, universal franchise, and the new order of social equality which opened all offices and honors to all men on the basis of merit. But he was the foe of genuine political liberty, even though he insisted that public burdens should be borne by all alike. Legislative as well as executive power was in his hands, and later acts placed the courts of law under his control. Even the police of the large cities were subject to his will. Laws were enforced as though France were under martial law. This despotism was adroitly concealed under democratic phrases and forms, and the appearances of popular government. His state was based on a nation of free peasant land owners and contented business-men. Bonaparte was the enemy of the old régime, and the creator of a new régime without civil freedom. He believed that France needed a strong but direct government. As a masterful ruler of men, he knew how to placate and use the leaders of all factions and thus ended turmoil and confusion. To wipe out old quarrels, he gave offices and honors to royalists, Girondists and Jacobins. To win the *émigrés* and clergy, he relaxed the harsh laws against them. He wisely identified his rule with the Roman Catholic Church, because he knew that throughout the Revolution the masses of the people had remained true to it. He had no religion himself — he was "a Mohammedan in Egypt, a Catholic in France." In 1801 to bring order out of chaos in the church he formed the *Concordat* with the pope in which the pontiff recognized the sale of church property, and the appointment and payment of the clergy by the state. "If the pope did not exist," he said, "I should have had to create him for this occasion." The people were pleased by this use of religion as a force in statecraft, and the royalists were deprived of their most effective weapon.

Internal reforms

Bonaparte and the Catholic Church

"My real glory," wrote Napoleon at St. Helena, "is my Civil Code." The Code Napoléon, based on earlier efforts, gave France a single body of laws, which perpetuated the gains of the Revolution. Moreover it was extended to Holland, Belgium, western and southern Germany, and Italy, had a marked influence on the rest of Europe and parts of America, and has continued to the present time. The Legion of Honor was created as a new aristocracy composed of the loyal servants of the new state; of the 48,000 members, however, nearly all were military men. The efforts of the Revolution in behalf of

Code Napoléon

Legion of Honor

public education were continued. Elementary schools, which in 1799 numbered only twenty-four in the city of Paris with 1,000 pupils, were maintained in every *commune*. Secondary schools and high schools were opened in every town. The teachers were trained and appointed and paid by the state. Special technical schools were organized. And finally the University of France was created to give unified direction to the whole educational system. Loyalty to the state and church was taught in all these educational institutions. Public improvements were taken up with a deep insight into the economic needs of France. Thirty fine military roads radiated to all parts of France. Two roads were built over the Alps into Italy. Marshes were drained, canals dug, ports improved, dykes built, and bridges repaired. Trade and industry were encouraged in every possible way. Order was injected into the disorganized national finances, and the Bank of France was established. The revenues were increased without seeming to burden the people, because all had to bear a just share of the taxes. Indeed the prosperity of France began to cause anxiety in England. Public funds were spent economically and scientifically. Paris was beautified, and conquered countries robbed to fill the art galleries. But all these reforms and improvements were intended to further the policies of one-man power.

Education

Public improvements

Business

The royalists had been led to believe that Bonaparte would use his authority to restore the Bourbons. When they saw that this was not his intention, they began to conspire for his overthrow. One plot after another was rendered futile by an efficient secret police. Finally, to terrorize the royalists, the Duke d'Enghien, a Bourbon prince, was seized on German soil, and without proof put to death for treason. The odious crime accomplished its purpose — the royalists stopped plotting the death of the new Caesar. The hostile Jacobins were either placated or silenced by force.

Royalists

In common with other rulers of the day, Bonaparte was an imperialist, and dreamed of restoring the French colonial empire. In 1800 he induced Spain to retrocede to France the Mississippi Valley, known as Louisiana, and shortly afterwards sent his brother-in-law, Leclerc, with 25,000 troops to seize the island of Haiti. To the East Indies he sent General Decaen with a number of officers to organize the sepoys with the intent of reconquering India from the English. Another military representative was dispatched to the near East to to spy out imperialistic opportunities there. These colonial projects proved to be a complete failure. New complications in Europe in 1803 forced Bonaparte to sell Louisiana to the United States and a stubborn Negro revolt in Haiti compelled him to abandon that island.

Imperialism

2. The Napoleonic Empire 1804–1815

By 1804 a French general of foreign blood, by ability and fortunate circumstances, had made himself master of France. He had defeated the second coalition and had brought peace to France and Europe.

With the exception of his colonial scheme, the Consulate had been a pronounced success. Opposition to his rule had been either crushed or appeased. He had made peace with the church. He was wise enough to employ the talent of all persons about him to further his projects. His numerous reforms and improvements had won the middle class and peasants alike. He stood before the nation as the guarantor of the fruits of the social and religious revolution; and he represented the symbols, if not the substance, of the political revolution. In 1802 he had his tenure of office changed from ten years to life, with the right to choose his successor. In 1804 the obliging Senate's proposal to make him "Emperor of the French" was approved by an overwhelming vote of the people. The coronation ceremony in Notre Dame in the presence of the pope outrivalled that of the Bourbon kings. "I found the crown of France on the ground and I picked it up with my sword," he explained. As the "anointed of the Lord," he took his place among the mighty monarchs of earth. His models for conduct and action were Caesar and Charles the Great — the greatest military emperors of ancient and mediaeval times, as he was to be regarded as the greatest of modern times. He did not hesitate to borrow the bees for his coat of arms from Chilperic, the court ceremonials of the Carolingians, the laws of Justinian, the ideas of Rousseau and the family policy of the Bourbons.

Napoleon "Emperor of the French"

Emperor Napoleon I desired a court that would give his high office the proper setting and color. Hence new positions were created, new costumes designed, and new rules of etiquette established. Outwardly the life of the Empire seemed to hark back to Bourbon days. Members of the emperor's family became princes of France. Titles, honors and pensions came from the throne. In principle, however, the Empire continued to be the First French Republic. The tri-color was still the national flag; popular sovereignty was recognized in name; and the social revolution was perpetuated. "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" continued to decorate the public buildings. Monsieur and Madame came again into use. But all adverse criticism of the government was stifled by the secret police and by a strict censorship of the press. The new catechism to be used in the schools taught the children that they owed to their emperor love, respect, obedience, military service, and taxes; and that those who refused these obligations were resisting "the order established by God himself."

Napoleon's court

Social revolution continued

European monarchs saw in the rise of Napoleon I the culmination of the dangerous Revolution. An autocrat, sprung from the people with sword in hand, was pointing it at their thrones. Through fifteen years of changes and wars, France had emerged modernized, powerful, boastful, and a menace to the old order of things everywhere. Hence kings, emperors and tsars began to muster their armies for the ten-year struggle ahead. The era of the Empire was to prove a period of uninterrupted wars. Great Britain regarded

European monarchs frightened rise of Napoleon

Napoleon as the disturber of peace, law and order, and stirred up one coalition after another to overthrow him. With her mighty navy she was mistress of the seas, as Napoleon was the military master of the continent. The gigantic contest became one between sea-power and land-power, and made its results felt around the globe. Aroused by Napoleon's colonial projects, alarmed at the control of Belgium by France, and jealous of her commercial interests, Great Britain broke the peace of Amiens and in 1803 declared war on France.

Believing that his plans for a federated Europe under French hegemony could not be realized until the one great power that blocked them was crushed, Napoleon welcomed war with England. The peoples of both countires loyally supported their governments in the struggle for world dominion. France had the assistance of her vassal states, and persuaded Spain to join her. Napoleon's first stroke was the seizure of Hanover, a German possession of the British king. His next act was to close to British goods the entire coast of Europe from Hanover around to Italy. Great Britain retaliated by preying on French and Spanish commerce. Pitt was recalled to power to conduct the war. In the meantime Napoleon made elaborate preparations for the invasion of the British Isles. At Boulogne an army of 150,000 men was collected. The American, Robert Fulton, offered to sell to Napoleon his newly invented steamship and a submarine boat, but the offer was refused. The intended invasion was frustrated by two factors—the large English fleet and the third coalition forming on the continent. The destruction of the combined French and Spanish fleets off Cape Trafalgar on October 21, 1805, by Nelson left England supreme on the sea and freed her from all danger of invasion. With the aid of British gold, Pitt induced Austria, Russia and Sweden to take up arms against France. Austria smarting to gain revenge for two defeats at the hands of the upstart emperor, hoped to recover Belgium and Italy. Russia feared Napoleon's plans to carve up the Turkish Empire — a project which she herself wanted to manage. The king of Sweden professed to be horrified by the murder of the Duke d'Enghien.

French Allies

Threatened invasion of England

"If the European states ever intend to renew the war," said Napoleon in 1802, "the sooner it comes the better." France, he thought, needed "glorious deeds, and hence war," while he was "destined" to fight "almost without intermission." In 1804 he predicted that "There will be no peace in Europe until it is under a single head — an emperor, who shall have kings for officers." To break the third coalition he hurried his matchless army into southern Germany, cut off the retreat of the Austrians, and forced the surrender of 60,000 men. In three weeks more he was in Vienna. On December 2, 1805, he defeated the combined forces of Austria and Russia at Austerlitz, his most famous battle. The Russians withdrew to their own country without making peace, but Austria at once signed the costly treaty of Pressburg. Venetia, Istria and Dalmatia were ceded to France.

Defeat of Austria

Baden and Bavaria had their boundaries increased at the expense of Austria. The dukes of Bavaria and Württemberg were raised to the rank of kings. Austria was torn from the third coalition. The Bourbon house of Naples was deposed, because of sympathy with the allies, and the vacant throne given to Joseph Bonaparte. The Batavian Republic (Holland) was changed into a kingdom under Louis Bonaparte. Principalities were bestowed upon Napoleon's sisters. In 1806 fourteen of the small German states were joined with Bavaria and Württemberg to form the Confederation of the Rhine under "Protector" Napoleon. The same year Francis II was forced to renounce the old title of Holy Roman emperor and to content himself with the role of emperor of Austria. Thus the master of France had become by war the master of the greater part of western Europe. To the pope he wrote, "You are sovereign in Rome, but I am its emperor." Pope Pius VII replied, "There is no emperor of Rome." He was mistaken; there was even a Roman emperor. To all these regions many of the gains of the French Revolution were extended. Feudal dues were abolished, social equality was introduced, and religious liberty was guaranteed.

Political changes

Napoleon's usurpation of power in Germany at last led wavering Prussia to join the third coalition, but too late to bring any result other than her own defeat. The fate of Prussia was sealed in one battle, that of Jena on October 14, 1806, and ten days later Napoleon marched triumphantly into Berlin. There he stole the sword of Frederick the Great and sent it to Paris as a trophy. "The entire kingdom of Prussia is in my hands," he boasted, as he levied heavy war indemnities upon his prostrate foe, and seized a portion of Prussian territory, which was converted into the kingdom of Westphalia for his brother, Jerome Bonaparte. Russia was the next member of the third coalition to feel the strong arm of the great war lord. Marching on to Warsaw, the bloody battle of Eylau was barely won by Napoleon, but a decisive victory followed on June 14, 1807, at Friedland. The treaty of Tilsit was more than a peace — it was a strong alliance between the emperor and the tsar, Alexander I, which completely broke up the third coalition, and left Napoleon in command of Europe. "What is Europe," asked Alexander I, "if it is not you and I?" Tsar Alexander agreed to mediate between France and Great Britain, and in case the latter refused to make peace, he promised to join Napoleon in enforcing the continental blockade against British goods. Napoleon now created out of Polish lands the Grand Duchy of Warsaw under the king of Saxony. This new state, together with Saxony and Westphalia, entered the Confederation of the Rhine as Napoleon's vassals. It is small wonder, after these triumphs, that the new Charles the Great spoke of regulating the "destinies of the world."

Defeat of Prussia

Alliance with Russia

Once again England, the despised "island of shopkeepers" and the source of "all the ills and curses which can afflict mankind," alone re-

mained unconquered by the lord of the continent. England continued to be the soul of the coalitions against Napoleon and the chief source of the supplies for his enemies. She had been blessed by the Industrial Revolution a generation earlier and her factories were now the salvation of herself and her allies. There is much truth in Professor Shotwell's assertion that the struggle against Napoleon was not won at Waterloo but in the cotton mills of Manchester and the iron furnaces of Birmingham. Direct invasion of England was impossible so long as British ships commanded the seas. Hence to force Great Britain to sue for peace, Napoleon resolved to cut off all her trade to and from the continent and thus ruin her industries and commerce. From 1806 until his overthrow this was the chief aim of Napoleon's foreign policy. The Berlin Decree in November, 1806, declared the British Isles in a state of blockade, forbade all trade with English colonies, excluded all British ships from European ports, and ordered the confiscation of all British goods. Great Britain answered this attack with threats and reprisals. Napoleon issued the Milan Decree the next year to strengthen the weak spots in the first proclamation. The fiercest commercial conflict in history prior to the World War of 1914 resulted from these measures. Both sides suffered, the continent perhaps more than Great Britain. So many peoples were involved that Napoleon was unable to make the "continental system" really effective. Large quantities of British goods were smuggled into the various countries, and it was said that Napoleon's own soldiers were clothed and shod with British products.

War continued against England

Continental System

Difficulties soon appeared both in business and politics. When Sweden refused to obey the decrees, Napoleon sought to punish her by urging Russia to take Finland. Then he forced her king to abdicate and had Bernadotte, one of his own marshals, made heir to the succeeding monarch, who was old and childless. When his own brother, Louis, king of Holland, refused to enforce the blockade and thus ruin his country, he lost his crown and Holland was annexed to France. When the pope declared his neutrality, the Papal States were added to the Kingdom of Italy. The pope then excommunicated Napoleon, but was taken prisoner himself and held for several years. When Portugal sought to remain friendly with Great Britain, Napoleon plotted with Spain for its partition. Thousands of individuals all over the continent were punished for smuggling. Such were the high-handed methods taken by this modern Caesar to bring Great Britain to her knees.

Effects of the Continental System

Prior to 1808 Napoleon had been fighting kings, not nations, and he had been generally successful. Meanwhile deep-seated national hatreds had been aroused against his tyrannical acts. This new nationalism, itself an outgrowth of the principle of "Fraternity," was creating implacable enemies to accomplish his downfall. The Portuguese rose in revolt against him and with the aid of British troops drove him out of the country. When he forced the last Bour-

bon king to abdicate the Spanish throne and seated his brother Joseph on it, the proud Spaniards flew to arms and welcomed the assistance of a British army. This national uprising cost Napoleon five years of war and the loss of 300,000 men. The troubles in Spain led the Austrians to believe that Napoleon was not invincible. Hence they began a new national war against him in April, 1809, but the battle of Wagram brought defeat to them for the fourth time. The humiliating peace of Vienna took from Austria a sixth of her territory and 4,000,000 inhabitants. Henceforth her army must not exceed 150,000 men. Eager to perpetuate his mighty Empire, and having no heirs by Josephine, Napoleon coolly divorced her so that he might ally himself with one of the oldest dynasties on the continent. He demanded the hand of Maria Louisa, the daughter of the defeated emperor of Austria, and was readily accepted as a son-in-law. With the birth of a son, the "King of Rome," in 1811, to a short, miserable life, Napoleon's Empire seemed at its zenith. It included practically all western and central Europe. An act of the Senate made the Roman state an integral part of the Empire, and the city of Rome became the second capital. Future Napoleonic emperors were to be crowned in St. Peter's at Rome after the coronation at Paris. The second crowning of Napoleon I at Rome was planned for 1813 and remarkable preparations were made for the great event. Russia was his ally, and Prussia appeared too weak to cause trouble. His name was on the tongues of the entire world. The rise of a poor Corsican adventurer to such heights of power is the miracle of modern history. One enemy, however, blocked Napoleon's path to world dominion — Great Britain, weary, impoverished, full of unrest, but relentless and determined to hold out to the end.

Rise of national spirit against Napoleon

Marriage with Austrian princess

The Napoleonic Empire contained within itself the weaknesses that led to its own destruction: (1) It was built up by the genius of one man, hence its permanence depended upon his life and luck. (2) Its foundations rested not upon the consent of the governed, but upon military force and conquest. Its moral basis was the autocracy of the seventeenth century. Consequently it violated the democratic principles of the very Revolution that supplied the occasion for its creation. (3) The spirit of nationalism in France, which first encouraged imperialism and then became its victim, awakened a similar movement in other European countries. This new national spirit fought, after 1808, not so much to defeat the French people, or even to sweep away the results of the Revolution, as to kill the giant vampire that was sucking up the life-blood of France as well as themselves. (4) The audacious "continental system," with its brutal acts, brought suffering and hardships to all classes of people. The series of revolts it provoked helped to wreck the Empire. (5) The use of the state church to further Napoleon's imperial policies embittered the Catholic clergy, who called him a heretic and an enemy of God, and aroused the faithful laity, who regarded him as a monster

Weaknesses of the Napoleonic Empire

of sacrilege. Protestants also hated the man who made of Christianity a secular convenience. (6) Finally, Napoleonism, which meant imperialism and militarism, had deadened the revolutionary ardor in France, which had led the people to defend themselves against Europe in the earlier wars.

Russia was the last of the independent powers on the continent. With her defeat, there would be no more Europe — only one vast Empire under Napoleon. The alliance with Russia, which had lasted five years, was now breaking to pieces. The tsar was allowed to add Finland and Turkish lands on the Danube, but was told that Constantinople was for the master of the world. The tsar feared the restoration of Poland. The Russian nobles hated the Revolution, the business men disliked the blockade, and the people suffered much from it. Russia's partial abandonment of the blockade resulted in 1812 in Napoleon's colossal invasion with his imperial "army of twenty nations" — 600,000 men and 1,000 cannon. The largest military force ever assembled up to that time, was lured farther and farther into a country devastated by a retreating foe until on September 14 Moscow, 709 miles from the border, was occupied. To spend the winter there was made impossible by the partial destruction of the city by fire and by the hostility of the Russian people. With little food, harassed at every step by the fierce Cossacks and the enraged peasants, and at last leaderless, the Grand Army made its historic retreat. It had dwindled to 50,000 men when it reached the German frontier. In the meantime Napoleon had deserted his army in December to hasten to Paris, where revolt was threatening. An overwhelming disaster without parallel had overtaken the unconquerable general. The "Grand Empire" dissolved in the flames of Moscow and the snow of Russia. He had sadly miscalculated. All Europe rejoiced and took heart.

Russian disaster and decline of Napoleon's power

On the heels of the defeat of Napoleon came the formation of the last coalition, consisting of Great Britain, Russia, Prussia, and Sweden. Although formed by rulers, yet it was backed up by peoples conscious of a holy cause. It proclaimed as its aim the liberation of subject nations from the yoke of a tyrant. A regenerated Prussia joined a jubilant Russia in the task of freeing Europe. The Confederation of the Rhine began to disintegrate. Forming an army of 200,000 men in feverish haste, and taking even the young boys of France, Napoleon in the spring of 1813 was back in central Germany sufficiently strong to check the Russo-Prussian forces at Lutzen and Bautzen. Meanwhile Austria had joined the coalition. On October 16–18, in the "battle of the nations" at Leipzig, Napoleon was overwhelmed by defeat. His imperial structure in Germany, resting upon the unstable basis of force, fell with a crash. The Confederation of the Rhine and the kingdom of Westphalia disappeared before the war lord, with a handful of his remaining soldiers, recrossed the Rhine. Germany was freed from foreign control.

The last coalition against Napoleon

"Battle of the Nations"

The coalition offered Napoleon his imperial throne and a France with her "natural boundaries" — the Rhine, the Alps and the Pyrenees. But with a gambler's instinct he refused to accept the limits, which even the ambitious Louis XIV had taken, and risked everything on the chance of victory. Early in 1814 Russia, Prussia and Austria with armies totaling 400,000, invaded northern France and began to converge on Paris. Meantime the duke of Wellington, with a combined British, Spanish and Portuguese army, was threatening Napoleon from the south. Still another army of Austrians was menacing France from Italy. Napoleon's military genius and mastery of men and resources were tested to the limit. Like a tiger at bay, he struck now one foe and then another with his dwindling forces, but the odds against him were too great. He had used up his human war fodder and had squandered his material substance in his dream of world dominion. Paris fell and the allies insisted upon Napoleon's unconditional surrender. He gave up all rights to the French throne for himself and his family; and, in return, was permitted to retain his title of emperor, was given full sovereignty over the little island of Elba, and was granted an annual pension of $400,000.

Napoleon's defeat and abdication

The victorious allies, thinking that they had eliminated Napoleon as a trouble-maker, restored the Bourbon house in France under Louis XVIII, brother of Louis XVI, and summoned a congress at Vienna to wrangle and bargain over the spoils of Napoleon's fallen Empire. For ten months Napoleon watched France and events at Vienna. The growing hostility to Louis XVIII and the threats of war among the allies at Vienna led Napoleon to believe that the pear was ripe again. Hence on March 1, 1815, he landed at Cannes and three weeks later without firing a shot once more sat on his throne in the Tuileries. His welcome was proof of both his own magnetic personality and the unpopularity of the Bourbon house. He said that the best men in France had called him back and that his return was "supported by three of the first powers of Europe." He told the people that he had come to protect them from privileges and feudalism. The imperialist and militarist now turned nationalist, pacifist and democrat. He denounced conquest and war, and promised to rule as a constitutional sovereign.

Restoration of Bourbon House

Return of Napoleon from Elba

Louis XVIII fled in haste. Europe was aghast with fear for the future. The four great powers at Vienna hastily outlawed Napoleon as "an enemy and disturber of the peace of the world." Once again Europe resounded with the tramp of troops. The duke of Wellington with 100,000 men planned to join 120,000 Prussians near Brussels. An Austrian army was approaching the Rhine. Napoleon, forced to fight for his throne, raised an army of 200,000 of his old soldiers, and rushed them north to defeat his enemies separately before they could unite. At Waterloo on June 18, 1815, he fought his last battle. In charge after charge his troops were mowed down, until the arrival of Blücher turned defeat into rout, and Waterloo took its place in

Final overthrow at Waterloo and exile to St. Helena

history. Napoleon rushed back to Paris only to find that the parliament, under Lafayette's leadership, had taken over all the functions of government. He abdicated the second time, but now in favor of his son, and fled to the coast with some vague idea of going to America. In the harbor of Rochefort he gave himself up to the British saying, "I have come like Themistocles, to seek the hospitality of the British nation." As a world menace, he was taken to the rocky island of St. Helena in the south Atlantic. There for five years he lived under guard with a small group of personal friends, writing on history and war, and dictating his memoirs, a strange mixture of truth and falsehood. He represented himself as the product of the Revolution and its perpetuator. He professed to have been always the friend of peace and of the oppressed nationalities, but said that he was thwarted in his plans by the British, and by the European despots. He predicted the revolutions that followed his downfall, and hoped that his son would revive his Empire. He declared that it had been his intention to unite the European peoples under a central body similar to the American Congress, and he predicted that such a federation would be evolved eventually.

Napoleon's last years

Judgment on Napoleon's life and work

It is difficult to pass judgment upon his character for there seem to be two Napoleons. While alive he was a mighty hero to the French, and to many others. After his death poets, painters, dramatists and historians created a giant out of the "Little Corporal." Even his enemies, after a time, began to admire his statesmanship and military ability. In Prussia generals and historians proclaimed his greatness. On the other hand, during his life and after his death, he was regarded in other European lands as a monster of evil. Some French historians, as well as those of other countries, have not hesitated to assail his work as largely destructive. But throughout all these differences of opinion, he has remained in the hearts of the French people the crusader of liberty, the foe of foreign despotism, and the champion of the new order. The era of Napoleon continued the French Revolution in many ways, and spread it over much of Europe. He did not permit the people to exercise much political liberty, yet he kept the idea alive by holding, theoretically, that the people are the source of all power. He was the champion of property rights and of freedom of worship. He was dazzled by the dream of a world state, and yet regarded himself as a missionary of nationalism. A free press and free speech were recognized on paper but denied in practice. The gains in social equality were embodied in the Code Napoléon. His soldiers carried the revolutionary idea of fraternity over Europe, and gave birth to a new thrill called nationalism. Against these gains must be placed fifteen years of warfare which cost Europe 4,000,000 lives, a policy of imperialism which unsettled Europe, and an egotism which divided all persons into two classes, servants and enemies, and showed a supreme contempt for all ideas conflicting with his own.

3. Permanent Contributions of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Era to World Civilization

This period of twenty-five years marked a new epoch in world history. The American Revolution set up a new régime among a few millions in a remote corner of the earth. The French Revolution made "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" the corner-stones of a new civilization in one of the oldest and largest states of Europe, and was the means of spreading these ideas over a large part of the continent. Since that time the results of the French Revolution have been felt around the globe. The catch-words were not empty phrases, but stood for new rights and institutions, which replaced old abuses and practices. The political changes were both sweeping and important. In France rule by divine right passed away forever. The absolute government was displaced by a limited, constitutional monarchy, which in turn gave way to a republic under different names. Napoleon transformed the Republic into an Empire, which was followed by the restored Bourbon monarchy. Throughout all these transitions a representative form of government persisted at least in name until it became a vital part of the nation. The throne of every despot in Europe was shaken by the French example. Today absolute rulers haze all disappeared, and a belt of republic girdle the earth. Within less than a quarter of a century France had eight different constitutions, no one of which became permanent like that of the United States, and since 1815 half a dozen more have been drawn up. In one form or another Napoleon forced his vassal states to adopt the French fundamental laws. The experiments of the United States and France in constitution-making have been so widely copied that all modern civilized states now have constitutions. England and the United States employed the two-house parliamentary system. France introduced the one-house model, which gave way to two houses in 1795 and to four bodies under Napoleon. Since 1814 France has used the two-house system. For the first time in history the First Republic established general manhood suffrage. Napoleon saw the wisdom of perpetuating universal male franchise and of extending it to other parts of the continent. As a result political control passed from the hands of the nobility and clergy first to the middle class and later to the common people.

A new epoch in world history

New constitutions

With the extension of the right to vote and to hold office was associated a greater degree of civil liberty. For the first time in France taxation became equitable. The sale of offices ceased and they were open to all men on the basis of merit, at least theoretically. The codification of laws, begun during the Revolution, and completed in the Code Napoléon, has remained a permanent contribution in the border states as well as in France, and even in parts of the New World. The system of local government evolved under the Revolution and modified by Napoleon, has endured to the present time.

Civil liberty increased

The reorganization of Germany and Italy, politically, and the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire, prepared the way after a few generations for the creation of the new German and Italian national states. Finally the proclamation of the right of revolution inspired many a later revolt against tyrannical rulers.

Significance of the social revolution

The social revolution also marked a distinct stage in the progress of mankind, because it laid the foundations for much of what we call modern society. The Revolution proved that progress can be accelerated but the disorderly violence, which at times accompanied it, made the word "revolution" anathema to men who believed in peaceable, orderly evolution. Since 1789 social reforms have been more easily secured. It should be remembered that the social revolution was quite as important as the political. Indeed one who sees only the changes in government does not comprehend the real French Revolution.

Equality is just as essential to human welfare as liberty. The abolition of serfdom and the overthrow of feudalism, which inoculated the rest of Europe and the world with the virus of social democracy, would alone have justified the Revolution. Before the close of the nineteenth century slavery and serfdom had generally disappeared. The alterations in land ownership produced great changes in the people. The sale of the estates of the king, nobility and clergy augmented the number of bourgeois and peasant proprietors, who now owned their property in fee simple and could buy, sell, and bequeath it as they pleased. Primogeniture and entails were abolished. The caste system was broken down. Educational opportunities were within the reach of a widened circle. The outcome of these changes was that the alert middle class came into power in France, and after a time elsewhere on the continent, while nobles and bishops largely lost their political control. The common people, conscious of a new freedom, with more opportunities for advancement, and masters of their own property and labor began to "count for something." With the ballot in their hands they gradually bettered their lot and became a force that had to be reckoned with in national and local politics. New social standards based, at least theoretically, on merit, ability and wealth replaced those of office, birth and blood and give rise to a new social democracy. The "people-nation" emerged as a dominating force in France with a new flag around which to rally. Nationalism, encouraged by Napoleon, helped to overthrow him when it spread to other nations. The radical advocates of social revolution in France became the pioneers of all sorts of dreams and schemes for reconstructing society. Institutions sanctified by time and sentiment crumbled before the onslaught and inspired Utopians to preach socialism, anarchism, syndicalism and bolshevism in the days ahead.

Changes in land ownership

Way prepared for radicals

The Revolution broke the shackles of industry by abolishing the guilds and by removing the numerous annoying internal re-

strictions on trade and business. Royal monopolies in manufacturing disappeared. The principles of *laissez-faire* and free trade were advocated to encourage the production and marketing of goods. A capitalist class emerged and France commenced to feel the thrill of the Industrial Revolution which was already under headway in England. The working classes were free to sell their labor wherever they wished and eventually to organize for their own protection. Although England was left mistress of the seas after the Napoleonic wars, still France soon revived a lucrative overseas trade and sold her manufactured articles through the numerous contacts made on the continent. These changes were producing a new set of economic and social problems for the years ahead. Twenty-four years of almost continuous war produced its usual economic effects. All European countries were deeply in debt, and the burden was passed on to the people in heavier taxes and higher prices. Those industries connected with war needs seemed to be in a flourishing condition, but others suffered and in some instances were ruined. In France and to a certain degree in French dependencies agriculture, which had become more intensive and consequently more lucrative after the people gained more land, was the basis of a solid prosperity and did not seem to be retarded by the draft of the war on man power. It was this new source of wealth which explains why France almost single-handed was able to fight Europe for so long a period without being bankrupt. It should be remembered likewise that the French were not shedding their blood to keep Napoleon on the imperial throne but to prevent the return of the lords and bishops who would deprive them of their newly acquired rights and possessions.

Economic changes

With a new conception of the functions of the democratic state and of a society founded on equality, came the proclamation of the theory of public education for all children. This idea born in the Revolution was adopted by Napoleon, and served as a model for various types of national education in other lands. Under Stein in Prussia a state system of both elementary and secondary schools was adopted. The universities of Berlin and Breslau were founded. The University of France was copied in the University of the State of New York and in London University. Modern science was encouraged. The literature of the period, saturated with politics, economics, and social reconstruction, voiced the spirit of protest and innovation. It inspired later writers like Hugo and Lamartine in France; Byron and Shelley in Great Britain; and Heine in Germany, to speak the discontent of those who longed to make the world a better place in which to live. The Revolution overthrew the Roman Catholic Church as a part of the old régime in France. The church restored by Napoleon was as different as the state restored by Louis XVIII. Freedom of conscience and worship slowly spread over the world. The separation of church and state decreed by the Revolution was undone by Napoleon, but was revived in France a century later (1905)

Educational gains

A new literature

Religious changes

and meanwhile had been adopted by other lands. The critical attitude of men towards the church and the Bible was followed by more intelligent and constructive criticism in the century to follow. The destructive atheism of the "Age of Reason" supplied arguments to skeptical minds in the years ahead. The leaders of Christianity began to take a deeper interest in the social welfare of the people. In conclusion it may be said that this period witnessed a world movement with political, social, intellectual, economic, and religious aspects, which supplied the outlines and some of the materials of modern civilization.

General results

The realization of legal equality in France produced in Europe a "revolution in property rights and business relations." Under the old régime the law protected the owners of large estates or of lucrative offices in the government against ambitious persons among the unprivileged class. Usually the eldest son held the family property intact, while the younger children were provided with positions in the state and church. The ruling middle class in the city republics safeguarded their rights in the same manner. Even in the trade guilds a few families monopolized the advantages. This system of privilege prevented those above from falling into the ranks of those below in the social scale. The principle of equality under the law opened offices to any person, gave all children an equal share of property, made the courts free to rich and poor alike, and proclaimed the freedom of industry. As a result society as a whole was revolutionized. France became a nation of prosperous peasant proprietors instead of a nation where the many worked for the few. An opportunity for the display of ability and talent was given to every man no matter how poor, and the nation was thereby immeasurably enriched. The future history of France and of much of the world differed greatly from the past, largely because of the realization of the principle of legal equality, first in the evolution of the United States of America and, secondly, in the creation of the First French Republic. Napoleon helped to establish this principle over a large portion of Europe.

Reaction on autocratic Europe

The royal and imperial masters of Europe had disposed of the illegitimate ruler, Napoleon. But had they destroyed, or even checked the republican revolutionary movement, which they feared and hated? The ruling classes were forced to make a serious survey of the ideas and events of the world during the previous half century. In interpreting the American and French Revolutions they were convinced that there was a close connection between these republican movements and the "Enlightened Despotism" of the eighteenth century. They professed to see a causal connection between the well-meaning reforms of the absolute rulers, on the one hand, and the substitutions of republics for monarchies, the proclamation of legal equality, the abolition of privileged classes, and the confiscation of property, on the other. Furthermore they were convinced that the

"Enlightened Despots," in turn, had been the dupes of that coteric of intellectuals whom they had invited to their courts and patronized. Feeling their own thrones shaken by the revolutionary earthquake, the rulers consciously formulated a policy of conservatism. Advocates of reforms were no longer welcomed at the courts of princes and pressure was used to curtail the activities of the intellectuals. On the ground that it was for the general good, Christian orthodoxy was upheld. Such culture as was not connected with dangerous social and political ideas was encouraged. Hence the fine arts, which showed a preference for the forms of the past, prospered; and science was approved so long as it improved the instruments of war and industry and did not attack the dogmas of religion. Thrown into a panicky fear by the French Revolution, the monarchs stubbornly shut their ears to all suggestions of reforms. They took as their guide for the ship of state the fixed principles of legitimacy and stability. Despite all their precautions, however, the rising tide of human progress was to sweep over their mossy granite dykes.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

The Napoleonic Empire

* J. H. Rose, *The Life of Napoleon I*, 2 vols. in 1, ed. 1907; H A. L. Fisher, *Napoleon* (1912); * A. Fournier, *Napoléon I*, 4th German edition (1922); English translations by E. G. Bourne (editor), and A. E. Adams; H. A. Taine, *The Modern Régime*, 2 vols. (1894–1896), English translation by J. Durand; E. Driault, *Napoléon et l'Europe: I. La Politique Extérieure du Premier Consul* (1910), II. *Austerlitz, la Fin du Saint Empire* (1912), III. *Tilsit, la Rivalité de la France et la Russie* (1917); E. F. Heckscher, *The Continental System: an Economic Interpretation* (1922); E. F. Henderson, *Short History of Germany*, 2 vols. (1902); H. von Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, 5 vols. (1890–1896), English translation (1915); H. A. L. Fisher, *Studies in Napoleonic Statesmanship: Germany* (1903), J. R. Seeley, *Life and Times of Stein*, 2 vols. (1879); * G. S. Ford, *Stein and the Era of Reform in Prussia, 1807–1815* (1922); G. C. Broderick and J. K. Fotheringham, *Political History of England, 1801–1837* (1906); J. H. Rose, *William Pitt and the Great War* (1911); A. Rambaud, *Histoire de la Russie* (1878); A. Kornilov, *Modern Russian History*, 2 vols. (1917); H. Adams, *History of the United States of America during the Administrations of Jefferson and Madison*, 9 vols. (1889–1891).

PART III

SYSTEM OF REACTION AFTER 1815

CHAPTER VII

RESTORATION AND REACTION UNDER INTERNATIONAL CONSERVATISM

1. Europe in 1814

The war aims of the various states allied against the French, from 1792 to 1815, differed widely in detail, but one purpose was set forth from first to last: to crush the international revolutionary movement. The French Revolution aroused the spirit of nationalism and spread liberalism over Europe. The allies sought to check the growth of nationalism and to restore absolutism and legitimacy. A return to the old régime, which was based on dynastic and class interests, seemed to promise so many advantages that Great Britain, which was already in possession of some of the fruits of the revolutionary wave in France, and Prussia, which was at least thrilled by it, did not hesitate to join Austria and Russia in defense of the established order.

Reasons for perpetuating the coalition

The downfall of Napoleon, however, did not defeat the revolutionary movement either within or outside of France. It had won too many victories and had gained too much momentum to be crushed by mere military defeat. The champions of the old order saw pretty clearly that the dangers of an international revolution must be offset by the perpetuation of the international conservatism for which the European alliance stood. There must be a "mutual insurance against revolutionary fires" during the decades ahead. Another reason for perpetuating the war coalition in time of peace was to protect the victorious powers in their spoils of war. All of the allies had emerged from the Napoleonic wars with considerable enlargement of territory, partly at the expense of France but mostly by the absorption of small states, and consequently felt that joint action alone would safeguard their gains. And, finally, the Great Powers sincerely desired peace after a generation of costly fighting and believed that coöperative conservatism would be most likely to preserve it.

"Romanticism" as a reactionary force

The counterpart of political reaction, in the realm of arts and letters was "Romanticism," which represented the revolt of the mind of intellectual Europe against the levelling and rationalistic tendencies of the Revolution. Romanticism was founded on emotion and an idealized history. It sought to revive in religion, literature and art ideals that had disappeared. It produced an enthusiastic revival of the Roman Catholic faith; a restoration of the Gothic style in building; and a "Christian" school of painting and sculpture. In social and political life it emphasized the idea of tradition and continuity in natural development; it defended the benefits of feudal-

ism and privilege, glorified the doctrine of the divine right of kings, and stimulated the new enthusiasm for nationality. "Legitimacy" was accepted as the true principle for the resettlement of Europe and the holy union of the "altar and the throne" was proclaimed. Chateaubriand and de Maistre propped up the crumbling power of the Papacy, while Pope Pius VII issued a bull reinstating the Order of the Jesuits.

2. Metternich and His Principles

Prince Metternich

The dominant forces of this period of reaction and restoration under international control found an able leader in Prince Metternich of Austria. His political ideals reflected the sentiments found quite generally in the government circles of Europe after the overthrow of Napoleon. Born of an old aristocratic family at Coblenz on the Rhine in 1773, young Metternich grew up in the atmosphere of the privileged class. As a university student he heard the stories of the French *émigrés* and became a violent opponent of the Revolution. Nor did the seizure of his family estates by Napoleon serve to lessen his hatred. Marriage into the family of the Austrian chancellor brought him wealth and a high social standing. Entering the Austrian diplomatic service, he became acquainted with all the rulers of Europe during the Napoleonic Era. Called to head the Austrian ministry in 1809, he held that office for nearly forty years. Throughout his life revolution was denounced "as the disease that must be cured, the volcano which must be extinguished, the gangrene which must be burned out with the hot iron, the hydra-headed monster with jaws open to swallow up the social order." "Sovereigns alone are entitled to guide the destinies of their peoples," he said, "and they are responsible to none but God." As the self-appointed "Apostle of God" he proclaimed that "What the European peoples want is not liberty but peace," and that it was his mission to "prop up the decaying structure" of society.

With the fall of Napoleon, Austria was for some years the dominant power on the continent. This afforded Metternich an opportunity to play a leading role in international affairs. He was wise enough to see that Europe would never consent to return to conditions before 1789, hence he promulgated his "modern policy" which was "Neither to innovate nor to go back, but to keep things as they are."

"Metternichism"

Like "a spider spinning a vast web," he planned to unite the great powers of Europe into a strong alliance to carry out his policy of "repose." Public questions in war-sick Europe were to be settled through international congresses. All efforts of the people to gain more rights and a greater share in government were to be resisted, peaceably if possible, otherwise by forcible intervention. There were to be no more republics with parliaments and constitutions. "France and England," as limited monarchies, were sneered at as "countries without a government." This method of repression through the

combined diplomatic and military powers of the big states was known as the "Metternich system." Devised to rule Europe and the world, it was quite generally successful until 1830 as long as the desire for repose and the feeling of exhaustion were really prevalent in Europe. After that it was restricted to central and eastern Europe where it flourished for another score of years. The Revolution of 1848 at last forced Metternich to flee for safety to Great Britain, the land "without a government," and his system of international repression crashed to the ground under the onslaught of the forces of liberalism and nationalism.

3. The Congress of Vienna

After Napoleon had been exiled to Elba, the allies on May 30, 1814, had signed with Louis XVIII the treaty of Paris, which began the work of readjustment in Europe. It recognized the restored Bourbon house in France; reduced the territorial limits of France to those of January 1, 1792; and returned all her colonies held at that date. From the Napoleonic Empire was erected a larger Holland which included modern Belgium under the restored House of Orange; a federated Germany; an independent Switzerland; and an *Italy* under the heel of Austria and her satellites. To a "future congress" was left the further work of reconstructing territorial and dynastic problems. Finally a "just balance of power" founded upon a "just repartition of force" was to be established to insure "a permanent peace." The statesmen of that day were confronted by many all-absorbing questions. Ancient states had disappeared and new ones had been created. Old laws and institutions; old titles and offices; old systems of land-holding and methods of business; old class distinctions and modes of education, had either disappeared or had been greatly altered. To what extent should this transformation in the civilization of Europe be made permanent? What measures should be devised to prevent the spread of revolutionary tendencies, or the rise of a new Napoleon? How should France and her allies be punished? What alterations in International Law were desirable? How could the civilization of Europe be stabilized so as to insure peace for the future? Answers to these questions were left to the forthcoming Congress of Vienna.

Problems confronting Europe at the overthrow of Napoleon

The European congress was held at Vienna from September, 1814 to June, 1815. It was one of the most important international gatherings in recent world history. Optimists talked grandly of "the reconstruction of the moral order," of the "regeneration of the political system," and of "enduring peace." Every country in Europe except Turkey was represented. "All the most illustrious persons" were there. Among the ninety sovereigns and fifty-three representatives of princes in attendance were Emperor Francis I of Austria, who with Metternich acted as the polite hosts of the congress; Tsar Alexander, the Russian ruler, with Nesselrode and the

Expectations from the Congress of Vienna

Composition of the Congress

German Stein as his advisers; the lethargic Frederick William III, king of Prussia, accompanied by Hardenberg and von Humboldt; Castlereagh and the duke of Wellington, the representatives of Great Britain; the lynx-eyed and oily-tongued Talleyrand from France; and Cardinal Gonsalvi, the pope's delegate. Such an exhibition of lace, gold buttons, impressive uniforms, and long titles had never been seen even under the old régime. The Austrian government almost became bankrupt in entertaining the congress with a continuous round of balls, banquets, theatrical performances, musicals, drives, and hunting tournaments. The great Beethoven, and dancers and actors from all over the continent, exercised their talents to delight the visitors.

There was little in the way of formal organization and no fixed rules of procedure. No officers were elected, and in the few plenary sessions of the congress no motions were made and no votes taken. "At a ball," wrote a contemporary, "kingdoms were enlarged or sliced up — at a dinner an indemnity granted — a constitution sketched while hunting; occasionally a *bon mot*, or a witty idea, brought an agreement where conferences and notes failed." This is, of course, a gross exaggeration. A great deal of hard work was accomplished by committees, though these were never really representative of all Europe. But the fact remains that the decisions were made by a small group of leading statesmen, and that the congress was the classic example of the old, eighteenth-century diplomacy in action. The fate of the congress was in the hands of the strongest and the shrewdest. So far as there was a presiding officer, Metternich performed that function, and an official secretary was employed, but no general sessions were held for debates.

How the Congress conducted its business

The "Big Four," Austria, Great Britain, Russia and Prussia, had secretly agreed to decide all questions among themselves before presenting them to the other members of the congress. The rights of the weak states were ignored as completely as under Napoleon. But Talleyrand of France posed as the champion of the small powers and aimed the first blow at the dictatorship of the "Big Four." He insisted that the congress should proceed according to International Law. "Might is right," gruffly replied the Prussian von Humboldt; "we do not recognize the law of nations to which you have appealed." Nevertheless, Talleyrand, by taking advantage of every disagreement among the "Big Four" insinuated himself into the inner circle and later managed to bring Spain, Portugal and Sweden, into the conferences. Further, he offered Great Britain and Austria the support of France in a secret treaty opposing the territorial ambitions of Russia and Prussia. This was the treaty which, upon his return to Paris, Napoleon found upon the desk of Louis XVIII and at once sent to Tsar Alexander.

Control by the "Big Four"

Talleyrand's work

In general the work of the congress was to undo, so far as that was wise and possible, the changes made since 1789. (1) The territorial

problems had to do with the disposal of Belgium, Holland, the Confederation of the Rhine, the kingdom of Italy, the grand duchy of Warsaw, and Switzerland. (2) The political questions included the elimination of the new rulers and the restoration of the old dynasties. (3) The assurance of "security" against France was an important part of the settlement. (4) The final task was the punishment of the states that had remained loyal to Napoleon. *Problems*

A simple solution of these problems was made difficult by the greed of the powers. The tsar wanted all of Poland; the king of Prussia, all of Saxony. Austria hoped to rule a weak Germany and Italy. Great Britain expected to retain the most valuable parts of the colonial empire she had won, control of the seas, and the balance of power in Europe. France was ambitious to regain her old power without loss of any sort. The smaller states had their own schemes to reap rewards or to escape penalties. "To divide the spoils of the conquered among the conquerors" seemed to be the purpose of the congress. "Legitimacy" and "compensation" were the two principles upon which the settlements were made. The former meant the restoration of all rulers, whose rights ran back of the Revolution, and of all institutions of the old régime. Since it was found impossible to restore all the former boundary lines, the doctrine of "compensation" was invented, under which bits of land were handed about here and there, without any regard to the wishes of the people, to satisfy territorial claims, or given away as rewards or punishments. This meant, of course, that the sentiment of nationality was completely ignored, but it must be remembered that this sentiment was still new and inarticulate, the product of an abnormal crisis, which, it was hoped, was now over. *Principles followed*

The principal territorial and dynastic changes were the following:

1. Of the French conquests, Belgium and Luxemburg were given to the restored House of Orange in Holland. Switzerland, enlarged by the addition of three French-speaking cantons and neutralized by the European powers, was revived as an independent confederated republic of an aristocratic type. The Bourbons recovered their throne and France proper was spared from serious spoliation. Indeed, she was allowed to retain both Alsace and German Lorraine. *Chief settlements France*

2. Some of the loyal German princes recovered their titles and possessions, but the claims of several hundred petty ecclesiastical and city states were ignored. No effort was made to revive the Holy Roman Empire dissolved by Napoleon. A new Germanic Confederation of 38 states was created under a constitution which provided for a diet of delegates or representatives of the rulers and gave Austria the presidency. Prussia was enlarged by receiving the west bank of the Rhine which had been conquered by France, western Pomerania from Sweden, two fifths of Saxony, whose king was thus penalized for his loyalty to Napoleon, and a part of Poland. *Germany*

3. The Bourbons were restored in Naples; the Papal States were returned to the pope; and the king of Piedmont recovered his throne with permission to annex the republic of Genoa. As "compensation" for the loss of Belgium, the rest of Italy was left under either the direct or the indirect rule of Austria.

Italy

4. Sweden was forced to cede Finland formally to Russia and western Pomerania to Germany, but as "compensation" received Norway from Denmark, because of the latter's friendship for Napoleon.

Sweden

5. The shameful dismemberment of Poland was legalized on the ground of "legitimacy." The lion's share, including Warsaw, went to Russia; Posen, Thorn and Danzig went to Prussia; Austria received southern Galicia; and Cracow became a free state.

Poland

6. Great Britain enlarged her colonial empire by obtaining from France the islands of Malta, St. Lucia, Tobago, and Mauritius; from Spain, Trinidad and Honduras; and from Holland, Ceylon, part of Guiana, and Cape Colony.

England

7. The Bourbon house was restored in Spain. The slave trade was abolished, but the enforcement of the act was left to each state. A code of International Law to regulate the navigation of European rivers and the methods of international diplomacy was drawn up.

Spain
Other acts

On June 2, 1815, a few days before the battle of Waterloo, all the separate treaties were incorporated in a Final Act and signed by the different powers.

This aristocratic congress ignored the new forces of liberalism and nationalism, which had been born in Europe. Gentz remarked that it had "resulted in nothing but restorations." A few lordly masters remade the map of Europe, trading off peoples as if they were still serfs. The patriotic feelings of the Belgians, Norwegians, Finns, Poles, Germans, and Italians were outraged by the enforcement of the practices of eighteenth-century despots. Even the doctrine of "legitimacy" was not rigidly adhered to, for Bernadotte, the Napoleonic marshal, heir to the throne of Sweden, was not deposed because he had deserted his master and been faithful to the cause of the Allies. It is said that every ruler left Vienna dissatisfied. All over Europe people were grumbling at the short-sighted settlements. Even the old general, Blücher, denounced the congress as "an annual cattle fair."

Blunders of the Congress

Much of the history of Europe long after 1815 was taken up with undoing this "auction of nations." Within fifteen years, Belgium separated from Holland. The settlements of Italy and Germany survived scarcely fifty years. The union of Norway and Sweden was undone in ninety years. The World War restored Poland and gave Italy her "natural" boundaries on the northeast. The vicious practice of trampling on the rights of small states has been replaced by the principle of "self-determination." To guard against another outbreak from France, she was surrounded by a chain of petty states

Work of Congress undone

which were to act as buffers. Excepting Holland, only the "Big Four" gained in power, lands and population. Europe was filled with "sore spots" for the future. The doctrine of "legitimacy" was to be applied to religion, education, and even science, philosophy and literature.

Against these blunders of the congress, must be placed some positive gains. "If ever the powers meet again to establish a political system by which wars of conquest would be rendered impossible and the rights of all guaranteed," said a shrewd observer, "the Congress of Vienna, as a preparatory assembly, will not have been without use." In the first place, Europe was given some years of badly needed peace. Secondly, the settlement of the affairs of the continent in one document, signed by all the states, meant progress in international relations. Finally, it was some positive gain to have the people imbued with the hope of "an all-embracing reform of the political system of Europe," even though it was not realized. "The ground was prepared," wrote the official scretary, Gentz, "for building up a better social structure." The return of Napoleon to France in the midst of the wranglings of the congress forced the diplomats to hurry up their work. Talleyrand hastened to Carlsbad, wittily saying: "The first duty of a diplomat after a congress is to take care of his liver."

Positive gains of the Congress

4. Treaties, Alliance and Congresses to Preserve Peace

After Napoleon, the "Black Demon," had fallen, the most spectacular ruler in Europe was Tsar Alexander I. Converted in Switzerland by a German mystic, Baroness von Krüdener, he was eager to further his "Gospel of Christian Peace" in a war-wearied Europe. Hence, on September 26, 1815, he drew up the "Holy Alliance," by which he intended to restore Christian patriarchal principles of government. The king of Prussia and emperor of Austria signed it, and other rulers were invited to accept it as International Law. Only Great Britain, the sultan, who was not invited, and the pope refused to do so. To thinking men, who recalled the work of the Congress of Vienna, this document seemed like blatant hypocrisy. Metternich called it a "sonorous nothing" and Castlereagh said it was "nonsense." The suspicious liberals denounced it as a diabolical scheme to crush the rights of man. The common people confused it with "Metternichism," and for a generation it stood in their minds as synonymous with repression.

The Holy Alliance

Its criticism

Not the Holy Alliance, but the Quadruple Alliance of the "Big Four," formally renewed on November 20, 1815, two months later, became the real basis for regulating European affairs until it dropped to pieces a decade later and was destroyed at last by the Revolution of 1848. This "mutual insurance society of sovereigns" was signed on the same day as the Second Treaty of Paris, which reduced France to the boundaries of 1790, levied on her an indemnity of $140,000,000,

Quadruple Alliance

and penalized her with military occupation for a period of five years. To guarantee "the peace of other countries," the members of the Quadruple Alliance agreed to crush the "revolutionary principles" in France and elsewhere and to exclude the Napoleonic family "forever" from the French throne or any other European throne. This "concert of Europe," as the alliance was called, was planned to extend the strong hand of international conservatism to every corner of the continent. All signs of discontent on the part of the people were to be watched and every threatened outbreak was to be put down with celerity. Further the "concert" arranged to hold a series of international conferences to provide for "the repose and prosperity of nations."

"Concert" of Europe

The first congress held to adjust European problems was that of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818, in which only the states of Austria, Prussia, Russia and Great Britain had a vote. Since repentant France was ready to pay her indemnity in full, the foreign troops were withdrawn and she was now rather reluctantly admitted to the "concert," which became the "Big Five," though the Quadruple Alliance continued in effect. A great variety of questions was considered, and the small states affected were "consulted" in the adjustments. The second congress was that of Troppau, called in 1820 to deal with the revolutions in Spain and Naples. Austria, Prussia, and Russia drew up the famous "doctrine of intervention" asserting their right to interfere in cases where governments were changed by revolutions. Great Britain and France opposed the declaration on the ground that it was the primary duty of all governments to combat the danger of revolt, wherever it might appear, and refused to sign the protocol. At a third congress held at Laibach in 1821, the three autocratic powers authorized Austria to suppress a revolution in Naples, while the tsar of Russia notified the revolutionists in Greece of his disapproval of their uprising against Turkey. The congress of Verona convened in 1822 was confronted by a revolution in Spain and in her American colonies. Austria was left free to deal with a revolutionary outbreak in Piedmont; Austria and Russia with the revolution in Greece; and France with that in Spain. The congress favored forcing the Spanish colonies to submit to the motherland, but the opposition of the United States and Great Britain prevented such a course.

Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle

Congress of Troppau

Congress of Laibach

Congress of Verona

The purpose of the "concert" to preserve peace was unquestionably sincere, but the determination of the three autocratic members of the "concert" to use armed force to prevent peoples from disturbing the established order revealed the menace of the system to political progress. The "concert" was a league of reactionary rulers and not of nations. The four congresses clearly revealed its purposes and methods. When it changed from a high court of justice to an alliance to perpetuate absolutism in the name of security, forces both within and without the "concert" began to destroy its power. The stand taken by Great Britain in refusing to accept the doctrine of Troppau,

Menace of the "concert"

the American Monroe Doctrine, and liberal revolutions on the continent of Europe brought about its defeat. As early as 1827 Metternich wrote: "The union known by the name of the Alliance has been for sometime little more than a pretense." Yet in 1833 in a secret treaty Austria, Prussia, and Russia reaffirmed the principles. *Forces against the "concert"*

5. Restorations in France, Spain, Portugal and Italy

Twice did the armies of the allies put Louis XVIII, brother of the unfortunate victim of the Revolution, upon his ancestral throne. Allied soldiers were stationed in France to "royalize" the people. Although an old man of sixty, who had spent nearly a quarter of a century in exile, Louis XVIII was sensible enough to see that the old régime had gone from France forever. Hence he granted a constitution known as the charter of 1814, which limited the royal power, provided for a legislature of two houses like that of Great Britain, and granted the right to vote to men above thirty years of age who paid a direct tax of $60 a year. The government was not democratic but aristocratic, based on property. Still France had a more liberal government under Louis XVIII than under Napoleon. The king had no more power than that bestowed by the Revolution in 1791 upon Louis XVI. The French government was one of the most liberal on the continent. Equality before the law, freedom from arbitrary arrest, free speech, a free press, and liberty of worship were guaranteed. The Roman Catholic Church was recognized under the Concordat of 1801 as the state religion. The revolutionary titles to the confiscated lands of the church and nobility were declared inviolable and no attempt was made to undo the work of the social revolution. Feudalism was not restored, and the old restrictions on industry were not revived. The new France had come to stay, and in fact nowhere in Europe was there so little "restoration" of the old régime. *Louis XVIII grants Charter*

France under the Charter

The *émigrés* and clergy returned to France in poverty and with bitterness in their hearts, determined to remain loyal to the spirit of the old régime and to recover what they had lost. They gathered about the Bourbon dynasty and formed a political party known as the Ultra-royalists, who declared war to the death on the champions of the Revolution. The old court ceremonies, etiquette, and dress were partly revived, together with former decorations and titles. The white flag of the old régime again floated over France. The Ultra-royalists wanted to obliterate all work of the Revolution, clamored for compensation for their losses, and demanded the suppression of the charter. For several months after Waterloo, they sought to accomplish their aims by riots and bloodshed, known as the "White Terror," but failed to secure much more than the banishment or death of leading Frenchmen, who had been loyal to Napoleon. King Louis XVIII stood squarely between these firebrands and their opponents and honestly sought to steer a moderate middle course. *Ultra-royalist party*

The "White Terror"

Victory of Ultra-royalists in elections

The contest between the Liberals and the Royalists was now transferred to the election of the new Chamber of Deputies. The Ultra-royalists won a majority, under the restricted franchise, and immediately began to pass laws to shackle the press, to try traitors in special courts, and to repeal the divorce laws. Fearing that these measures would drive the people to revolt and force him to "go on his travels" again, the fat old monarch dissolved the Chamber and ordered new elections. In the new elections of 1816 the moderate Royalists and the Liberals gained a majority which they held until 1820. During that period France settled down to its new life, extended the right to vote, and organized an army of 240,000 men on a popular basis. In 1820 the murder of the king's nephew and the wave of revolution in southern Europe produced a reaction against the Liberals, which swept the Ultra-royalists once more into power.

Liberals in control 1816

Return of the Ultra-royalists

As champions of the system of Metternich, they at once suspended the guarantees of personal liberty in the charter; muzzled the press; turned education over to the Catholic clergy; again limited the suffrage; suppressed the various groups of revolutionists; and in 1823 sent an army into Spain to restore the Bourbon king. When Louis XVIII died in 1824 France was cordially coöperating with the autocratic powers of Europe in the "concert."

Charles X (1824–1830)

For the next six years the French throne was occupied by Charles X, another brother of Louis XVI. As the count of Artois, he had stubbornly fought the Revolution for thirty-five years. He hated and cursed Napoleon. He belonged to the Middle Ages and not to the nineteenth century. To him civilization meant a divine-right king, an intolerant church, and a feudal aristocracy. At sixty-seven, he could not readjust his views. His spectacular coronation amused some and disgusted others, as he was anointed on seven parts of his body with "holy oil" preserved through the intervention of God from the time of Clovis. In his frantic efforts to hold back the floodtide of progress, Charles X outdid Metternich. His tyrannical acts alienated all the French people except a small group of the Ultra-royalists. As the result of a revolution which he provoked in 1830, he was forced to flee to Great Britain. He died six years later in Austria, under the conviction that he was going to join the saints whom he loved and believed he had served.

Spain under Ferdinand VII

When restored to power in 1814 by his own loyal subjects with the aid of the duke of Wellington, Ferdinand VII found Spain imbued with a new national spirit and enjoying the liberal constitution of 1812. Urged on by the nobles and clergy, he abolished the constitution and the Cortes or national assembly. Absolute government was restored, and the privileges of the nobility and clergy were reaffirmed. Individual liberties were taken away from the people, and the Liberals were banished or imprisoned. The Jesuits were recalled and the Inquisition reëstablished. The Metternich system was put into operation, and all progress checked. This cruel

and inefficient monarch ignored the people's rights, hampered business, and squandered the wealth of the country on his court favorites. He incited the Spanish-American colonies to revolt, and then in vain tried to crush them by force. So unwise was his policy that even Metternich urged him to a more moderate course. As might be expected, the rule of Ferdinand VII brought Spain to a sad plight. Scandals and abuses multiplied. The national treasury was bankrupt. Education was neglected. When in 1820 a storm of revolution swept over the country, he begged his fellow autocrats in Europe to save his crown. In 1823 a French army of 95,000 men restored him to power. He ruled Spain as an autocrat until 1838, and left behind him a backward and ruined country, which under different political and economic conditions might have ranked high among the peoples of Europe.

After driving the French out of Portugal in 1813, Great Britain set up a regency and through it ruled that state almost as if it were part of the British Empire. By 1820 the nationalistic party was strong enough to overthrow the regency and draw up a constitution like that of 1812 in Spain. *Portugal*

The Congress of Vienna left Italy disrupted — a "geographical expression" — and chiefly under the domination of Austria. The Bourbon king of Naples, Ferdinand IV, was restored to power on promising to make no foreign alliances and to give no liberties to his subjects without Austria's consent. The king of Piedmont likewise came back to his throne, and restored the privileges of the nobility and clergy. All Italy was ruled autocratically, burdened with taxation, harassed by spies, curbed in industrial progress, and ruled as a conquered province. Political constitutions, and even gaslight and vaccination, were swept away because introduced by the French. In Turin the French plants and vines were torn up in the Botanic Gardens, and the French furniture in the royal palace was destroyed. Education was again turned over to the clergy. Liberals were watched and imprisoned on the slightest suspicion. Like Spain, Italy began to move backwards. *Italy*

6. Reaction in Great Britain Under the Old Tories 1815–1832

In the eighteenth century British political institutions were more progressive than those on the continent, but were in no real sense democratic. After 1789 France and other parts of Europe had gone further than Great Britain on the path of self-government. Even a "liberal" like Burke wrote: "Our representation has been found perfectly adequate to all of the purposes for which a representation of the people can be desired or devised. I defy the enemies of our constitution to show the contrary." The French Revolution had engendered a fear of all remedial agencies for political reform. At the same time the Revolutionary and Napoleonic wars, which had *England reactionary under the Old Tories*

cost Great Britain the enormous sum of $5,000,000,000, left her loaded with the heaviest public debt ever incurred by any nation up to this time, and produced a series of financial crises that caused British leaders to dread popular uprisings. The Old Tories, then in power, hated the French Revolution and were just as determined as Metternich to resist changes. Ignorance of the real significance of the French Revolution led some English Whigs, who had sympathized with the American Revolution and lauded men like George Washington, Benjamin Franklin and John Adams as allies in the cause of liberty, to see nothing in the French revolt but "a carnival of bloodshed and horror." There was no "restoration" in Great Britain because there had been no revolution. The Tory success in overthrowing Napoleon helped to continue them in power. At their head, as a stout champion of autocracy, stood King George IV (1820–1830), who had been regent from 1811 for the sightless and insane George III. From 1812 to 1822 he was ably assisted by a second Metternich, Castlereagh, as foreign secretary. The blunt soldier, the duke of Wellington, who became prime minister in 1828, carried on the same policy.

The ruling aristocracy, frightened by the excesses of the experiments in France, not only remained unmoved by French political propaganda, but used all their force to crush it. The doctrine of nationalism was distasteful to the English, who relied on the Scotch, Irish and Welsh to support the state. Their attitude was typified in the abolition of the Irish Parliament in 1800. Yet on the continent these British leaders encouraged nationalism and held up English constitutional liberty as superior to Napoleon's "cosmopolitan despotism." At home the Old Tories passed laws to increase the prosperity of the landed aristocracy. The "enclosure" acts permitted great landlords to drive small farmers off the lands which they had long occupied and to add these lands to their own estates. The reason given was to improve agriculture, but the real purpose was to enable the landlords to make more money in the new capitalistic farming, and to give the rich merchants the social prestige which went with landholding. Under George III, 3,209 such acts "enclosed" over 6,250,000 acres. As a result the number of small landowners was greatly diminished, while the wealth and power of the nobility were increased. The "corn laws" put high duties on imported wheat, and thus raised the cost of living for the poor in the cities and industrial centers. In 1821, as an outcome of these measures, and an unwise system of poor relief, there were 2,500,000 "assisted poor" in the country.

Old Tories liberal in foreign policy but conservative at home

Inclosure acts

The Anglican Church was the state church in England, Wales, and Ireland, similar to the Roman Catholic Church in France before 1789. Its clergy formed a privileged class. Officially protected and endowed, this state church had vast wealth and received special tithes from all landholders. Its courts had jurisdiction over divorce,

The state church

marriage and wills, as well as distinctively church matters, and its clergy alone could perform marriages and register births and deaths. The higher clergy sat in the House of Lords. The Anglican Church worked hand in glove with the landed aristocracy, and warmly supported their measures. Since 1689 Dissenters such as Quakers, Baptists, Presbyterians and Methodists, as well as Catholics and Jews, by sufferance had had freedom of worship, but all of them were still deprived of many privileges enjoyed by Anglicans. Dissenters might vote and enter Parliament, but were disqualified from holding high public offices and from receiving degrees from the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. Catholics and Jews were barred entirely from Parliament and from political and military offices. The laws permitted *them to be fined for not attending* church; *forced them to* pay the church taxes; and forbade their inheritance of land. Roman Catholic priests might be thrown into prison. Such harsh measures raised a cry of protest from the victims, and elicited sympathy among liberal Anglicans. The Church of Scotland was Presbyterian, and had its own laws, clergy, *right of discipline, and tithes.*

Dissenters

At this time Great Britain was not a democracy but a land of the "old régime." The inequalities in the state, church, and society were strongly defended by the nobility and clergy, who controlled the national Parliament. The House of Lords, composed of these classes, formed the bulwark of the old order. The House of Commons, supposed to represent the common people, was also controlled by the aristocracy through corruption and unfair distribution of seats. It was little more than an assemblage of landlords and wealthy men, or their representatives. The men who executed the laws, and the judges likewise, were selected by processes which excluded the nation at large. Large counties and boroughs often had fewer representatives *in the Commons than the small places. Little towns like* Buckingham with thirteen voters, Gatton with five, and Old Sarum with none, still had two members, as many as were returned for Manchester, Birmingham, or Leeds. These little hamlets were called "rotten boroughs," and were in the hands of a neighboring nobleman, who controlled the seats and might even sell them. It was said that out of 634 seats in the House of Commons prior to 1832 487 were chosen by "patrons." These conditions make it clear that Great Britain was an oligarchy.

House of Lords and Commons

Representation

The right to vote was not regarded as one of the rights of man, but a privilege attached to property. In the counties, only free-holders with an income of about $50 or more could vote for members of Parliament. Hence, *since the small landholders had almost disappeared,* the number of voters was small, possibly only 5 per cent of adult males. The county of Bute with 14,000 people had but 21 voters. On one occasion, it was said, a single voter attended the meeting to elect a member to the House of Commons. He called the meeting to order, appointed *himself* chairman, nominated *himself* for the office, called

Franchise

the roll of voters, and announced the unanimous election of himself to Parliament. Bribery was notoriously common, and candidates sometimes openly advertised the price they would pay for votes. In 1829 the duke of Newcastle dispossessed 587 of his tenants for having dated to vote against his candidate. When his right to do this was questioned in the House of Commons, the irate duke asked: "Have I not the right to do as I wish with my own?" Under such a system the House of Lords had no difficulty in controlling the makeup of the House of Commons. Well might it be said that before 1832 Great Britain had a "government of the people, by the landlords and for the landlords."

Harsh criminal laws

The barbarous criminal laws, remnants of mediaevalism and despotism, were still in force. About 250 minor offenses such as pocket-picking, shop-lifting, and poaching, were punishable by death. Only the sense of justice of British juries and judges saved men and boys from the gallows for petty crimes. Many criminals were deported to Australia instead of being hanged. The prisons were foul holes with brutal keepers, in which men, women, and children were herded with the foulest criminals. When riots broke out against these and other evils, instead of remedying the causes, the government put down the rioters by force, and the leaders were shot. Secret societies, like those on the continent, were formed to preach democracy and justice. When an attack was made on the prince regent in 1817, the writ of *habeas corpus* was suspended for a year, and arbitrary arrests authorized. The freedom of the press was suppressed. Many prominent radicals and agitators like the editor, William Cobbett, fled to America or the continent to escape punishment.

The Six Acts

The "Six Acts" of 1819 marked the high crest of reaction in Great Britain. They forbade military exercise without permission; permitted local justices to issue warrants to search houses for arms; curtailed the right of free assembly; authorized the seizure of seditious writings; and put a stamp tax on pamphlets like that already existing for newspapers. Such were the measures designed by the oligarchy in Great Britain to stifle political and social progress. Forces were at work, however, that could not be crushed. Within a few years Great Britain was to pass by peaceable reform from reaction to liberal leadership among the nations of the Old World.

Foreign policy

During the generation following the fall of Napoleon, although the home policy of Great Britain was reactionary, the foreign policy was enlightened. Castlereagh was inclined to accept Metternich's system of curbing all popular discontent by force, and hence Great Britain joined the "concert" to keep peace in Europe. When the actual test came in dealing with revolution in Naples in 1820, while he was not against intervention by Austria to protect her own interests, he did oppose the Troppau proclamation of the right of intervention as a "principle" of International Law. This led to a

rift in the "concert," which grew wider until at length it went to pieces. The man who persuaded Castlereagh to change his policy was George Canning, whom Metternich called "the malevolent meteor hurled by an angry Providence upon Europe." Under his guidance the Quadruple Alliance was repudiated, and the doctrine of non-intervention in the internal affairs of nations was set up against Metternich's policy of interference. Thus Great Britain indirectly became the virtual supporter of the liberal movements in such countries as Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, and the Latin-American colonies. Canning also persuaded Great Britain to suggest and champion the Monroe Doctrine, which prevented European powers from forcing the Latin-American republics to return to their allegiance to Spain and Portugal. "I called the New World into existence to redress the balance of the Old," he boasted as he urged Parliament to recognize the independence of the Spanish-American states in 1825. A Whig ministry under Earl Grey succeeded Wellington in 1830.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. Continental Europe

E. Bourgeois, *Manuel historique de politique étrangère*, Vol. II, 1789–1830, 4th edition (1909); W. A. Phillips, *The Confederation of Europe*, 2d edition (1919); C. K. Webster, *The Congress of Vienna, 1814–1815* (1918); C. D. Hazen, W. R. Thayer, and R. H. Lord, *Three Peace Congresses of the Nineteenth Century* (1917); J. S. Bassett, *The Lost Fruits of Waterloo* (1918); C. Roget, *Étude sur les origines de la Sainte-Alliance* (1888); A. Sorel, *Essais d'histoire et de critique*, 12th edition (1884); C. de Mazade, *Un Chancelier d'ancien régime: le règne diplomatique de M. de Metternich* (1889); G. B. Malleson, *Life of Prince Metternich* (1895); R. Metternich (editor), *Memoirs of Prince Clemens Metternich*, English translation by Mrs. A. Napier, 8 vols. (1881–1882); C. M. de Talleyrand-Perigord, *Memoirs*, 5 vols. (1891–1892); G. Pallain, (editor) *Correspondance inédite de Talleyrand et du roi Louis XVIII pendant le congrès de Vienne*, 3d edition (1881); W. P. Cresson, *The Holy Alliance* (1922); G. L. Dickinson, *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France* (1892); E. Bourgeois, *Modern France*, 2 vols. (1919); G. Weill, *La France sous la monarchie constitutionelle* (1912); H. Houssaye, *1815*, 3 vols. (1896–1895); L. Michon, *Le gouvernement parlementaire sous la restauration* (1905); J. Jaurès (editor) *Histoire socialiste*, Vol. VII, *La restauration*, by R. Vivinni (1906); P. Rain, *L'Europe et la restauration des Bourbons* (1908); J. R. Hall, *The Bourbon Restoration* (1910); G. Humbard, *Histoire Contemporaine de l'Espagne*, 6 vols. (1869–1883); C. E. Chapman, *A History of Spain* (1919); F. L. Paxson, *The Independence of the South American Republics* (1903); W. R. Shepherd, *Latin America* (1914); W. S. Robertson, *History of the Latin-American Nations* (1922); B. King, *A History of Italian Unity*, 2 vols. (1899); R. M. Johnston, *The Napoleonic Empire in Southern Italy and the Rise of the Secret Societies*, 2 vols. (1904).

2. Great Britain

G. C. Broderick and J. K. Fotheringham, *The Political History of England: 1801–1837* (1906); J. A. R. Marriott, *England since Waterloo* (1913); A. L. Cross, *Shorter History of England and Greater Britain* (1914); G. M. Trevelyan, *British History in the Nineteenth Century (1782–1901)* (1922); E. and E. G. Porritt, *The Unreformed House of Commons*, 2 vols. (1907, new edition 1909); T. E. Kebbel, *History of Toryism* (1886); C. B. R. Kent, *The English Radicals* (1899); W. L. Blease, *A Short History of English Liberalism* (1913); W. E. H. Lecky, *Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland*, 2 vols. (new edition 1903); B. Ward, *The Dawn of the Catholic Revival, 1781–1803* (1909); *The Eve of Catholic Emancipa-*

tion, 3 vols. (1912); H. W. Clark, *History of English Nonconformity*, 2 vols. (1913); E. Jenks, *A Short History of the English Law* (1912); Sir J. F. Stephens, *History of the Criminal Law of England*, 3 vols. (1883); R. M. Garnier, *History of the English Landed Gentry* (1893); Sir G. Nicholls, *A History of the English Poor Law*, new edition, 2 vols. (1898), Vol. III by T. Mackay (1899); J. S. Nicholson, *The History of the English Corn Laws* (1904); G. Slater, *The English Peasantry and the Inclosure of the Common Fields* (1907); E. C. K. Gonner, *Common Lands and Inclosure* (1912); Sir H. Maxwell, *The Life of Wellington*, 2 vols., 3d edition (1900); J. A. R. Marriott, *George Canning* (1903); H. W. V. Temperley, *George Canning* (1905); E. I. Carlyle, *William Cobbett* (1904).

CHAPTER VIII

ABANDONMENT OF LIBERALISM IN RUSSIA AND THE MAINTENANCE OF AUTOCRACY IN CENTRAL EUROPE

1. Russia under Alexander I and Nicholas I

Russia, with a population of 45,000,000 under Tsar Alexander I, and not Great Britain, *strange to say, was the least loyal to* "Metternichism." Alexander I had received a large part of his education from a Swiss liberal named La Harpe, whose teachings continued to exert a great influence over him. He was impressed by the French Revolution and worshipped at the feet of Napoleon. Indeed, as the "Little Father" of his people, he dreamed of making Russia a free country. As a lover of peace and a religious enthusiast, he labored to unite all European peoples into one Christian family. He thought of having his conglomerate Empire supplant France as the champion of constitutional liberty. He advised Louis XVIII to give France the charter. The state rights of Finland were confirmed. The Poles were *granted a liberal constitution guaranteeing them self-government.* At the Congress of Vienna, he coöperated with Stein to regenerate the German nation, and with Great Britain to abolish the slave trade. Intelligent reforms were made in Russia; the abolition of serfdom was contemplated; and great schemes for popular and higher education were discussed. The formation of a written constitution was seriously considered. Had circumstances been more favorable and Alexander more determined, he might have prevented a century of autocracy in Russia. But Alexander lacked firmness and was easily swayed. With all his liberal inclinations he never really overcame his thirst for power and the belief in his own divine mission to rule.

Liberal policy of Alexander I

By 1820 Alexander at the age of 43 had fallen into Metternich's "spider-web." An insignificant mutiny had occurred in one of his regiments and he allowed himself to be persuaded that it was part of a general revolutionary movement that liberalism was a foe to established government and religion; and that the best way to obtain Christian peace in the world was to check all these dangerous forms of progress. A series of conspiracies, assassinations and revolutions, fomented by secret societies in Russia and Europe, frightened the tsar and convinced him that liberalism inevitably resulted in revolution and terror. At the Congress of Troppau in 1820 Alexander said to Metternich: "Today I deplore all I said and did between the years

Alexander I becomes conservative

1815 and 1818. . . . You have correctly judged the state of affairs. Tell me what you wish me to do, and I will do it." Thus Alexander became a willing tool in the hands of the champion of reaction and offered to place his troops at Metternich's command to curb all revolutionary movements in the Old World and the New. At home he ceased to talk of constitutions and reforms, and drove the liberals to employ secret means to secure their rights. These secret societies were composed almost entirely of young nobles, officers in the army who had served in France and who had returned home converted to the revolutionary doctrines of the west. When Alexander died in 1825 they attempted to take advantage of complications connected with the succession, and effected a rising in St. Petersburg the object of which was to place Constantine instead of Nicholas, on the throne. How little they represented the masses is shown by the fact that the population at large hardly stirred. Indeed, it is said that the "Constitution" for which they cried was believed by the people to be the wife of Constantine. The rising was suppressed with little difficulty and the ringleaders shot.

Nicholas I was no less reactionary than Charles X and Ferdinand VII, though he was a man of greater ability. He opposed all reforms, and during his autocratic reign of thirty years nearly every new institution and progressive idea brought into Russia disappeared. The iron arm of autocracy reached everywhere and held all in subjection by force and terror. Reaction as a system was carried to perfection and as a result Russia became one of the most benighted countries in Europe. A conscious policy of cultural isolation was fostered.

2. The Austria of Francis I

The Austrian Empire

In spite of the series of defeats at the hands of Napoleon, Austria had emerged in 1815 stronger, larger, and more populous than ever. With her 30,000,000 people, she soon became the dominant power on the continent. But within the Austrian Empire were serious menaces which were to lead eventually to her destruction. She was a medley of races, states, tongues, religions, and institutions, without national, racial, or social unity. Germans in the west, Magyars in the central east, Italians in the south, and Slavs and Rumanians around the northern, eastern and southern borders, lacked the inspiration of a common history, patriotism, and rights. The Empire was held together only by the autocratic Hapsburg government supported by a loyal nobility and an extensive bureaucracy. The Hapsburgs were a German house, and the Germans were a minority in the Empire. The Congress of Vienna had placed Italy under the iron heel of the Hapsburg rulers and had given Austria the presidency in the Germanic Confederation. The political, social and educational institutions of Austria were those of the old régime. The autocratic emperor ruled with the aid of ministers and councils, like Louis XVI in France before

Hapsburgers

Institutions

1789. Society was divided into the privileged and unprivileged classes. Feudalism persisted, and the nobles were free from military service, held their own courts, and were exempt from many of the taxes. They monopolized the offices in the church and state, and owned most of the land. The middle class was small and of no importance. The peasants were in effect wretched serfs with little hope of relief from their galling burdens.

Home policy of Francis I

The domestic policy of the Austrian government was the special domain of Emperor Francis I, who, like so many of his contemporaries, had learned nothing from experience and who carried the idea of stagnation so far that even Metternich disapproved. To prevent racial independence from growing, he sent Hungarians to watch Italians; Italians to guard Slavs; Germans to occupy Bohemia; Czechs to defend Austria; and Slavs to terrify Hungary. To keep out dangerous revolutionary ideas from abroad, a cordon of tariffs and censors was placed on the borders of the Empire. Mail was opened and travelers were stopped on the frontiers and rigidly searched. The press was not free but formed a department of the government; education was in the hands of the clergy; and textbooks were selected by the imperial authorities. The theater, and even art and music were censored. Foreigners were closely watched. The police reported all books read by professors and students in the libraries. All kinds of associations were strictly forbidden. A friend of Metternich congratulated him for keeping the study of science and history out of the schools. Only half as many children were in receipt of elementary education as in Prussia. A copy of Copernicus, *On the Revolution of the Celestial Bodies*, was confiscated on the ground that it taught "revolution." Bible reading among the masses was not encouraged. The whole country was overrun with spies to keep civilization "frozen." The Catholic Church was the state church, and Protestant students could not receive a degree from a university. This was the system of Francis I in practical operation, which its author wished to extend to Europe. "Govern and change nothing" was urged in the will of Emperor Francis I.

Foreign policy of Francis and Metternich

Austria, with the exception of Russia, was the strongest power on the continent after 1815, and occupied a commanding position in the heart of Europe. Italy was a dependency, as were most of the German states, except Prussia. Austria's aim was to build up a union of the great powers of Europe under her own leadership. Through this league, based on force, the continent was to be protected against a new outburst of revolution and its horrors. Unfortunately, no distinction was made between the moderate demands of liberalism and the agitation of radicals. All opponents of the existing order were classed as "dangerous." Metternich regarded himself as the policeman of the continent and under his influence Austria threw her full force against constitutional development. It seemed to bode ill for the future of Europe and the world that the center of political power

in Europe was at the same time the center of opposition to political and intellectual advancement.

3. Prussia under Frederick William III, 1797–1840

Reforms in Prussia

Napoleon reduced Prussia to a third-rate state. This humiliation led patriots like Hardenberg and Stein to demand the modernization of the nation as the only method of recovering its position. "Patriots cannot be made out of serfs," said Stein, so serfdom was abolished, and the king rejoiced that he was not "the king of slaves, but of free men." Class distinctions were removed from the civil code. The government was reformed, and Scharnhorst reorganized the military system on the basis of universal service. Humboldt introduced a new system of education for the people, which soon made Prussia one of the most intelligent states in the world. These reforms came not from the people, as in France, but from the king. Nevertheless they were enthusiastically accepted and sent a thrill of patriotism throughout the nation. In the readjustments of the Congress of Vienna, Prussia emerged with her boundaries enlarged and her territory more unified, although Hanover still split the country into two parts. The government was an absolute monarchy like Austria. The population in 1815 numbered 10,500,000 and included a good many Poles in the east. Both nationally and economically Prussia was not yet a unity, and religiously the people were divided between Protestants and Catholics. The eastern portion of the monarchy was aristocratic with 15,000 noble (Junker) estates; the western half, much more prosperous and enjoying the commerce of the Rhine basin, had been affected by the French Revolution and was more democratic and industrial, with a rich middle class. The nobility were clamoring for the restoration of the old régime, but the liberals wanted a constitution and a parliamentary government.

Lack of unity

Frederick William III, like Tsar Alexander I, thought of giving Prussia a constitution, but the powerful landlords, or "Junkers," whom Stein called "heartless, wooden and half-educated," bitterly opposed such a step. The revolutionary writers and the outbreaks of students in some of the smaller German states caused the king to hesitate. Already in 1819 Prussia had coöperated with Austria in promulgating the Carlsbad Decrees, which subjected the universities to supervision and muzzled the press. When the revolutions occurred in Spain and Italy, Metternich persuaded him to abandon all thought of a constitution. Prussia now openly took her place beside Austria and Russia as a champion of autocracy and "an orgy of reaction set in." Prussian police were sent "demagogue hunting"; popular heroes like Jahn and Arndt were imprisoned; college professors and military officers suspected of liberalism were dismissed; and the whole country was overrun with spies. Paternal despotism in Prussia, unlike Austria, was wise enough, however, to see the advantages of a system of universal, compulsory education; a scientific financial

King becomes conservative

system; an intelligent control of the church; and a new customs union with other German states.

4. The Germanic Confederation

What to do with the numerous German states was one of the most perplexing questions before the Congress of Vienna, which Blücher called a "council of thrice-accursed constables and lazy-bones." A crowd of German princelings had flocked to the congress demanding the restoration of their estates. Patriots, on the other hand, pressed for a federal constitution. Stein's sensible proposal to create a strong German nation was opposed both by the jealous small states and by the greedy large states, Austria and Prussia, neither of which was willing to submit to the leadership of the other. As a result the congress, under the direction of the two large powers, organized a weak Confederation of 38 sovereign states under the direction of Austria — an organization that resembled the loose union of the American states under the Articles of Confederation. The Diet, which was provided, was merely a "permanent assembly of ambassadors" meeting at Frankfort to consider general policies. All Europe joked about this "center of inertia" in which delay was easier than action. One small state had the power to veto the wishes of all the others in any question involving a change in the Federal Act. Even the right of petition was censored. The execution of the laws enacted was left to the local rulers, and they enforced them only when they pleased. Germany was at the mercy of a union of jealous, selfish princes. Since Metternich had regarded a united German nation as an "infamous object," he now held a divided Germany under his thumb. The Confederation was to do for Germany what the Quadruple Alliance was to do for Europe, namely, preserve the existing social and political institutions unchanged.

The German Confederation

Weakness

Article 13 of the treaty drawn up at Vienna promised that a constitution would be established in all the states of the Confederation. A few of the south German states were granted charters by their rulers, in imitation of France, but some of these were soon withdrawn. A notable exception was the grand duchy of Saxe-Weimar whose ruler, the patron of Goethe and Schiller, established a modern type of government. In the other states all the people received was "a prophecy" and "an unlimited right of expectation." Absolutism generally prevailed, and Metternich grinned in mockery at the disappointment of the liberals. Progressive newspapers and societies were suppressed, and even the display of the black-red-gold national emblem was proscribed. The surest way to be thrown into prison was to appear in the streets in a black coat, red vest, and a straw hat.

Despotism in small states

With the triumph of autocracy, the German people increased their efforts to overthrow it. The middle class demanded a share in the government and the common people clamored for social reforms. The universities became centers of national patriotism, where the students

Opposition to autocracy in Germany

formed secret fraternities, sang of a united fatherland, and broke out in noisy demonstrations for self-government. To arouse the German people, one of these secret brotherhoods, called the *Burschenschaft*, held a national celebration on October 18, 1817, at the Wartburg castle, famous in the life of Luther. About 200 professors and students from sixteen universities attended. Patriotic songs were sung,

Wartburg Festival

the fiery orators denounced Metternich, and on the closing evening some of the symbols of military tyranny — a pigtail, a corset, a corporal's cane, the Prussian police code, and Kotzebue's *History of the German Empire* — were thrown into a bonfire in imitation of Luther's burning of the papal bull three centuries earlier. Reports of these boyish pranks soon reached the ears of the German rulers and caused great consternation. Austria and Prussia demanded that the grand duke of Saxe-Weimar, who had permitted the outrage, should make an investigation. He did so, and reported that the students had committed no grave offense. The Prussian minister of police was not satisfied and insisted that the "band of demoralized professors and corrupted students" be punished. Metternich professed to see in the incident positive proof of a wide-spread conspiracy to repeat the French Revolution. This conviction was strengthened when the author, Kotzebue, a Russian spy, was assassinated at Mannheim in 1819 by Karl Sand, a half-crazed Bavarian student.

As a result of the Wartburg festival, Metternich met Frederick William III and persuaded him to join in issuing the Carlsbad Decrees which had been formulated by eight frightened princes, to repress all

Carlsbad Decrees

liberal movements. The servile Diet proclaimed the Decrees as law and thus assured the triumph of the Metternich system in Germany. Student societies were suppressed. Special officers were sent to all the universities to supervise the conduct and expressions of students and teachers. Any professor guilty of spreading revolutionary ideas was to be dismissed and refused appointment elsewhere. Expelled students could not enter any other university. Suspected "democrats" were subjected to the rigors of a vindictive police law. The display of the new national flag was forbidden, and freedom of discussion was checked by a rigid censorship of the press. A mild reign of terror, which persecuted the "demagogues" into silence, resulted. One collegian was imprisoned for having drawn a cartoon showing the devil devouring a king. So brutally were these measures carried out that Castlereagh denounced them as a menace to the liberties of Europe, while even Tsar Alexander I publicly called them "absurd pretensions of absolute power." Humboldt protested against them as "shameful, unnational, and provocative for a thinking people." Nevertheless they continued in force for nearly twenty years.

After 1815 the fundamental problem confronting Europe was whether the old régime or the new should triumph. Absolute monarchy, feudal society, a fettered industry, education for the privileged few, and compulsion in religious belief were battling for

victory against self-government, equality, nationalism, freedom of trade, popular education, and liberty of worship. On the surface of things, for some years after the fall of Napoleon, it looked as if the reactionary forces had won. The enforcement of the Metternich system seemed to be a victory for the old order and the ancient institutions. Looking backward now, however, it is clear that the autocratic and privileged type of society was being undermined by a spirit of progress. The new ideas and institutions produced by the French Revolution, and spread over Europe by the conquering troops of Napoleon, were held in abeyance, it is true, by a Charles X, a George IV, a Ferdinand VII, a Nicholas I, or a Francis I, but they were not crushed out. They continued to grow and to spread in secret. Louis XVIII found it necessary to compromise with the new régime, and rulers over Europe generally had the same experience. Even Metternich was shrewd enough not to want to go back, for he knew that to be impossible, and only insisted upon standing still. Europe could never again be what it had been. The new hopes that had been born expressed themselves in a thousand different ways — in secret societies, and in songs, art, and literature. They were discussed in the fields, shops and drawing rooms, as well as in parliaments, congresses and royal courts. The Metternich system was doomed to failure because it was founded upon obscurantism, autocracy, force, injustice, and inequality. The time was not far off when the peoples of Europe would destroy it, legally if possible, forcibly if necessary.

Fundamental problem confronting Europe

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

A. Rambaud, *History of Russia*, English translation 3 vols. (1881); A. Kornilov, *Modern Russian History*, 2 vols. English translation by A. S. Kaun (1917); A. Czartoryski, *Memoirs and Correspondence with Alexander I*, 2 vols. (1888); N. Mikhailovitch, *L'Empereur Alexandre Ier*, 2 vols. (1913); T. Schiemann, *Geschichte Russlands unter Kaiser Nikolaus I*, 4 vols. (1904–1919); H. von Sybel, *Die Begründung des Deutschen Reiches durch Wilhelm I*, 7 vols. (1890–1898), English translation by M. L. Perrin and G. Bradford (1890–1898); H. von Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, 5 vols. (1890–1896), English translation (1915); P. M. Laurin, *Histoire de l'Autriche-Hongrie, depuis les Origines jusqu'à l'année 1878* (1879), English translation by Mrs. N. Hill, (1889); H. von Zwiedineck-Südenhorst, *Deutsche Geschichte von der Auflösung des alten bis zur Errichtung des neuen Kaiserreiches* (1806–1871), 3 vols. (1897–1906); M. L. Deventer, *Cinquante années de l'histoire fédérale de l'Allemagne* (1875); A. W. Ward, *Germany*, 3 vols. (1916–18); V. Bibl, *Der Zerfall Oesterreichs*, Vol. I, (1922).

PART IV

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION AND THE GROWTH OF CONSTITUTIONAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

CHAPTER IX

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

1. The Meaning and Significance of the Industrial Revolution

Forces in world history

The period of world history from 1815 to 1848 was characterized by four forces that engaged the chief attention of men: (1) the Industrial Revolution; (2) the rise of constitutionalism, which came through the various political revolts; (3) the growth of nationalism; and (4) the rise of socialism as a protest against the existing economic and social order.

Daily life of the people

The English Revolutions of 1649 and 1689, the American Revolution and the French Revolution had started the New World and the Old along the road towards political democracy and social equality. At the same time religious toleration and modern ideas of education were slowly growing. But the daily life of the masses of the people was much the same as it had been two thousand years ago. While their ideas in many respects were being modernized, their habits and ways of doing things had not changed a great deal since the time of Columbus and Luther. The tools of the farmer — the axe and the plow, the rake and the sickle — and the hammer, auger and chisel of the carpenter, were like those used by the Romans. Household utensils and comforts had undergone few improvements. The industrious mother carried her distaff about with her to make yarn, or sat by the open fire to spin it, or to knit it into stockings and mittens. Cloth was woven on a clumsy loom like that of the Egyptians. Grain was cut with a scythe or sickle and threshed with a flail, or trampled out by oxen as in Bible days. The homes of the people in the villages and cities were similar to those of the Middle Ages. People travelled in clumsy wagons, or on horseback, while goods were carried in squeaking carts or crude sailing vessels. It took as long to send a letter from London or Berlin to Naples as in the time of Charlemagne. If a shoemaker, or a blacksmith, or a stonemason of the days of St. Paul or even Abraham had returned to the world, he would have felt at home, after a little orientation, in the methods of work and ways of living.

Changes in last 150 y

What a transformation has taken place during the past century and a half! The farmer has a tractor for plowing, a selfbinder for his grain, a thresher for his wheat and oats, and an automobile for his marketing. In modern homes are found stoves, furnaces, steamheat, fireless cookers, sewing machines, electric washing machines, telephones, phonographs, radios, and dozens of other devices for saving

labor and for adding enjoyment. In like manner the simple tools of the artisans have been largely replaced by machines to make shoes and clothing, to dig ditches and mine coal, to cut lumber and quarry stone, to build houses, bridges, and roads, to carry people and goods, and to lighten toil in a thousand directions, or to get a greater number of products from the same amount of toil. Iron, steam, gasoline, and electricity now do the heavy work on the farm, in the mine, and in the city. A new world has come into existence — a world of science and machinery. Huge cities full of factories have sprung up. Railroads now run to all parts of the globe, giant steamships plow the seas, and airships rush swiftly through space over land and water. The telegraph, cable, and telephone make the whole world a neighborhood. The printing-press brings to the humblest workman every day the news of the entire earth.

Why the Industrial Revolution came first in England

This transformation, which began early in the eighteenth century and is still in progress, is known as the Industrial Revolution. It came slowly and steadily, not suddenly and violently, but it has produced a new civilization. Germany was the home of the religious reformation; England, the United States and France the scene of the political revolutions; and England, the original source of the Industrial Revolution. Great Britain was peculiarly fitted for leadership in this movement. She had a strongly centralized and stable government which fostered business interests. Her powerful navy protected her from invasion and made her mistress of the seas, while her large merchant marine gave her the commercial leadership of the world. She was blessed with vast supplies of coal and iron ore, and an unequalled quality of wool. She had already built up a world market for her goods as is shown by the fact that between 1700, and 1800 her foreign trade increased sixfold, while her domestic trade was still larger. The small shops, although quite numerous, could not produce goods fast enough to supply the demands. Scientific societies were offering prizes for improved tools, and thus encouraging British genius for invention and organization to utilize the large amount of cheap, efficient labor. The surplus wealth made from wool-growing and trade was awaiting investment. The rise of commerce and capital produced the *entrepreneur* and promoter to organize and guide the new industry. All these factors, which were not so pronounced in other countries, explain why the Industrial Revolution first occurred in Great Britain, and then, like the French Revolution, spread to other lands, and is still reaching out over the world.

2. The Background and Antecedents of the Industrial Revolution

The Industrial Revolution was preceded by (1) the Commercial Revolution, which resulted from the expansion of Europe, and (2) the agricultural improvements. These movements began in

the seventeenth century and lapped over into the nineteenth century. In the eighteenth century Great Britain was predominantly an agricultural country. The small farmers played an important role in the economic life until their power was broken by the acquisition of land by the old nobility and the rich tradesmen through purchase and the "enclosure" of the "commons" and waste lands. From 1709 to 1839 over 4000 acts of Parliament enabled these large landlords to secure more than seven million acres. Many of the small farmers also sold their little holdings and went either to the large cities or to the colonies for better opportunities. The passing of the land into the hands of fewer owners resulted in the investment of more capital in agriculture and in better farming. Cultivation became more intensive, fallow lands were "seeded down," wooded and waste lands were cleared, fertilizers were used, and the increase in flocks and crops made it easier to supply the increasing population with food and clothing. Not until 1792 was Great Britain forced to import grain for foodstuffs. *Antecedents*

The first signs of a change in agriculture came early in the eighteenth century, when, by crop-rotation introduced by Charles Townshend, fallow lands were used to raise clover, beets and turnips, which had been introduced from the continent. This improved the soil, raised more food, and enabled the farmers to keep better breeds of cattle and sheep. Closer attention to scientific stock-raising by Robert Bakewell and others meant richer soil, more beef and mutton, leather and wool. Swamps and marshes were drained, and new grains, grasses, and vegetables were grown. Up to 1750 three fifths of the land was still not "enclosed," but after that date the process of large-scale farming began to increase rapidly, and was defended on the ground that it was more scientific and economical. In 1789 about one third of the land was "unenclosed." An improvement in farm machinery and tools followed the initial work of Jethro Tull. The first crude but successful thrashing machine was invented in 1786 by the Scotchman, Andrew Meikle. Small's cast-iron plough appeared in 1800, but farmers, fearing that it would "poison" the soil, were slow to use it. The cradle-scythe, patented in 1808 in America, enabled one man to do the work of ten with the old sickle. After 1815 scientific drainage was adopted, and the chemical nature of soil studied. More attention was given to the selection of seeds. In 1838 the Royal Agricultural Society was formed. Arthur Young was the great prophet and promoter of these changes in agriculture. *Agricultural Revolution*

These humble beginnings were a phase of a great world movement which was to usher in "modern times." They made it easier to feed and clothe the people of the world. They brought about mighty economic transformations. Manufactured woolens increased between 1700 and 1775 from forty to sixty-five million dollars. The "enclosures" drove thousands to the factory towns to supply an abundance of labor to run the new machinery. Other thousands helped to build *Beginnings of a world movement*

up the British Empire. Three classes were left on the soil: (1) the large-scale landlords, (2) the small, independent farmers, and (3) the farm hands working for a wage. In 1876 the "New Doomsday Book" showed that England had the largest average land holdings and the smallest number of cultivators, who owned their own land. Of the 966,000 landowners outside of London, 263,00 only possessed more more than one acre, while in France there were 5,600,000 landholders and in Belgium 1,000,000.

The invention of the mariner's compass and fire-arms contributed to the expansion of Europe overseas through exploration, discoveries, and colonization. The printing-press helped to spread a knowledge of the earth and its inhabitants, and greatly accelerated the work of the cartographers. The seventeenth century was preëminently an age of mathematics, physics, and mechanics, which laid the foundations for modern science. In the eighteenth century England was superior in applied science. If a physicist at Marburg, Germany, one Denis Papin, discovered the expansive power of heat, it was Watt who applied it to the steam engine, which bridged the chasm between science and business. While many of the English inventors were men without technical education, still they utilized the scientific principles already discovered. Thus the man of science pointed out the way to the man of tools. In the seventeenth century France and England worked together in promoting the new science, but in the next century France devoted her energies to political and social improvements while England promoted the Industrial Revolution. England was indebted to the continent for many inventions. In 1700 Manchester adopted from Holland the "swivel-loom" for weaving many narrow ribbons at once. The art of trimming iron plates was taken from Saxony, and perfected in South Wales. Improved "silk throwing mills" were built in England in 1719 on Italian models. Indeed up to 1730 the continent was ahead of England in mechanical technique. England was even indebted to Holland for the plough. The French Revolution and the first steam-propelled cotton-spinning mill are marked by the same date. It was science, therefore, applied to economics and sociology, that prepared the way for the great transformations in industry and commerce. The Industrial Revolution, like all mighty movements, was the natural sequel of preceding forces, but its significance was understood only when men began to see the profound changes it wrought in society as a whole.

Advance in science

The overseas expansion of Europe and the Commercial Revolution greatly increased the volume of trade by opening up new markets and by creating demands for more European goods. The importance of money as an aid in business received careful study, and improved financial institutions appeared. Larger and more numerous organizations for trade and commerce responded to the greater opportunities for profit. The increase in population, the rise of higher standards of

Commercial Revolution

comfort, and the call for European products in foreign markets, necessitated improvements in the methods of production, which would multiply the output. Necessity and the prospect of gain became the parents of inventions. At the same time the emergence of the middle class supplied men who were capable of taking full advantage of the new conditions for themselves and the world in general. These factors prepared the way for the Industrial Revolution.

Immediat causes of Industria Revolutio

The immediate causes of the Industrial Revolution were (1) the discovery of new sources of power in water, coal, steam, gas and electricity; (2) the discovery of new processes in chemistry; and (3) the new mechanical inventions to take the place of manual labor. These new forces were not created by kings and generals, nor even by great philosophers, but by humble scholars and workmen seeking to save time and toil. In world history, the evolution in the manufacture of cloth is more important than the creation of constitutions. The steam engine and printing-press have added more to the freedom and happiness of man than all the wars of conquest with which the pages of history are too often filled. To these causes of power, knowledge and technique should be added the abundance of capital and cheap labor, and the progress already made by the merchant-manufacturer under the old guild and domestic systems. London by 1789 had superseded Amsterdam as the center of money and commerce and was the recognized financial capital of the western world. It was the money made out of business that enabled Great Britain to fight the long series of wars with France, and her monetary primacy was greater than ever after the fall of Napoleon. Many foreign merchants and capitalists, among them Nathan Rothschild, settled in London. Private banks on the Italian model were numerous. Lloyd's marine insurance company, reorganized in 1779, was insuring foreign as well as British vessels. Thousands of skilled workmen from France and Holland had gone to England to join the British laborers, and thus amply supplied the needed man-power.

To understand just what industrial and social transformation came through the Industrial Revolution, the life of a country like England under the old economic régime must be clearly visualized. Picture the people living for the most part on their own farms or on the manors of the great lords, feeding themselves with the produce of their own labor, shoeing and clothing themselves with the hides and wool of their own flocks, making their own crude tools, and leading a simple and fairly happy life. The good summer days were devoted to agriculture, and rainy days and the winter months given to mending and making harness, tools, boots, clothing, and other necessities, or to spinning and weaving. The farmers were "Jacks of all trades" and not only supplied practically all their own needs at home but also had a surplus of home-made yarn, cloth, and other articles to sell. This was called the "domestic system." The spinning and

weaving of wool was found as a by-employment all over England as late as 1820, when the power looms began to be applied to the worsted trade. In the hamlets, towns and cities were found the handicrafts-men, such as blacksmiths, wagonmakers, masons, carpenters, and other skilled workmen, who had their own shops and devoted practically all of their time to a specialized business. Such manufacturing as existed was carried on through the domestic system. The guild system had disappeared in England by 1700. Glass, hardware, beer, bricks, tile, pottery and paper, as well as foods, textiles and leather goods, were all made under the domestic plan.

Industrial life under the old régime

There had come into existence under the old economic régime a certain type of a business man who might be called a capitalist. In all western nations — more commonly in England, Belgium and Holland — and even in Russia, in the eighteenth century, there was large-scale mining and manufacturing and also many trades in which capitalists invested money and employed hand-workers. For instance, the "clothier" raised or bought his wool, sent it to the spinners, weavers, dyers, fullers, shearers and dressers, and then sold the finished product wherever he might find a market. A "wagoner" with his money invested in wagons and teams hauled goods on contract, or managed a system of stage coaches, or served as a letter carrier. He might also own a series of inns along the route of the stage coach or possess storage warehouses, and thus add another source of profit. The "broker" was another capitalist, who might own his own show rooms, act as a sales agent for the manufacturer, export and import goods, purchase raw materials and finished goods as a jobber, and make money as a "middle man." The ship owner was also a capitalist who made wealth out of commerce. Companies, partnerships, and joint stock corporations of all sorts were more numerous than one might think. This expansion of business necessitated the establishment of banks, credit systems, and improved methods of accounting. These facts will help to explain how the old economic system in England, through the Industrial Revolution, hastened the transition to the modern economic system.

3. The Technological Revolution: the Coming of the Empire of Machines

Changes in spinning and weaving cotton

It should be seen, from what has been said, that many forces were already transforming the industrial world in preparation for the Industrial Revolution. The mechanical inventions were not the original cause of this change but a result of it, and in turn served to accelerate it. A description of the progress made in the spinning and weaving of cotton will help to make this relationship clear. The lucrative trade with India brought to England large quantities of cotton cloth. Its cheapness, durability and wide use greatly injured the woolen, linen and silk industries. From 1740 to 1770 the imports of cottons trebled, and fortunes were made from their sale. As early

as 1750 cotton exports equalled $250,000. This competition led the makers of other textiles to attempt to restrict the sale of cotton fabrics in England and on the continent. The battle between King Wool and King Cotton was a life and death struggle. The champions of King Cotton turned to new devices and inventions to win their victory. By 1802 the exports of manufactured cotton goods equalled those made of woolens, and soon greatly exceeded them. King Cotton's triumph not only laid the foundations for a new industry, but it also changed the life and habits of a large part of the world. The importation of raw cotton increased from 1,000,000 pounds in 1760 to 56,000,000 pounds in 1800 and 400,000,000 pounds in 1840, whereas in the last-named year only 200,000,000 pounds of wool was used in England. Between 1820 and 1840 wool began to reach Europe from Australia, Cape Colony and the Plate River.

With this situation in mind, it is not surprising to find that the early inventions of the Industrial Revolution were mostly connected with cotton manufacture. Next to food comes clothing in the list of man's elemental needs. For centuries yarn — wool, linen, silk, and cotton — was made by the primitive distaff and spindle. The invention of the spinning wheel, turned at first by hand and then by the foot, increased the output, but still produced only one thread. Kay's "flying shuttle," invented in 1733, had put the weavers far ahead of the spinners in efficiency. A weaver at his clumsy loom could use as much yarn or thread as eight or ten spinners could supply. The first spinning mill at Birmingham in 1741 employed ten girls. In 1758 Wyatt and Paul took out a patent for a "spinning engine" which combined rollers with bobbins. So great was the demand for a more rapid method of spinning that in 1761 the English Society for Encouraging Manufacturers offered a prize for such an invention. In 1764 a weaver named Hargreaves, taking the hint, it is said, from his wife's overturned spinning wheel, invented a "Jenny" by which one wheel turned eight spindles at once. Five years later Arkwright, in his early days a hair dyer and wig maker, devised a spinning machine of rollers revolving at different speeds, and ran it by water power instead of by man or horse power. This "Water Frame" spun cotton into threads rapidly and so firmly that cloth could now be woven entirely from cotton instead of using linen for the warp. The first mill using this device was set up in 1771 at Crawford. Arkwright's invention was in use in 150 mills by 1790 and made him a fortune. By the close of the American Revolution 20,000 of Hargreaves' "Jennies" were in use doing the work of 1,500,000 spinners. In 1779 Crompton combined the "Jenny" and the "Water Frame" in a new machine called the "Mule," by which one spinner could spin 200 fine threads at once and thus made possible the weaving of fine muslin. He received but $300 for his invention though he spent his life improving it. In 1792 Kelly invented his self-acting "Mule." By 1811, 4,500,000 spindles worked by "Mules" were in use. Today

Mechanical improvements

Spinning machines

over 2,000 spindles are carried at once on one machine. New devices for carding also came into use. While these improvements in spinning were designed primarily for cotton, they were also soon used for woolens, linens and silks.

Improvements in weaving

Now the weavers had too much thread and necessity moved them to improve the loom, which had not been changed since Kay made his shuttle in 1733. Cartwright, a clergyman, patented in 1785 the first power loom in which the shuttle was thrown back and forth automatically by water power. With it a child of fifteen could weave as much cloth as several hand-weavers. Cartwright's original loom was quickly improved by other inventors. A Manchester firm in 1791 called for 400 of these looms, and by 1815, despite the hostility of the weavers who feared the loss of employment, the power loom, at least for cotton weaving, had come into use. Between 1813 and 1833 the power looms increased from 2,300 to 100,000 in number, and after 1815 steam began to replace water as the motive power.

Cotton gin

Soon the spinners and weavers were crying for more cotton. Picking the little seeds out of the raw cotton by hand was a slow process. In 1792 an American named Eli Whitney invented the "Cotton Gin" with which one slave in one day could clean as much raw cotton as he had done before by hand in a whole year. As a result the export of cotton from the United States increased from 200,000 pounds in 1793 to 40,000,000 in 1803. The manufacture of cotton cloth centered in Great Britain, thanks to these inventions, and she controlled most of the markets of the world. The discovery of methods of

Bleaching and colored printing

chemical bleaching and of printing colored calicos from inked rollers greatly extended the use of cotton cloth, and made it one of the revolutionizing forces in modern civilization. By 1851 over one third of the workers in Great Britain were engaged in textile industries, whereas before the Industrial Revolution agriculture employed most of the population.

New sources of power

The utilization of new sources of power accompanied the changes already described. The transition from hand to foot power; then to water and steam power; and finally to gasoline and electric power, has been another large factor in the Industrial Revolution. It is estimated that the steam engine alone has added the equivalent of one billion men to industry, and that water power, gas and electricity have doubled that estimate. As early as 1705 Newcomen, by using the principle of the cylinder and piston, constructed a "fire engine" to meet the need of pumping water out of the coal mines. It was soon doing the work of fifty horses and greatly multiplied the coal output. Newcomen's engine and other early types were in reality atmosphere engines rather than "steam engines." James Watt, a Scotchman, by 1768, had patented an improved steam engine, and in 1785 hitched it up to spinning machines and looms. The next great improvement in the steam engine came with the invention of the turbine engine about 1890. The improvement of tools, better and cheaper iron, and the

gradual advance in mechanical technique soon enabled clever men to revolutionize the methods of transportation by land and sea. In time steam was in part replaced by internal combustion engines and electricity.

The first improvement in land travel and transportation over the horse and the clumsy ox-cart was the stage coach which came into general use about 1700. Then followed an era of road-building on the continent and in England. About 1670 England began to facilitate travel by building turnpikes and charging toll for their use. Mac-Adam, a Scotchman, devised a new method of road-building, which bears his name to this day. In 1767 iron strips were laid on plank roads by tram companies to facilitate hauling, especially from the coal mines. Englishmen began to talk about the "astonishing changes" in transportation. Then the roads were supplemented by canals as early as 1759 and better bridges built over the rivers. The first canal with locks was built in 1761 to carry coal from a mine to Manchester seven miles away. An iron canal boat seventy feet long and seven feet eight inches wide was built in 1787 at Birmingham. Rivers were widened and deepened, harbors improved and docks constructed. By the close of the eighteenth century more rapid transportation than the slow cart and sailboat was demanded to bring raw materials and food, and to carry finished goods to the markets. John Fitch, a poor American carpenter, in 1787 built a boat with side paddles driven by steam, and ran it up and down the river at Philadelphia. In 1802 a steam tug was operating successfully in the Forth and Clyde canal, and in 1812 Bell's *Comet* was sailing on the Clyde. Robert Fulton, in 1807, launched his steamboat, the *Clermont*, with a Watt Engine, on the Hudson River, and ran it at the rate of five miles an hour from New York to Albany. The next year a regular line of steamers plied between the two cities. In 1811 a steamer made its way down the Ohio and Mississippi to New Orleans. In the year of Waterloo a steamer first made passage from London to Glasgow. The *Savannah* in 1819, with the aid of sails, as well as steam, crossed the Atlantic in twenty-nine days, and the *Great Western* in 1838 made the voyage in fifteen days. The screw propeller invented by Ericsson came into use about the same time. The Cunard Line was organized in 1840, and by 1854 the Atlantic was crossed in nine days. By the middle of the century iron vessels began to replace wooden ones. The problem of transportation by water was solved. Remarkable improvements in navigation quickly followed these beginnings. Steam had conquered the seas.

Roads

Progress in transportation by water

If steam could drive boats across the ocean, why not carts and coaches on land? Wagons drawn by horses over "tramways" with wooden, and later iron rails, had long been in use in England and America. John Stevens in the United States invented a traveling engine, but could get no capital to promote it. In Great Britain in 1801 Richard Trevithich invented the locomotive and in 1804 the rail-

Railroads

way. In 1814 George Stevenson built the "Puffing Billy" with which coal was hauled from a mine to the nearest canal. By 1825 a passenger line twelve miles long was opened in Great Britain. At the first exhibition a man rode on horseback ahead of the engine, which travelled at a speed of twelve miles an hour, to warn people off the track. In 1830 the first train ran from Liverpool to Manchester covering the twenty-seven miles in one hour and a half. By 1843 there were 1800 miles of finished railroad in England. In 1828 the aged Charles Carroll, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, drove the golden spike that began the construction of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad in the United States. In 1833 passengers were carried from London to Liverpool in ten hours instead of the week taken by the old stage coach. By 1844 the various short lines were consolidated into a system with a uniform gauge of track. The railroad age had come. Improvements rapidly multiplied. Wooden rails covered with strap iron gave way to iron rails, and the latter to steel rails. A flexible roadbed with ties and gravel ballast was provided. Freight cars, and coaches with diners and sleeping cars replaced the small coaches of an early day. The toy engines of seven tons were followed by iron giants. The speed increased from thirteen to seventy miles an hour. Today the automobile, motor truck, submarine, and air ship are beginning to rival the steamship and locomotive.

Communication

The communication of ideas to distant points depended upon the speed of travel until the telegraph was perfected in 1832 by Morse and Vail, two Americans. Bells had been used in the Middle Ages to send messages, and signal fires on the tops of mountains served to arouse the countryside to war. Napoleon employed a system of long-distance signalling by means of semaphores or poles with movable arms on them. With the telegraph, however, messages in word-signs were sent over a copper wire to distant points within a few seconds. The same principle was employed in 1866 in an under-sea cable from America to Europe. The telephone was discovered in 1860 by Philip Reis of Germany and improved by the American, Alexander Graham Bell, for practical use. Finally there came the wireless telegraph, and the wireless telephone or radio. Through these marvelous inventions the business of the world was facilitated and the most distant peoples were brought into constant communication. A business man in Chicago may send a message to Hong Kong in a few minutes. The human voice is carried from New York to Glasgow, and from London to Rome.

The earliest machinery to improve spinning and weaving were made mostly out of wood and leather. A wood-cutting lathe was patented in 1790. But wood gradually became scarce as the forests were cut down and used for fuel and for the smelting of iron, and wood was scarcely strong or tough enough for the new machines. Not until 1740 was iron smelted with coal or coke, when 17,000 tons of raw iron was produced. Although England had plenty of iron and

coal, yet in 1750 she was importing pig iron from Sweden. The steam engine and locomotive called for more coal and iron. Soon, by the utilization of the new machinery to pump water out of the mines and to carry the coal to market, the production of coal became unprecedented. The slow and costly method of smelting iron was improved in 1760 by the blast furnace, which increased the output of a furnace fourfold by a forced draft and the substitution of coke for coal. This early cast iron was brittle, but the carbon was eliminated by Henry Cort's "puddling" process in 1784 and a tougher wrought iron resulted which revolutionized the industry. By 1800 England was producing 150,000 tons of iron and by 1815 she was exporting 91,000 tons annually. Nails were still made in blacksmith shops from long rods hammered out by hand and cut with chisels. The first screw-cutting lathe was patented in 1800. Expert tool-makers proved to be an important factor in the progress of industry. The Bessemer process in 1856 produced a still harder and better metal called steel, and brought the inventor a large fortune. The steel industry was further forwarded by the "open-hearth" and the Thomas-Gilchrist's "basic lining" processes.

New methods of smelting iron

Thus by the use of coal and steel the brain of man gave the world the machine, a new slave without nerves to hurt or muscles to tire, which helps to feed and clothe humanity, and annihilates time and space. The thousands of inventions have magnified man's power many times. The telescope and microscope have enlarged his vision. The telephone enables his voice and ear to speak and hear around the globe. Many machines multiply the strength and reach of his arm and give him a thousand fingers. He travels about the earth by land and sea or through the air with incredible speed. Nothing seems impossible to his inventive genius in applying science to life. The fairy tales and miracles of the past have been surpassed by actual achievements altering the world's ways of living, of enjoying, and of doing things. Verily the Industrial Revolution has produced a new world.

Other inventions

This transformation of the life of the world was due to the application of the physical sciences, particularly chemistry, physics, and mechanics, to manufacturing processes, to modes of transportation, and to facilities for communication. It involved a transition from the method of handicraft to machine technique, the provision of cheaper and more effective ways of making metal products, and the dissemination of knowledge through cheap, popular newspapers and books. The old system of guild and domestic production, and the personal basis for industrial relations and discipline were displaced by the factory system, impersonal relations in industry, and a strikingly different type of industrial discipline. The new technology and the rise of the factory system resulted in innumerable economic changes, new theories of business control, altered social relations, the increase of information, and rapid strides towards political

General effects of applied science

democracy. These results will now be explained in somewhat greater detail.

4. Economic Results of the Industrial Revolution

The economic effects of the Industrial Revolution were especially marked in the expansion of industry and the increase in commerce. The new machinery and the improved methods brought a tremendous increase in the output of the factory, mine and farm. English exports grew in value from $65,000,000 in 1782 to $290,000,000 in 1815. To France alone in 1793 were sold goods to the sum of $5,000,000.

Increased production

Within the past one hundred and fifty years the value of British cotton manufacturers has increased six hundred times. If every woman and child on earth were set to spinning with the old fashioned spinning wheel, they could not produce as much thread as is now made by machinery. The 20,000 tons of ore mined in England in 1750 is exceeded five hundredfold today. Improved tools and scientific methods in farming have brought hundreds of thousands of acres of new land under cultivation, and increased the produce of each acre. A visit to any large department store will reveal the endless variety of things made for man's use and comfort. Enormous quantities of goods are distributed over the world easily and cheaply. Distant countries exchange their wares as readily as farmers in a single neighborhood did a century ago. New markets have been opened up around the globe. A business man in Boston or London carries on a world trade with as much ease as the country storekeeper used to supply his community. British trade increased fivefold from 1750 to 1830, and seventy times from 1830, to 1910. For the first half of the nineteenth century the commerce of America and Europe increased 800 per cent, and the growth since 1850 has been even greater.

The disappearance of the domestic system of labor, if measured in terms of human welfare, was historically one of the most significant results. Hand-labor gave place to machine-labor, and the independent home-laborer was converted into the paid factory-laborer. In the olden days the farmer and his family engaged in spinning and weaving at home. The cobbler, or the tailor worked in his own shop after he had learned his trade and became a master workman. The blacksmith and wagon-maker had little independent establishments of their own, and took the greatest pride in their output. This was the "domestic system" of industry with no overproduction, no panics, little fluctuation in prices, and no serious labor problems. With the exception of the apprentices and hired men, the workers were masters of their own time. Their life was simple, frugal, and hard, it is true, but for the most part they seemed to be fairly happy and contented.

The "domestic system"

The "domestic system" was gradually crowded out by the rise of a capitalist class and the "factory system." The new thing in the Industrial Revolution was the importance which capital and the

factory came to have. This transition, it must be remembered, did not come suddenly but slowly and covered a long period of time. Under the old system of home-labor and the guilds there arose a class of wealthy men, who had much to do with the promotion of the Industrial Revolution. They were the "clothiers," "brokers," ship owners, "wagoners," mine owners, and rich merchants, who formed the middle class of "middle men." At first they imported raw cotton, or purchased wool, flax and silk, and resold them to the spinners and weavers. They also bought cloth and sold it in distant markets, or handled it on commission. Under the domestic system the richer master workmen employed outside laborers and ceased working themselves. Their work-rooms were often factories without machinery. In fact hand looms continued to be used in factories well into the nineteenth century. The silk throwing mill of John Lambe in 1719 has been called the first factory. The old system and the new existed side by side, but the factory system eventually replaced the domestic system, although it was not until as late as 1830 that the weaving machines seriously threatened the extinction of the old hand looms. Under the sway of the merchant-capitalists, then, were the beginnings of the capitalist class and the factory organization. With the new inventions many spindles, or looms, or both, were assembled for discipline and economy under one roof thus making a "factory." With the increase of capital hundreds of these factories for spinning cotton and wool and for weaving all sorts of cloth were built near an abundance of water power or of coal which could be used for steam engines. A good supply of labor was of course just as important as money and power.

Emergence of factories

Men with brains and ability put their wealth into these enterprises and thereby increased it. Boulton and Holt, for instance, had a manufacturing plant at Soho, which produced everything from buttons, buckles, and watchchains to steam engines, and made them rich. Arkwright, called the "father of the factory system," became a millionaire and was knighted by King George III. At the outset the capitalist millowner was promoter, manager, and salesman. As the business grew, he hired competent men to perform these duties and gradually became merely an investor, who took his profits and invested them in other factories, or mines, or steamships, or railroads. The rapid growth of industry increased the number of capitalists until they became a powerful factor in national affairs. Commerce and industry were now organized on a world scale, and capital and labor were for the first time thoroughly differentiated. New types of the middle class appeared, such as the trained mechanical engineer, who was soon in great demand on the continent as well as in Europe, the wholesaler, the retailer, the skilled millwright, the efficient mechanic, and the superintendant, who made it easier for invested capital to obtain satisfactory returns.

Capitalists

5. Social Results of the Industrial Revolution

A readjustment of society also appeared. Just as the old régime had its nobles and serfs, so the new society produced by the Industrial Revolution had its capitalists and wage-earners. The rich middle class was composed of manufacturers, merchants, traders, mine owners, shippers, bankers, and professional men, known on the continent as the *bourgeoisie*. The wage-earning class made up of the mill workers and factory hands was called the *proletariat*. Wherever the factory system spread it produced these two classes. The barrier between them, however, was not like that in the old régime because the ablest and shrewdest of the laborers were continually pushing their way into the capitalist class. Nevertheless the gulf between the rich and the poor was greatly widened.

Social changes

With the rise of the factory came the new city and its problems. Between 1760 and 1821 the population of Great Britain grew from 7,000,000 to 15,000,000. The population of Liverpool increased from 40,000 in 1760 to 228,000 in 1841, and that of Manchester from 45,000 to 300,000. The people of Lancashire in 1760 numbered 166,000, and in 1901 around 4,500,000. London, already the greatest city in the world in 1801, doubled its population in the next forty years. The population quickly shifted from the country to the cities. In 1800 there were only eighteen cities in Europe with more than 100,000 inhabitants. Today there are ten times as many such cities. In Great Britain three fourths of the people live in the cities, and one fifth of the population live in the single city of London. The growth of the cities brought with it innumerable changes in housing, food, clothing, recreations, and education. The complex city differed in a hundred ways from the simple life of the country or the little hamlet. The changes resulted in both good and evil. On the whole, city life was, perhaps, pleasanter, less laborious and tiresome, and had more opportunities for pleasure and culture.

Rise of large cities

At the same time the Industrial Revolution brought many drawbacks for the working people. While the capitalist became wealthy and independent, the lot of the wage-earners was too often one of dire want. Under the factory system the workman was little more than a post in a huge plant. Knowledge and ability received small opportunity for advancement, when one spent the whole day feeding hungry machines and repairing them. The factory hand came and went with the blast of the whistle to put in his twelve or even eighteen hours of labor for a low wage. In 1802 the average weekly pay of weavers was $3.38 and in 1817 only $4.02, and yet wheat cost per bushel in these same years $2.11 and $3. Under the old economic régime the apprentice system, which permitted master workmen to use paupers, was at times little short of actual white slavery. Under the new régime laborers declared that they were worse off than under the old, hence they protested against the rise of the factories, and broke out again

Sad lot of the wage-earners

and again in destructive riots. Too frequently, owing to the monotony of their work, they had little honest pride in their toil, and thought only of the pay received. Their labor, through the new machinery, vastly increased wealth, lowered prices, and in general benefited the world, but their own condition was not improved by the transformation until well along in the nineteenth century. Wages were low and workers were so plentiful that the average workman suffered much from poverty. The factories were neither sanitary, nor well-lighted and heated. The workers toiled under harsh and oppressive taskmasters, and, with some exceptions, their condition was one of degradation and misery. After 1840 the supply of unskilled labor was more than could be absorbed in industry and, consequently, led to serious manifestations of discontent.

The factory system, unfortunately, found its worst victims among women and children rather than among the strong men. As soon as it was discovered that women and children could tend the spinning and weaving machines as well or better than men, they were extensively employed in the mills, and even in the coal mines. It is estimated that the factory workers on fine broad cloth from 1781 to 1828, consisted of about 20 women, 45 children, and only 35 men, out of every 100 workers. In the cotton mills around three fourths of the workers were women and children, and many of the latter were as young as ten years of age. The wages of the women and children were incredibly low and the hours of labor long. As a result of this situation, the men were often jobless, and spent their idle hours in the taverns, while women and children became the real bread-winners. A happy home life tended to disappear. Vice and crime increased with poverty and unemployment of the men. Empty stomachs led to riots and the destruction of valuable machinery. The economic system that should have brought more happiness, more comfort, shorter hours, higher wages, more political rights, and a finer type of men and women, seemed at the opening of the last century to be dragging civilization backwards. As late as the coronation of Queen Victoria in 1837 it appears that 10 per cent of the people in Manchester, as an example, lived in cellars which were damp and filthy. The traffic in orphans and pauper children might well be compared to human slavery in the southern part of the United States.

Women and children

Home life

Since riots and protests failed to remedy the economic and social evils, the common people began to demand civil rights and a greater share in the government. The state regulation of industry practiced under the old régime curtailed the opportunities of the aggressive business man to venture out into new paths. With the French Revolution came the new theory of "liberty" in industry, called the *laissez-faire* doctrine, which demanded: (1) free competition, (2) non-interference by the state except to protect property and to keep order, and (3) the prohibition of labor unions. The "natural rights" of both capitalists and workers were in nowise to be interfered with,

"Liberty" in industry

and this idea prevailed during the early part of the nineteenth century in the freest countries — the United States, Great Britain, and France. It worked well for the capitalists, but badly for the workers. To insure their freedom to make money, the rich and powerful middle class developed an ambition to control the government. They desired to prevent the laboring classes from organizing to force higher wages and shorter hours. They wanted to lower the cost of living by taking the duties off grain. At first they used their money to buy seats in Parliament, and then began to agitate in Parliament and outside for political reforms which would increase their power. In the general election of 1830 the Whigs defeated the Tories and were able to secure the passage of the Great Reform Bill of 1832, which ended the old political régime in Great Britain by doubling the number of voters and by beginning the transfer of political control from the clergy and nobility to the middle class. The reform of municipal government in 1835 gave all tax payers the right to vote for aldermen and mayors. But with these changes, however important, Great Britain was not yet a democracy. The opportunity of the new class of factory workers to secure representatives of their own in Parliament to protect their interests seemed remote indeed.

Political results

6. The Industrial Revolution in France

While this epoch-making transformation was taking place in Great Britain, it is difficult to realize how agriculture and industry were shackled on the continent in 1789 by the guild, the manor, feudalism, state monopolies, local tariffs, laws, and even the church. In France, however, some significant changes had occurred before the French Revolution. A better rotation of crops was reducing the extent of fallow lands. More clover and grass were grown, more potatoes were planted, and the cattle and sheep were improved by better breeds. During the period from 1789 to 1815 the French were devoting their energies to political and social reforms, and to Napoleon's imperialism. Serfdom was abolished and the social status of the rural population was improved. Although the number of land holders was very great before 1789, the growth of small holdings was accelerated by the sale of the estates of the nobles and of the church. Improved methods of farming, which resulted, increased the supply of food and of materials for manufacturing. Between 1789 and 1848 the yield of wheat increased from 93,000,000 to 152,000,000 bushels; of potatoes from 5,000,000 to 275,000,000 bushels; and of wine from 374,000,000 to 924,000,000 gallons. From 1818 to 1889 the yield of wheat was increased from 11 to 18 bushels per acre, and the number of cattle doubled. The population of France in 1831 was 29,000,000 of whom 17,500,000 were engaged in agriculture and only 6,200,000 in manufacturing. Today half of the people still live on farms, and over 3,000,000 of them have holdings under twenty-five acres in size. This explains why they are able to export food stuffs in normal times.

Economic conditions in France

After 1817 there was a steady increase in agricultural prosperity. The peasants worked hard and saved their earnings. More corn, tobacco, wool, madder, beets, and potatoes were grown than in the previous century. Agricultural schools were opened, provincial fairs were held, and model farms were established. With the improvement of roads, rivers, canals, and bridges the markets multiplied and the prices increased. But the French peasants were slow to adopt modern machinery. Although there were 100,000 threshing machines in France in 1862, of which 3,000 were operated by steam engines, yet in 1840 horses were still treading out grain and the flail was not discarded until 1861. Other labor-saving devices were adopted with equal tardiness. In 1830 fifty-eight beet sugar factories were making over 14,000,000 pounds of sugar. Not until after the middle of the last century was agriculture modernized.

The changes in commerce and manufacturing under the old régime were quite noticeable. Companies under royal patronage for all sorts of enterprises were not uncommon. In 1782 Louis XVI was the chief shareholder in an iron foundry at Creusot, and Marie Antoinette held most of the stock in a glass factory at the same place. In 1787 French exports amounted to $105,000,000, which was $26,000,000 more than in 1817. Yet there was no such Industrial Revolution in France as in Great Britain, because France lacked capital, skilled labor, full legal freedom, and political stability. The National Assembly in 1791 sought to destroy the guilds by opening all fields of business to any persons who secured a license. During the French Revolution and the Napoleonic wars the guilds tended to vanish in France and over a large part of Europe, but Napoleon restored some of them in order to regulate the prices and to improve the quality of the goods. In 1801, for instance, the guilds of the bakers and butchers were revived and lived until 1856, while the guild of printers was not abolished until 1862, and a few other guilds lasted until 1870. It was not until 1825, when the high duties on imported machinery were removed, that a transformation like the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain began.

French commerce and manufacturing

In the textile industry, particularly cotton, France lagged far behind her neighbor across the Channel. As early as 1770 cotton manufactoring was introduced in France, and in 1785 the first cotton mill equipped with English machinery was set up. Napoleon encouraged both spinning and weaving, but the old domestic system and the handicrafts prevailed until after 1825. In 1815 some 15,000,000 pounds of raw cotton were made up, and by 1830 this quantity had increased to over 64,000,000 pounds, which employed 260,000 persons. Here as in England the factory system was organized in connection with King Cotton. In all France in 1834 only 5,000 mechanical looms were in operation, but a dozen years later this number had increased to 31,000. The factory system in the true sense was established at Lille in 1840, at which time the woolen, linen, and silk industries had not yet adopted the power loom. The hand-made silks

French textiles

and linens were superior to those made in England. The loom for weaving complex patterns of silk was invented at Lyons in 1804, and adopted by the British. French shawls and veils found no equals in the west. In 1830 there were 70,000 silk workers in Lyons and vicinity alone, and 27,000 silk looms and twenty-seven calico establishments in Alsace. About 1820 lace making was introduced. In dyeing and bleaching France surpassed England. France excelled in industrial chemistry, invented the first oil lamp, and Daguerre in 1829 produced his "sun pictures." With the introduction of steam for power, considerable advance was made in the manufacture of textiles. Other articles made in this early period were paper, leather goods, watches and clocks, jewelery, soap, beer and liquors, glass, locks, and perfumery.

After 1817 the economic recovery of France from the drain of a generation of wars was accelerated. Capital was borrowed from the Barings in London, and the Hopes in Amsterdam at a low rate of interest. The National Bank, chartered in 1803 with a capital of $17,000,000, was also active in supplying the needed credit for business. Joint-stock companies were organized to build canals, to utilize water power for mills, and to operate mines of coal, salt, and precious metals. The bad roads which had hindered the growth of industry were so improved that by 1830 there were 30,000 miles. Over the better main lines coaches "in the English style" were drawn, and a "kind of a chariot" carried the mails. As early as 1814 tramways were in use. The first experiment in railway building in 1832 was followed by the opening in 1843 of an English-built railway from Paris to Rouen. After 1850 railway construction was rapid. The first stationary steam engine was set up at Cholet in 1779, but coal was too scarce and too dear to operate it. In 1810 sixteen steam engines were in use to pump water. By 1850 there were 5,322 steam engines in the country and ten years later the number had increased to 14,513. Although 600,000 tons of coal were mined in 1815, this quantity had increased by 1829 only 165,000 tons, and 600,000 tons still had to be imported to meet home needs. In 1814 a heavy duty was placed on iron to encourage the home industry. Wood was still used in the forges. About 160,000 tons of iron were used in industry but most of it was imported. Yet France was the first country to construct iron bridges. By 1830 there were 408 blast furnaces producing 100,000 tons of pig iron. Of these 29 used coke and the rest charcoal. Out of the 430 blast furnaces in 1864, 210 were still using charcoal. The first rolled plates of iron were made in 1819. With coal, iron, and the new machines France slowly but gradually forged ahead in the industrial world. In 1829 her total exports amounted to $133,000,000 and her imports $153,000,000. By 1846 her foreign trade had risen to $523,000,000 of which $240,000,000 consisted of exports.

French capitalists

Railroads

Coal and iron

In France the Industrial Revolution produced somewhat the same results as in Great Britain, though on a smaller scale. There was an

unprecedented increase in business and money making. The machine largely replaced hand-labor. Two sharply differentiated classes arose — the *bourgeoisie* and the *proletariat*. The former gathered so much strength that they were able, in the Revolution of 1830, to overthrow Charles X. Under his successor, Louis Philippe, they promoted industrial prosperity, but ignored the rights of the masses, who were suffering through long hours, low wages, and lack of employment. True it is that in 1833 primary schools were established for the children, but municipal reform and the reduction of the tariffs on imports were in the interest of the middle class. When the common people demanded the right to vote in order to redress their wrongs, the premier, Guizot, said: "Work and grow rich, and you will become voters." In both France and Great Britain, therefore, the Industrial Revolution put political power into the hands of the middle class, but left the workers disfranchised and restless. It was Blanqui, a French professor of economics, who first characterized this significant transformation as the "Industrial Revolution" and pointed out its historical consequences. It was compared with the French Revolution as marking a break with the past and as an effort to replace the old régime. It was more than "the conquest of nature by the machine" — it meant a new social and economic world. *Results*

7. The Beginnings of the New Industrial Order in Germany

Germany in the eighteenth century was broken up into a large number of small states. Nowhere had the people outgrown the guilds and handicrafts of the domestic system. Industry was fettered in a thousand ways as in the Middle Ages. A few improvements were made in agriculture. In western Germany new field crops had come in, and the fallow fields were cultivated. Elsewhere the land was allowed to lie fallow every third year. The persistence of the "common field" in Europe generally was a sign of the lack of progress. Before 1800 deep plowing was unknown, and the soil to the depth of three or four inches only was turned up. Most of the land was still held by "ancient feudal tenure." Although wolves were still found in France as late as 1830, in the extensive forests of Germany there were wild deer, elk, swine, foxes, lynxes, bears, badgers and wolves. At Gotha in 1817 rewards were paid for killing 90,000 field mice. Evidences of poverty are found in the use of goats instead of cows for domestic purposes. Grain, fruits and vegetables were grown to feed the people, and they were clothed from the wool, flax and hemp raised at home. In 1803 in Prussia 73 per cent of the people, and in Germany as a whole 80 per cent, lived on the land as farmers. Of the 13,500,000 inhabitants of Prussia in 1834 three fourths were peasants. "Personal slavery" was not abolished until 1811. In most of the German states serfdom had disappeared by 1820. In *Conditions in Germany*

Germany as in France before the nineteenth century the small holdings had become numerous. This was particularly true in western Germany, while in the northeast the holdings tended to increase in size as in England. The number of acres tilled grew from 23,000,000 in 1816 to 44,000,000 in 1887. By 1850 there existed a large number of free, landless agricultural laborers who might easily be absorbed in industry.

Backward state of German industries

The natural resources of Germany were scarcely touched, except the clay for bricks and pottery. Some "fossil coal" was mined, but little was used because wood was so plentiful and cheap. Home industries, in which wooden wares, linens, woolens, cottons, silks, leather, iron, copper utensils, musical instruments, toys, snuff, soap, candles, leather goods, optical and mathematical instruments, paper, and wooden clocks were made, supplied the needs of a frugal people. Frederick the Great had established an iron foundry at Berlin, but in 1830 only "2,400,000 hundreds" of iron ore were mined to meet the needs of 36,000,000 people, and the forges and blast furnaces were still using charcoal. Little or no iron was exported. In 1856 Germany was mining only 700 pounds of coal per person, while England's average was 4,300, and the ratio of pig iron was 30 to 160. When Germany was producing 5,000 tons of steel in 1859 England was exporting twice that amount. Not until 1840 was coke used for smelting, and in 1846 half the iron was still made with charcoal. Thereafter the iron industry developed rapidly until in 1865 the smelted iron amounted in value to $45,000,000. Although the French system of license in industry was adopted in Prussia in 1808, the guilds lost power but were not abolished and, in fact, they continued until the middle of the nineteenth century. For a century before 1848 the number of master craftsmen as compared with the total population scarcely varied. Indeed Germany remained in the eighteenth-century ways of life long after England and France had outgrown them. After 1815 the German markets were fairly flooded with British, French and Belgian goods, because Germany lagged so far behind. The marvelous industrialization of Germany did not take place until after 1870, in spite of some important beginnings described below.

Textiles

In the textile industries until 1840 the bulk of the wool and flax was spun and woven by hand, and in 1843 one third of the looms were in private homes. The Industrial Revolution did not really begin in Germany until after 1845. Between 1836 and 1840 about 18,500,000 pounds of cotton were used annually, and by 1861 the amount had climbed to 98,000,000 pounds. In 1846 there were 136 cotton mills equipped with British machinery in Prussia; and three linen weaving factories, four cloth factories, and three wool spinning factories, in Berlin — each employing from fourteen to thirty workmen. After 1850 the linen industry forged ahead, and in 1869 over 2,500,000 spindles were in use. In 1830 there were 14,000 watermills, 10,500 windmills, and 1,184 horse-power mills in operation. Although the

steam engine had been used in Alsace as early as 1812, and hitched up to power looms in 1823, yet its use spread slowly to Germany and it was scarcely found anywhere before 1840. In 1846 Prussia boasted of engines amounting to 22,000 horse power, and Saxony 2,500. In 1830 Prussia had 300 paper mills and 337 printing-presses; and her mechanics and assistants were given as 509,000. Saxony and Silesia in 1835 set up sugar-beet factories.

Reasons for slow industrial growth

The industrial development of Germany was handicapped in many ways. Her soil was far less favorable to agriculture than that of France. She had no markets, no colonies, and inferior shipping facilities. Prior to 1848 her capitalists existed only as isolated individuals and did not form a distinct class in society. Further she was not unified politically but divided up into a large number of states. She also had to depend upon France for industrial chemistry, and upon England for technique, inventions and engineers. Not until 1840 did German chemical knowledge surpass that of the British. But the institution of the *Zollverein* helped to overcome some of these drawbacks. Prussian statesmen saw in the conflicting local tariffs one serious cause of the backward industrial condition of Germany. Prussia alone in 1800 had 67 different tariffs. Consequently in 1818 Prussia created a single uniform tariff for the whole kingdom, and invited other German states to join her in a tariff union. By 1834 the Customs Union included 17 states, and others entered later. Members of this Union could send their goods to markets anywhere within the area covered by the members without any duties or annoying restrictions. Under this arrangement a new industrial life began to creep over Germany. "*Freedom of trade through unity*" was the motto, and by 1852 all the German states except Austria, the Mecklenburgs, and the Free Cities, were coöperating in the Union. A favorable trade treaty made with England in 1824 helped on the good work in both countries.

The Customs Union

Free trade was established in the Rhine Valley and in 1831 a railroad was projected. In 1835 a railroad from Nuremberg to Fürth four miles long was built, and in 1839 one ran from Leipzig to Dresden. In 1850 there were 3,633 miles of railroads in Germany, and by 1865 one factory in Berlin was making 142 locomotives in one year. The railroads were supplemented by canals and improved wagon roads, and the institution of an excellent postal system. The removal of internal tariff barriers, and the improvement of transportation and communication, together with applied science, education, and favorable commercial treaties were powerful forces in spreading the Industrial Revolution to Germany. The middle class which emerged was strong enough to fight for a German Republic in 1848. They failed to attain their goal at that time but constituted a powerful factor in the unification of Germany in 1866 and 1870. Shortly after 1870 the presence of Germany as a competitor for world trade began to be felt.

Railroads

8. Spread of the Industrial Revolution

Industrial changes elsewhere

Elsewhere on the continent the history of the Industrial Revolution was also felt sooner or later. In Belgium its history paralleled that of France. Between 1830 and 1840 30,000 men were digging more coal than either England or France produced. The Netherlands and Denmark were leading Europe in certain kinds of farming and in dairying. Sweden was one of the principal producers of iron. Spain, Italy, Austria and Russia were almost untouched by the movement until the latter part of the nineteenth century and the first part of the twentieth. The Balkan peninsula was wholly an agricultural area.

Industrial conditions in the United States

The history of the Industrial Revolution in the United States is closely connected with that of England although its effects were felt there somewhat later. With the opening of the nineteenth century the economic development was pronounced. A new nation had grown out of the Thirteen Colonies in possession of a vast region rich in natural resources. The cotton textile industry sprang up in New England after 1789. The South with its slave labor was devoting all its attention to agriculture, and amassing wealth out of rice, tobacco, sugar cane, and cotton. The great influx of immigrant labor into the north from Europe after 1815 was a movement of world-wide significance. The like had never before been witnessed in history. From Great Britain alone the number of immigrants to North America steadily increased from 12,000 annually in 1820 to 65,000 in 1834. Not until 1835 did more than 5,000 go elsewhere. The outflow from Germany after 1830 was 15,000 yearly. Before 1840 the immigration from other continental countries was rather light, but it became heavier from Switzerland and Scandinavia in the 'forties. With this labor the North built factories, opened mines, dug canals, constructed roads, bridges, and railroads, cleared the land, and laid the foundations for the future wealth of America. In New England the cotton industry, ship-building and fisheries flourished. Foreign trade grew steadily and the wealth of the young Republic prospered by leaps and bounds. The near West was opened up by hardy pioneers, and soon turnpikes, canals, and railroads connected the coast states with the interior. On the whole the social and industrial conditions in the United States developed more satisfactorily than in any other part of the world.

In other parts of the globe

The sweep of the Industrial Revolution to other parts of the globe can be stated in a few words. Japan has been transformed by it, as have been the self-governing portions of the British Empire. Latin America, India, China, and Egypt are just beginning to feel its influence. The remaining portions of Asia and Africa, and the islands of the seas are still primarily virgin soil. The results of the Industrial Revolution in these widely separated regions will be discussed in latter chapters.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

A. Toynbee, *Lectures on the Industrial Revolution of the Eighteenth Century in England* (1884), new edition (1913); W. Sombart, *Der Moderne Kapitalismus*, 2 vols. (1902), new edition (1920); H. de B. Gibbins, *Economic and Industrial Progress of the Century* (1903); P. Mantoux, *La révolution industrielle au XVIII^e siècle* (1906); W. Cunningham, *An Essay on Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects*, 2 vols. (1900); C. Beard, *The Industrial Revolution* (1912); J. A. Hobson, *The Evolution of Modern Capitalism*, new edition (1912); D. H. Macgregor, *The Evolution of Industry* (1912); C. Gide and C. Rist, *Histoire des doctrines économiques depuis les Physiocrates* (English translation 1915); F. A. Ogg, *The Economic Development of Modern Europe* (1917); *Social Progress in Contemporary Europe* (1917); L. Brentano, *On the History and Development of Gilds, and the Origin of Trade Unions* (1870); G. Unwin, *Industrial Organization in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (1904); R. E. Prothero, *The Pioneers and Progress of English Farming* (1888); J. E. T. Rogers, *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, (1866–1902); W. H. R. Curtler, *A Short History of English Agriculture* (1909); E. W. Byrn, *The Progress of Invention in the Nineteenth Century* (1900); E. Baines, *History of the Cotton Manufacture in Great Britain* (1835); G. J. French, *Life and Times of Samuel Crompton* (1860); G. von Schultze-Gävernitz, *Der Grossbetrieb: Ein wirthschaftlicher und socialer Fortschritt: Eine Studie auf dem Gebiete der Baumwollindustrie* (1892), English translation: *The Cotton Trade in England and on the Continent* (1895); S. J. Chapman, *The Lancashire Cotton Industry* (1904); *The Cotton Industry and Trade* (1905); M. S. Woolman and E. B. McGowan, *Textiles: a Handbook for the Student and the Consumer* (1913); H. Heaton, *The Yorkshire Woolen and Worsted Industries from the Earliest Times up to the Industrial Revolution* (1920); J. P. Muirhead, *The Origin and Progress of the Mechanical Inventions of James Watt*, 3 vols. (1854); J. H. Thurston, *A History of the Growth of the Steam Engine* (1902); R. L. Galloway, *History of Coal Mining in Great Britain* (1882); E. A. Pratt, *A History of Inland Transportation and Communication in England* (1912); A. W. Kirkaldy and A. D. Evans, *The History and Economics of Transport* (1913); H. W. Dickinson, *Robert Fulton, Engineer and Artist: his Life and Works* (1913); H. Fry, *History of North Atlantic Steam Navigation, with Some Account of Early Ships and Shipowners* (1896); L. Beck, *Die Geschichte des Eisens in technischer und kulturgeschichtlicher Beziehung*, 5 vols. (1884–1903); R. W. Cooke-Taylor, *The Modern Factory System* (1891); A. Clarke, *The Effects of the Factory System* (1899); W. Hasbach, *A History of the English Agricultural Laborer* (1908); F. Engels, *The Condition of the Working-class in England in 1844*; L. R. Villermé, *Tableau de l'état physique et moral des ouvriers employés dans les manufactures de coton, de laine et de soie* (1840) 2 vols.; B. Leroy-Beaulieu, *La question ouvrière au XIX^e siècle* (1881); *Le travail des femmes au XIX^e siècle* (1888); E. Levasseur, *La population française*, 3 vols. (1892–1889); *Histoire des classes ouvrières et de l'industrie en France de 1789 à 1870*, 2 vols. (1903); S. and B. Webb, *History of Trades Unionism* (1894); J. L. and B. Hammond, *The Village Laborer, 1760–1832: a Study in the Government of England before the Reform Bill* (1911); *The Town Laborer* (1917); L. Levi, *History of British Commerce and of the Economic Progress of the British Nation, 1763–1870* (1872); E. P. Cheyney, *An Introduction to the Industrial and Social History of England*, revised edition (1922); W. Cunningham, *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times*, 3 vols., 5th edition (1910–1912); H. de B. Gibbins, *Industry in England*, 6th edition (1910); G. T. Warner, *Landmarks in English Industrial History*, 11th edition (1912); A. D. Innes, *England's Industrial Development* (1912); W. J. Ashley, *The Economic Organization of England* (1914); G. H. Perris, *The Industrial History of Modern England* (1914); E. Lipson, *Introduction to the Economic History of England* (1915); G. Slater, *The Making of Modern England*, new edition (1915); A. E. Bland, P. A. Brown, and R. H. Tawney, *English Economic History — Select Documents* (1915); A. P. Usher, *An Introduction to the Economic History of England* (1917); D. Russell, *The Prelude to the Machine Age* (1926); A. des Cilleuls, *Histoire et régime de la grande industrie en France aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles* (1898); G. Weill, *La France sous la monarchie constitutionelle* (1912); J. Jaurès, *Histoire socialiste* (1901); E. Lavisse, *Histoire contemporaine* (1920–22); J. H. Clapham, *The Economic Development of France and Germany, 1815–1914* (1920); G. Renard, *Life and Labour in Europe from the Fifteenth to the Eighteenth Century* (1925);

W. Sombart, *Die Deutsche Volkswirtschaft im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (1903); W. H. Dawson, *The Evolution of Modern Germany* (1908); J. Mavor, *Economic History of Russia* (1914); K. Latourette, *The Development of Japan* (1918); E. L. Bogart, *Economic History of the United States* (1912); I. Lippincott, *The Economic Development of the United States* (1921); C. D. Wright, *Industrial Evolution of the United States* (1920); V. Clark, *History of Manufactures in the United States* (1912); J. R. Commons et al., *History of Labour in the United States*, 2 vols. (1919); H. U. Faulkner, *American Economic History* (1924).

CHAPTER X

THE POLITICAL REVOLUTIONS, 1820–1848

1. The Swing away from Reaction

With the overthrow of Napoleon, it appeared to liberal-minded men as if the progress inaugurated in the world by the French Revolution had been checked, perhaps crushed. The hopes for an era of constitution-making in Europe were dashed to pieces by the Congress of Vienna. The reactionary system fathered by Metternich and other conservatives was put into operation to prevent the recurrance of another wave of reform or revolt. But the most tenacious forces in world history are ideas, which cannot be killed by bayonets and acts of congresses, or suppressed by legislative measures. It is not a matter of surprise, therefore, that within five years after the dissolution of the very body that was summoned to stabilize Europe, a series of revolutions broke out in the three Latin countries south of France, in Latin America, and in Greece. These insurrections were followed, within a decade, by the Revolution of 1830 in France, which spread over a large part of Europe, and within another generation by the Revolution of 1848, which swept across Europe like a hurricane. The causes and results of these movements, as factors in world history, will now be considered.

Persistence of liberalism

2. Revolution in Spain and the Spanish-American Colonies

The restoration of the absolutist king, Ferdinand VII, and the harsh, drastic measures used by him to reintroduce the old régime in Spain, led to a volcanic explosion of public feeling. The liberals organized secret societies such as the "Friends of the Constitution," the *Carbonari*, and the Freemasons, to carry on a propaganda of revolutionary ideas. The middle class, as well as the artisans and peasants, were determined to resist the restoration of autocratic rule. The soldiers likewise, who had served in the national revolt against Napoleon, and even the officers, were disaffected and took the initiative in an insurrection. In 1820 the king's army, assembled since 1816 at Cadiz awaiting orders to go overseas to crush the rebellious colonists in Spanish America, mutinied, joined the liberals, and forthwith all Spain was ablaze with revolution. To save his throne the frighted Bourbon king restored the constitution of 1812, which was posted in every city, abolished the Inquisition, promised reforms, and hypocritically said to his angry subjects: "Let us advance frankly, myself leading the way, along the constitutional path." The

Reaction in Spain under Ferdinand VII

credulous people believed him and the outbreak subsided. Many wholesome reforms were inaugurated, and for two years fear forced him to govern with the aid of a new Cortes and liberal ministers.

Foreign intervention in behalf of absolutism

But during all this time Ferdinand VII was plotting to overthrow the constitutional régime by force. The nobles and clergy gave him their support and, unfortunately, the quarrels among the liberals furthered his scheme. He secretly implored his friend Metternich to intervene. Finally, in the Congress of Verona, the autocratic powers decided to go to his aid, and in 1823 by an ironical arrangement French troops, who had dethroned his ancestor, marched into Spain and restored him to absolute power. Great Britain alone opposed intervention. The reign of terror and reaction which followed, disgusted even the king's rescuers. Ferdinand VII ruled Spain as a despot until 1833, and left behind him a backward and ruined country, which under different political and economic conditions, might have ranked high among the nations of Europe.

Revolt of Spanish-American colonies

Compared with the English-speaking colonies of North America, the Spanish colonies of Central and South America had made little progress towards self-government by the close of the eighteenth century. The American Revolution and the creation of a federal Republic, however, had made a deep impression on them. The stirring events of the French Revolution inspired them to action. Spanish rule was harsh and corrupt, and was one of the worst examples of the selfish character of the old colonial system of exploitation. These dependencies were treated as sources of wealth for the mother country, and were exploited by colonial officials and adventurers. Unlike England, Spain learned no lesson from the revolt of the Thirteen Colonies in 1776. Left to shift for themselves during the Napoleonic wars, the Spanish colonies increased their trade relations with the United States and Great Britain and began to agitate for political independence. Patriots like Bolivar had visited Europe and had felt the new thrills of democracy and nationalism; others had visited the young Republic in the north; and many had read the revolutionary literature of the latter part of the eighteenth century. Between 1804 and 1825 popular uprisings drove out the Spanish governors and defeated the troops sent to subdue them. Most of the colonies, encouraged by the United States and Great Britain, separated from Spain, set up independent republics, and patterned their political institutions after those of the United States, France, and Spain under the constitution of 1812. For the future of world history the successful revolts of the Spanish-American colonies attained a significance second only to the independence of the British-American colonies.

The successful revolutions of the Spanish colonies alarmed the despotic rulers of Europe. When they decided to intervene in Spain in 1823, it was generally understood that this policy would be extended to the rebellious colonies as well. Both the permanence and

the prestige of the international alliance for conservatism seemed to make such a course of action imperative. But the Spanish-American republics were saved from intervention by opposition from two directions. Great Britain let it be known that she would resist, by arms if necessary, any interference by European powers with the free status of the new states. This attitude was due, not so much to the British approval of the liberal institutions set up in Spanish America, as to the lucrative trade which Great Britain had already built up with the people of that region, and which she hoped to increase at the expense of Spain. At all events, the British threat, backed by her control of the seas, caused the European autocracies to halt their plans to aid Spain in crushing the revolts. The United States also desired to extend commerical relations with the new republics to the southward. At the same time there existed a genuine fear that disastrous political effects might grow out of the extension of Metternich's doctrine of intervention to the New World, and a real pride in seeing republican principles extended to such an extensive area in the west. As early as 1796 George Washington said: "Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none or a very remote relation."

British support of revolution in Latin America

Spanish claims to Florida were purchased by the United States in 1819, and in 1822 the independence of Colombia, Chile, Argentina, and Mexico was recognized. Finally in 1823, at the very time French troops were in Spain restoring Ferdinand VII to absolute power, President Monroe, at the indirect suggestion of the English minister, George Canning, presented to Congress the famous statement known as the Monroe Doctrine: "In the wars of the European powers in matters relating to themselves we have never taken any part, nor does it comport with our policy to do so. It is only when our rights are invaded or seriously menaced that we resent injuries or make preparations for our defense. With the movements in this hemisphere we are necessarily more immediately connected, and by causes which must be obvious to all enlightened and impartial observers. The political system of the allied powers is essentially different in this respect from that of America. . . . We owe it, therefore, to candor . . . to declare that we should consider any attempt to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety." As for the states whose independence was already acknowledged, it was stated, "we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them of controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States."

The "Monroe Doctrine"

Through the Monroe Doctrine the United States threatened to join the Spanish-American republics in resisting the extension of the principle of intervention to the New World. The advocates of restoration in Europe were warned that the republics of America were

determined to protect their own free institutions. Great Britain, although aristocratic at home, expressed her approval of this policy for America. The conservative powers of the continent of Europe were forced to give up all thought of crushing revolutions across the seas. Spain made little effort to regain her lost colonies, although she waited long before recognizing their independence. The threat of Canning that if France restored autocracy in Spain, "it would be Spain without her colonies" had borne fruit. Beyond doubt the Monroe Doctrine, as a factor in world history, prevented European powers from devouring the weak and backward republics south of the United States. The ideas of the American Revolution and the French Revolution were spread over a large portion of the globe through the success of the free Spanish-American republics.

3. Revolution in Portugal

The causes of the Portuguese Revolution of 1820 were: (1) the example of the French Revolution a generation before; (2) a patriotic nationalistic movement which took for its watchword "Portugal for the Portuguese," and (3) a desire to imitate the Spanish uprising. The British officials, who had continued in office since Napoleon had been driven out of the country, were dismissed. A new constituent assembly suppressed the Inquisition, abolished privileges, declared the press free, proclaimed the equality of all citizens before the law, and drew up a democratic constitution. After thirty years, Portugal seemed to be shaping her political course after the example of revolutionary France. The nobles and clergy opposed these changes.

Revolution of 1820 and its results

The monarchical powers of Europe talked of intervention. Even Great Britain, forgetting that consistency is a jewel, persuaded King Dom John VI of Brazil to return to Portugal to take the throne. Angered at their ruler's desertion, the Brazilians declared their independence under Pedro I, the son of John VI. Upon returning to Portugal John VI, in 1821, swore to support the new constitution, formed on the model of the Spanish constitution of 1812, but forthwith abrogated it to appease the conservatives. This caused another outbreak, and John was forced to find refuge on a British warship. Then Great Britain induced the other European powers to coöperate in setting him on his throne once more. When John died in 1826, Dom Pedro I of Brazil became Dom Pedro IV of Portugal and sought to quiet the country by granting a charter like that given to France by Louis XVIII. Civil war followed intermittently until 1834, when Great Britain, France and Spain intervened, but this time in favor of the liberal party. The charter was once more proclaimed; tithes, privileges and monopolies abolished; monastic property nationalized; and the Jesuits expelled. Next to France, Portugal had made the greatest progress towards constitutional government.

As early as 1799 the reforms of the Portuguese minister Pombal, the influence of the British colonies in 1776 and the French develop-

ments after 1789, had inspired the Brazilians to a futile uprising for independence. Napoleon drove John VI to Brazil in 1808, and in 1815 the colony became a kingdom. The Revolution of 1820 in Portugal produced a similar outbreak in Brazil the next year, and forced the king to grant a constitution. In 1822 Brazil declared itself an independent empire, which endured until 1889, when a republic was established.

Brazil becomes a republic

4. Revolutions in Italy

It was in Italy, where the people were placed under the dominion of Austria by the Congress of Vienna, that revolutions next occurred. In no other part of Europe outside of France had the French Revolution created a more favorable reaction or left more positive results. Napoleon, himself a son of Italy, aroused the spirit of unity and nationalism. Furthermore, the glorious traditions of the past kept alive the longing for freedom. Against the restoration of the old régime in 1815 arose the patriotic *Carbonari*, who had 60,000 members in 1816, the Freemasons, and other secret societies.* In 1820, inspired by the news of the Spanish revolution, the people of Naples, led by the army, forced King Ferdinand VI temporarily to grant a constitution of the Spanish type and to appoint a liberal ministry to rule what was called the "worst-governed state in Europe." The Sicilians also demanded a charter of their own but failed to get it. Austrian troops speedily suppressed the revolution in Naples and the king calmly abrogated the constitution.

Revolution in Naples

No sooner had the outbreak in Naples been put down, than in 1821 another occurred in Piedmont in the north of Italy. Living on the border of France, the Piedmontese were early inoculated by French ideas. They had seen Napoleon sweep across northern Italy with his victorious armies and they rejoiced when he planted the new *régime of "liberty and equality" in their country*. The revolutionists in Turin and Milan now adopted the Italian tri-color flag, demanded the Spanish constitution of 1812, and urged a national war against Austria. King Victor Emanuel I abdicated in favor of his brother, Charles Felix, who easily secured the aid of Austrian and Russian troops to crush the revolution. Yet children born during these troublous times were to see Austria driven out of Italy, and the nation freed and united.

Revolution in Piedmont

5. The Greek Revolution

Of all the Balkan nationalities under Turkish rule, the sturdy, land-locked Serbs were the first to revive a national sentiment and to attempt to "shake off the oppressive yoke of the infidels." The French Revolution of 1789 inspired patriotic Serbs and Greeks to conspire for joint action against Turkey, but nothing came of the agitation except a spread of the spirit of revolt. Ideas of democracy

and nationalism, which so profoundly affected the peoples of western Europe soon travelled to the south-east, where for centuries the heavy yoke of the Mohammedan Turks had galled the necks of the Christians. Some 15,000 Greeks had joined the standards of the allies in overthrowing Napoleon, and had looked for national deliverance through the Congress of Vienna. Disappointed in that quarter, the Greeks after 1815 began to work underground through the "Association of Friends," an armed secret society organized in 1814, which quickly spread over the Balkans and had 17,000 members in Constantinople alone. It conducted a wide-spread propagandism for independence. In 1817 the Ionian Islands were granted a constitution under a British protectorate. The Serbians in 1820 obtained partial independence, although it was not until 1830 that the sultan recognized the prince of Serbia as autonomous. To the Greek patriots the moment seemed ripe to break away from the rule of the tyrannical Ottoman government, and they even talked wildly of restoring the Eastern Empire. "Hellenes, the hour has struck," said Ypsilanti. "It is time to avenge our religion and our country." Hence, in 1821, the war for Greek independence began and was waged with savage fury until freedom was secured in 1829. In 1822 a constitution was proclaimed for all Greece.

Origins of Greek nationalism

To the allies meeting in the Congress of Laibach in 1821 came the news that the Greeks had rebelled against a "legitimate "ruler. Metternich was disposed to let it "burn itself out beyond the pale of civilization." But after the Greeks had fought heroically alone for six years, public opinion in Europe demanded intervention in behalf of the rebels. Liberals saw their own cause at stake; pious Christians were horrified at Mohammedan atrocities; and educated people insisted upon saving the "mother of civilization." When Athens and the Acropolis fell into the hands of the Turks in 1827, the popular demand for aiding the Greeks could not be resisted. Volunteers from every land flocked to Greece. Victor Hugo lauded the Greeks; Lord Byron sacrificed his life and his wealth for their cause; Henry Clay urged American recognition and support; and Panhellenic societies appeared everywhere to raise funds and to recruit soldiers. Metternich succeeded in restraining Austria and Prussia, but Russia, France and Great Britain closed their ears to his advice. Their warships annihilated the Turco-Egyptian fleet in 1827. When Great Britain, the first power to recognize the Greeks as belligerents, withdrew through fear of endangering her Asiatic possessions by the dismemberment of Turkey, France and Russia continued the war until, by the treaty of Adrianople in 1829, Greece gained her complete independence. Once more revolution had dealt a hard blow at Metternich's idea of the *status quo* and at his theory of intervention to crush any effort to overthrow established government however unjust it might be. One of the effects on European politics was the announcement that "intervention" was legitimate when it supported

Western European enthusiasm for Greek independence

nationality. This doctrine was to travel far in later times, and find many advocates during the World War.

Greece with its 750,000 people was organized in 1832 as a constitutional monarchy, with the eighteen-year-old Otto, a Bavarian prince, as her first king. The first new state after 1815 was added to the European community of states. Rumania was granted some degree of self-government. Russia gained certain provinces on the Black Sea. Russia and France both claimed the right to protect Christians in Turkey — a claim that was to have grave consequences for the future. Liberals rejoiced over the freedom of Greece, and were inspired to hope for better days in their own lands. The outcome of events in the Balkan peninsula also presented to Europe a persistent and knotty problem called the "Near Eastern Question," which was to command the attention of European statesmen from that day to this. In 1914 it precipitated the greatest tragedy in history. The other Balkan peoples were fired with an ambition to gain their freedom, and also to affix the title of "Greater" to their names.

The establishment of Greek independence

The rise of the "Eastern Question"

6. The Revolution of 1830 in France

No sooner was the attention of the world withdrawn from the little state of Greece than it was centered on the Revolution, which in 1830 broke forth in France and then spread over the greater part of Europe. In a large sense, the Revolution of 1830 was merely the attempt to settle the unsolved problems of the Revolution of 1789. The French people, without being consulted, had been forced to see the Bourbon dynasty, which they had deposed, restored in the person of Louis XVIII, an enemy of the ideals of the Revolution. Worn out by a generation of wars, they tolerated the good-natured, compromising monarch, but the inspiring hopes of the Revolution had sunk too deeply into their souls and had wrought too many changes in their institutions to permit them to forget. The Revolution of 1830 was a protest against the Congress of Vienna and all it stood for, as well as against a tyrannical Bourbon. It was a test of strength between the assumed right of the rulers of Europe to impose a monarch of their own choosing on the French people, on the one hand, and the right of the people to decide their own affairs in their own way, on the other. This principle applied to Belgium, Italy, Germany and Austria with as much force as it did to France. The Revolution of 1830 appeared in France first for two reasons: (1) the unreasonable despotism of the crotchety, old Bourbon, Charles X, and (2) the more active persistence of the earlier revolutionary aspirations in France.

Meaning of the Revolution of 1830

Charles X, the last Bourbon in the direct line to rule France, had gnashed his teeth in rage at the compromises of Louis XVIII. He vowed that he "would prefer to saw wood" rather than rule like an English monarch. As a matter of fact he was too old and too ill-fitted by nature to perform the duties of either occupation well.

Charles X and reaction

Even the restoration seemed too progressive to him. When he became king in 1824, he resolved to do God's will, not the people's, and so far as possible it was his expressed intention to restore both the spirit and the institutions of former days. To undo the "crimes of the Revolution," the nobles were compensated with a grant of $200,000,000, in part at the expense of French bondholders, and the clergy were restored to power and given charge of education. Free speech was denied, and the press was muzzled. By these measures and other repressive acts Charles X encountered all the forces that overthrew Louis XVI in 1792. His unwise policy welded the various elements of discontent into one solid party of opposition. The French Revolution had not died out with the exile of Napoleon, nor had the restoration done more than to check it. Liberals united to preserve their political rights, social equality, and religious freedom from the whims of an aged, despotic Bourbon, whom the mere accident of birth had placed at the head of the French state. These new gains were so deeply rooted in the life of the nation that, if endangered, the people were ready to undertake another revolt to save them.

When the people of France returned a Chamber of Deputies hostile to the policies of the monarchy, against the advice of Metternich and the Russian tsar, Charles X resolved to crush the opposition by a *coup d'état*. Enraged at the election and doubting the strength of the resistance, he published in the official *Moniteur* four ordinances: (1) restricting the freedom of the press, (2) dissolving the new Chamber before it had even met, (3) issuing a new electoral law disfranchising three fourths of the voters, and (4) proclaiming another election of deputies. These "ordinances" of July 26, 1830, were the occasion for the revolt. Immediately artisan, student, and business man — Bonapartist, Republican, and Constitutional Monarchist — each for reasons of his own — joined the movement to save France from despotism. So little did the ruler suspect an uprising that he spent the day on a hunting trip. Meanwhile the newspapers, influenced by the intellectuals with Thiers at their head, incited the people to insurrection. Excited crowds thronged the streets shouting, "Down with the ministry." "Long live the charter." Old soldiers, students and workmen built barricades of paving-stones, wagons, and furniture in the narrow, crooked streets of Paris. The Freemasons, *Carbonari*, and "Friends of Truth" who had been urging the expulsion of the Bourbons, and the "Cosmopolitan Alliance" composed of French liberals like Lafayette, were openly active in fomenting revolt. A handful of royalist troops half-heartedly tried to put down the rebels, and for three days street-fighting went on. The insurgents held Paris, and Paris meant France. Disaffected regiments began to go over to the rebels. Charles X, forced to bow to the national will, abdicated in favor of his ten-year-old grandson, the count of Chambord, and fled to Great Britain, where he had plenty of time to "saw wood," if he still preferred that occupation.

Overthrow of the last Bourbon in 1830

The ghost of divine-right monarchy was temporarily driven out of France by the people.

The Republicans, recruited from the small shop-keepers, the workingmen, and the students, who had really brought about the Revolution, now advocated a republic. The middle class, led by Thiers, declared that "order" as well as "liberty" was important, and hence urged a constitutional monarchy. Lafayette, now an old man and a pioneer in the cause of freedom, brought the two parties together and persuaded the Republicans to accept the plans of the Liberal Monarchists. Hence on August 7 the Chamber of Deputies called to the throne, as "King of the French," Louis Philippe, a member of the younger, or Orleanist, branch of the Bourbon house, who had always posed as a friend of the people. As it turned out, therefore, the Revolution of 1830 was a victory for the *bourgeoisie*, who had also shaped the early course of the great Revolution of 1789. "Legitimacy" had been firmly disregarded, and the people had selected their own ruler. The international alliance for the repression of liberalism built up by Metternich and his colleagues had been dealt a severe blow as a European system. Metternich shook his head and blustered about "dangers," but did not openly dare to do anything. Henceforth his system was restricted to the Austrian dominions, and to those of his friends, the tsar of Russia and the king of Prussia. His immediate concern was not to halt revolution in France, but to keep it from spreading to central and eastern Europe.

Louis Philippe and the Orleanist monarchy

7. The Reign of Louis Philippe, 1830–1848

A group of 89 deputies issued a proclamation saying: "Frenchmen, France is free. The absolute power was raising its flag; the heroic people of Paris overthrew it. . . . We reënter into possession of order and liberty." Louis Philippe "will respect our rights, for he will hold his own from us." The new constitution, based on the amended charter, was authorized by the two chambers. It assured freedom of the press and assembly. The right to vote was given to all men above 25 years of age, who paid a property tax of $40 a year, and to professional men, who paid $20 or more. Thus the middle class, by whom and for whom the earlier Revolution had been made, were given control of France, while the workingmen and peasants were excluded from participation in the government. Although the voters had been about doubled, the Roman Catholic religion was no longer that of the state, and the schools were freed from church supervision, yet democracy still had its battles to win.

The new king, now 57 years of age, had fled from France some months before the death of his father in the Terror. An exile for twenty-one years, he had seen much of Europe, spent two years in the United States, and finally settled in Great Britain. After the restoration of Louis XVIII, he recovered a large part of his family estate, and in 1821 was said to be worth $40,000,000. He lived in the old

Character of Louis Philippe

Royal Palace in the heart of Paris and cultivated popularity with the *bourgeoisie*. He posed as a liberal, promenaded about the streets without a guard, wearing a frock coat and a silk hat, carried a green umbrella under his arm, and made friends with the rich and influential business men. He sent his children to the public schools. He patronized the working classes and the soldiers, and ate and drank with them in the popular restaurants in a friendly manner. He was wise enough to see that wealth and brains had replaced blood and titles as the real power in France, hence he made his palace the center of all sorts of middle-class activities, invested his money in various enterprises to win strong friends, and bided his time. As the champion of the Revolution of 1789, his popularity increased with the people, who believed that he would make an ideal constitutional king. But behind all this democratic display, he was an autocrat at heart and ambitious to become a strong monarch.

The bourgeois *monarchy*

The masses of France were given a ruler by the middle class. The legitimists, who wanted a real Bourbon, regarded him as a usurper. The Bonapartists and Republicans were his enemies. In the face of this hostility, the policy of Louis Philippe was to use the rich middle class to prop up his throne. France was peaceful, orderly and contented for awhile. To replace the nobility of the old régime, Napoleon had formed a new nobility of his military officers. So Louis Philippe began to build up a new nobility of wealthy business men such as bankers, manufacturers, and merchants. The old soldiers and the old nobles were not welcome at court. The workers soon discovered that they had only put their employers in power and had no share in the government themselves. The course followed by the king was the "golden mean" — neither too reactionary nor too radical, but moderate and hence stable. The new theory of the state rested on nationalism and capitalism. Taking all things into account, that seemed to be a wise policy. The old régime was gone forever in France; the new régime would be supported by an "enlightened Metternichism."

Rise of discontent

The discontented *proletariat* began to complain that the government had not been democratized by the Revolution of 1830. They said that the absolutism of Charles X had only been exchanged for an aristocracy of the rich, who were determined to check all progress towards true democracy. These disgruntled laborers formed one secret society after another — the "People's Friends," the society of the "Rights of Man," and the "Families" — "to complete the Revolution." Loud were the cries of the workers against the long hours, low pay, unsanitary factories, and the hardships imposed on women and children in industry. These outcries were only answered by laws forbidding the workingmen to organize to improve their lot. The numerous strikes that resulted in the industrial centers were broken up by the government. The silk spinners and weavers in Lyons revolted and marched down the street with a black flag bear-

ing the motto, "Live by labor or die fighting." The leaders of the laboring classes demanded not merely universal franchise, but particularly a "social change," which would "divide the burdens and benefits of society equally." Louis Blanc's book, *The Organization of Labor* (1839), became their platform and program. He argued that the fruits of their toil should be divided among the workers so that each would receive "according to his services." Heine reported in 1842 that he found the workers in the factories reading cheap editions of Robespierre's speeches and Marat's pamphlets, and were wildly singing revolutionary songs. He predicted that a "republican outbreak" would occur "sooner or later."

The Republicans, drawing their strength from the common people and some of the middle class, also felt that the Revolution was a failure. They wanted to see the people educated to rule themselves and insisted that political liberties be granted to all men without regard to wealth. They likewise had secret societies and employed newspapers to carry on an active propagandism. Satire and caricature were used with telling effect. The *Tribune* pictured the king as a huge pear, or as a juggler tossing balls marked "Liberty" and "Revolution," or as an assassin fleeing after having cut the throat of "Miss Liberty." The Republicans did not hesitate to encourage violent demonstrations, but they were lacking in able leaders, and hence accomplished less than would have been done otherwise. The young intellectuals, neglected by the government, threw in their lot with the Republicans and talked and wrote about the "Great Revolution," which they believed to be immediately ahead.

Autocratic methods

Instead of removing the causes of discontent, Louis Philippe decided to use force, the blind policy of most autocrats. All organizations had to present their constitutions for his approval. The right of assembly was forbidden and societies were broken up by the police. Republican journals were suppressed and their editors fined, imprisoned, and exiled. The editor of the *Tribune* was prosecuted more than a hundred times within four years and severely penalized. To criticize the king, or to question the divine right of property, or to defend any other form of government than monarchy, was made a crime. Special courts were created to try persons guilty of violating these laws. Throwing aside his mask of liberalism, Louis Philippe declared that "the throne was not an empty armchair." Before 1840 there had been ten ministries, but thereafter he had only one — that of Guizot, a renowned historian and great orator, who opposed democracy and believed in the absolute rule of the propertied classes. Louis Philippe accepted the Revolution, but was resolved that it should go no farther. Like Metternich, he wanted to "freeze" France and prevent all real progress. The chambers were either coerced or bribed into obedience. About 200 out of the 430 deputies held lucrative government offices, and hence were loyal supporters of the throne. To make matters worse, the foreign policy was weak

and severely criticized by the people. In short, the rule of Louis Philippe, which started so well, became so tyrannical that it disgusted and aroused the nation. Six attempts were made to assassinate him.

For years a party of opposition had been growing. The workingmen, stronger and better organized than ever, despite the stringent laws, were openly hostile and forming a communist-socialist party. The Republicans were secretly plotting for a change. The legitimists were eager to see the fall of one who had betrayed the Bourbon house. The Bonapartists were hoping by some stroke of fortune to put their own candidate on the throne. The autocracy of Louis Philippe and his arbitrary minister, Guizot, supplied the opportunity for all these parties to unite in the Revolution of 1848, which forced another French king to flee for safety from his own people to Great Britain.

8. Spread of the Revolution of 1830 over Europe

When Charles X was driven from France by revolution, Metternich thought of forming a coalition against the "king of the barricades," as he called Louis Philippe. But the spread of the movement beyond France kept him and his brother autocrats too busy at home to oppose effectively the new French government. After the change in France was accepted in Great Britain, all the powers of Europe were forced, more or less reluctantly, to recognize the ruler enthroned by revolution. The effects of the Revolution of 1830 were felt over the Old World and the New. In Europe it was the signal for uprisings which everywhere threatened to undo many of the settlements of the Congress of Vienna.

Belgium

Without consulting the wishes of the people, Belgium had been annexed to the state of Holland in 1815 by the Congress of Vienna. The Belgians differed from the Dutch in speech, religion, and national interests. The Dutch were mostly Protestants, farmers, dairymen and traders, and advocates of free trade. The Belgians were Catholics, engaged in mining, trade and manufacturing, and believed in a protective tariff. The Dutch hated the French; the Belgians loved them. The Dutch king, William I, insulted Belgian patriotic pride by forcing on them a Dutch bank, Dutch laws, and Dutch officials. He angered the Belgian liberals by muzzling the press. He offended the business men by heavy taxes. He alarmed the Catholics by putting Protestant inspectors in their schools. The Belgians with 3,500,000 people had no more representatives in the parliament than Holland with only 2,000,000; and in 1830 only one out of seven ministers was a Belgian. In fact the Belgians felt that they were treated as a conquered nation and exploited by the Dutch. Consequently, following the successful revolt of the French, the Belgians on November 18, 1830, declared their independence, drew up a modern constitution, and elected a German prince, Leopold I, as their king. The great powers of Europe, in a conference at London, recognized the new state. In 1839 the inde-

pendence and neutrality of Belgium were guaranteed "forever" by Great Britain, France, Austria, Russia, and Prussia. This was the "scrap of paper," which Germany, successor to the treaty obligation of Prussia, sought to ignore at the outbreak of the World War in 1914. The separation of Belgium from Holland put another dent in the "eternal settlement" of the Congress of Vienna.

All that remained of old Poland, after the three shameless partitions, and additional readjustments in the Congress of Vienna, was a comparatively small region about Warsaw, which remained as a dependency of Russia. But the hope of winning back their national freedom never deserted the Poles. The success of the Revolution of *Poland*
1830 in France and Belgium fired them with a desire to secure their independence. In this attempt, they rose in revolt, and expelled or killed their Russian officials. Public opinion in Germany, France, and Great Britain was sympathetic with the Polish cause, but the governments refused to intervene to save "nationalism" there as had been done in Greece. Alone, under poor leadership, and with scanty supplies, the Poles fought for nearly a year, when the revolt was crushed. Poland ceased to exist as a separate kingdom and became a Russian province. Thousands of Polish patriots were put to death or banished to Siberia. Others fled to America or to western Europe, where they continued to hope for the emancipation of their native land. Poland had to wait for her restoration as an independent nation until the conclusion of the World War.

With revolting states to their westward and eastward, the people of the small German states were electrified with a yearning for liberty and national unity. So strongly entrenched were the auto- *German states*
cratic governments of Prussia and Austria, however, that no revolution occurred within their limits. The actual outbreaks were confined to the little members of the Germanic Confederation. In Brunswick, the worst-governed of all the states, Charles II was expelled, his castle burned, and his successor forced to grant a constitution in 1832. In Saxony, the people drew up a constitution, made some reforms, and compelled the king to recognize the changes. Hanover was granted a constitution in 1833. The elector of Hesse-Cassel, who had caned his subjects and made bread a government monopoly, likewise gave his people a new constitution. At Hambach in Germany 30,000 people met, sang songs of freedom, offered toasts to the "United States of Germany" and to a "Republican Europe," and heard a speaker say, "The best king by the grace of God is a traitor to the human race." At Frankfort soldiers suppressed a meeting of 400 students, who had assembled and called upon all the German people to unite. Students' clubs like the *Burschenschaften* reappeared in the universities, noisily sang their patriotic songs and urged national unity in the fatherland. Germany was once more flooded with patriotic literature. Leadership for a general revolution was lacking, however, and no concerted outbreak took place. Metternich

was still strong enough to prevent it, and the Diet enacted the reactionary laws he demanded. During the reaction which soon set in, the reforms and constitutions were mostly withdrawn. Patriots were imprisoned, or driven to exile. In Prussia twenty-seven students were sentenced to death, but the sentence was commuted to imprisonment. When a nobleman congratulated Emperor Francis of Austria on having a "good physical constitution," he exclaimed, "What do you say? A good constitution? Let me never hear that word again. Say my robust health, my strong bodily system, or my good physical condition, but never say my constitution. I have no constitution; and I never will have one. I'd perish first. No one but the devil has a constitution, or has need for any." Metternich explained that all the trouble and discontent arose from the fact that a small "faction" wanted to introduce the dangerous "representative system and the modern idea of popular sovereignty." Germany had to wait forty years before unity came, and eighty-eight years before she had a republic.

Italy

No other people welcomed the Revolution of 1830 with more enthusiasm than the Italians. The liberals and patriotic secret societies became active over the entire peninsula. It was reported that outside aid would come from France and Spain which were going to form a Latin League with Italy against Austria, Prussia, and Russia. A plot was set on foot to induce Napoleon's son, the duke of Reichstadt, to proclaim himself Napoleon II, king of Italy. This time revolution broke out in central Italy. The tyrannical duke of Modena was driven out by his people. A revolt in Parma forced the Duchess Maria Louisa, the second wife of Napoleon I, to flee. Uprisings took place in the Papal States. The tri-color flag stirred a wave of enthusiasm from the Po to the Tiber. Reforms were made and free governments set up. Lafayette promised assistance and the two sons of Louis Napoleon offered their services. Louis Philippe boasted that he would not permit the revolution to be crushed, but did little else. The pope and the deposed rulers frantically appealed to Metternich for help. Austrian troops were rushed into Italy and the old régime was quickly restored. Far-sighted Italians now clearly saw that only a united Italy, with outside aid, could drive out the hated Austrians. One of these, Mazzini, a young Genoese lawyer, in 1831 organized "Young Italy," a secret society which soon had 60,000 members, mostly of the middle class, who were preparing for the "great day" of independence and unity only a generation away.

Spain

Spain, like Italy, was sensitive to the course of events in France, hence in 1831 the liberals again raised the cry for reform, but only to have the old system of terror increased. Spies and the court martial were used to keep down revolution. In Madrid a student was hanged for shouting "Hurrah for Liberty." A young woman was put to death for embroidering "Liberty, Law, Equality" on a flag.

Yet the liberal party finally gained control of the ministry in 1834 and created a popular type of local government, which still remains. A new constitution in 1837, based on that of 1812, gave the Cortes power to vote taxes. Although the franchise was much more restricted than in France, yet some small gain had been made towards democratic government. Spain henceforth was a constitutional monarchy.

In Switzerland, the period from 1829 to 1837 is called the "Regeneration." After the Revolution of 1830 the people of nearly every canton met to reform their aristocratic governments and to change their systems of justice which were notoriously bad. These objectives were attained by the revision of the cantonal constitutions. The reactionary, middle-class Swiss national Diet was denounced by the students and young Swiss, and meetings were held all over the country to discuss desired changes. Under this pressure the Diet gave its approval to local reforms and constitutional amendments, but was still powerful enough to prevent the drafting of a new national constitution, which had to wait until 1848. *Switzerland*

Great Britain was powerfully influenced by the happenings in France. The Revolution of 1789 found many echoes among the British people. In 1790 Jacobin Clubs were formed and reforms were urged in public meetings. The government employed strong measures to curb all manifestations of discontent, which was particularly pronounced after 1815. Low wages, long hours, high prices, and poor crops exasperated the laboring classes. Mobs in the country burned the grain, and mobs in the cities smashed the machinery. The "Peterloo massacre" in 1819 was typical of the excited feelings of both the rulers and the workers. Cobbett and Bentham created a sentiment for parliamentary reform. The government did make some concessions. In 1823 the criminal code was reformed by the removal of the death penalty for about a hundred petty crimes. The permission given to the workers in 1825 to form trade-unions was followed in 1828 by the removal of the political disabilities of Dissenters, and in 1829 by the restoration of political rights to the Catholics. *Great Britain*

But in 1830 Great Britain was seething with discontent under the autocracy of the Old Tories. Hence both the middle class and the working people rejoiced over the upheaval in France and took heart. When Wellington publicly declared that the system of representation could not "be improved," a wave of anger spread among the people. The Whigs, for the first time since 1783, gained control of the government under Earl Grey and in 1831 Lord John Russell introduced the First Reform Bill, but it failed to pass the House of Commons in a test vote. A general parliamentary election was then ordered which resulted in a strong Whig majority. The Second Reform Bill was rejected, however, by the Lords. Monster mass meetings, parades, and even riots, kept the issue alive. At last in 1832, confronted by reform or a swamping of their body by

the creation of new peers, the House of Lords gave way and the Great Reform Bill, which Spencer Walpole called the "largest revolution" ever attained in a peaceable manner, was passed: (1) Fifty-six "rotten boroughs" were disfranchised and many others lost part of their representatives, thus releasing 143 seats in Parliament which were redistributed among the more populous counties and cities. (2) The qualifications for voting were reformed so that the county voters were increased from 247,000 to 370,000; and the voters in the boroughs from 188,000 to 286,000. Thus one out of every 22 persons gained a vote. (3) The manner of voting was modified by limiting the time of "polling" from fifteen to two days, and by providing for the registration of voters. The Reform Bill was a great middle-class victory, for the number of workingmen entitled to vote was actually reduced. The House of Lords emerged from the conflict with its power lessened. The House of Commons was now recognized as the sovereign power of the nation, and in the event of serious disagreement, the Lords had to give way. The crown had been saved by yielding to public opinion, hence no such upheaval occurred as in France. That so important a change could be made in the British constitution without the chaos of revolution and civil war was a positive gain for peaceable progress. The old régime had passed forever in Great Britain, but a truly democratic government had not yet been created. It is not surprising to find that the radicals, who were demanding universal franchise, should bitterly oppose the Great Reform Bill, because it fell far short of their expectation.

United States

The Revolution of 1830 was felt even in the United States. A generation had grown up under the new economic and social conditions of the young Republic. The west had been filled with a self-confident democracy, which, with the aid of the eastern laborers, swept Jackson into the presidency in 1832, for the second time, with an overwhelming vote, as the champion of the people against the banks, corporations, and capitalists. There appeared a new conception of the responsibility of the local and national government for the welfare of the people. Imprisonment for debt was abolished. Attention was directed to the conditions of child and woman labor. Negro slavery became an acute issue, and about 1,000 abolition societies with 40,000 members arose in the north to demand the immediate freedom of the slaves. As despotism was losing ground in Europe, the people of the United States were growing more sympathetic with the poor, the unfortunate, the ignorant, the criminal, and the slave. It was an era of great social and moral reforms.

The day when Metternich, or any other advocate of autocracy, could impose his outgrown ideas and institutions on an advancing world by means of such instruments as the Quadruple Alliance, the Concert of Powers, congresses of despotic kings, and the force of arms, was gone forever. The rights of the nation, and of the people making up the nation, had to be taken into account. Abso-

lutism and stagnation, as a public policy in Europe, might persist in central and eastern Europe, but it was disappearing in western Europe and in the New World. Metternich confessed defeat when in 1832 he persuaded the tsar of Russia and the king of Prussia to form a league to support "divine right" against France and Great Britain, the two progressive nations that had the "courage to profess aloud rebellion and the overthrow of all stability." The Concert of Europe disappeared almost entirely in the Revolution of 1830. The new system of balance of power began to emerge.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

Given at end of Chapter XI.

CHAPTER XI

THE REVOLUTIONS OF 1848 AND THEIR EFFECTS ON THE WORLD

1. Scope of the Revolutions of 1848

The Revolutions of 1848, speaking generally, grew out of the determination to recover the gains of the earlier revolutions, and a conviction that the time was ripe for further progress. It was decidedly a European movement and left its impress on the ideas and institutions of all the peoples of the western world. Its two cardinal forces were middle-class liberalism and nationalism. Contrary to common belief, it was in Italy and not in France, that the first assault was made on absolutism in the revolts of 1848. Revolution broke out in Milan and in Sicily, and then spread over the peninsula, but since the movement was so much more spectacular and successful in France, and because the Paris revolt is generally regarded as the pioneer, the course of revolution in France will be explained first.

2. The Revolution in France

Opposition to Louis Philippe

The Revolution of 1848 in France was so conspicuous for the simple reason that the people were politically more advanced than in any other country on the continent. The French clung to their liberal traditions with a remarkable and tenacious persistence. When their "Citizen King," called to power by the "people" in 1830, betrayed his promises and supporters, and gradually revived the absolutism of the Bourbons, he aroused the protest of the nation. To make matters worse, to tyranny he added shameful corruption. When a "nation of citizens" asked for reforms and the widening of the franchise, the "vile band of beggars" were told that France already had too many voters. Consequently by 1848 an impatient and hostile nation stood helpless to secure their rights in a legal manner before a despotic king and an oligarchy of the middle class. Assassination, the weapon employed by desperate people against a tyrant, was attempted against him in half a dozen instances.

Industrial Revolution in France

The Industrial Revolution had brought about a transformation in France. The multiplication of factories and the general advance in transportation and communication had greatly increased the number of wage-earners, but had not improved their lot. With a new hope in their hearts, they now turned both to socialism and to revolution as a shorter way to a better world. Patriots and soldiers, who professed to be Republicans, were alienated by the refusal of Louis Philippe to

aid the Poles, the Germans, and the Italians in their struggles for freedom. Catholics hated Guizot as a Protestant and, of course, held the king responsible for his appointment to the premiership. The Bonapartists and the legitimists, with special ambitions of their own, willingly joined in the plot for the monarch's fall. Only the faithful few among the wealthy business men, who had profited by the favors bestowed upon them, remained loyal.

The occasion for the revolt was a clash over the right of free assembly. During the winter of 1847 various groups of liberals planned a series of public banquets throughout France for the purpose of preparing a nation-wide petition, in imitation of the Chartists in Great Britain, demanding reforms, particularly the extension of the right to vote. By this public agitation it was also hoped to overthrow the Guizot ministry. At these banquets the Republicans drank to "the bettering of the lot of the laboring classes," and the liberal and royalist middle classes proposed toasts to the king and to needed reforms. The government condemned this fomentation of "hostile and blind passions."

To test the issue, it was decided to hold a huge banquet in Paris on February 22, 1848, which was Washington's birthday. The national guard and the students in a showy parade were to escort to the banqueting hall the 87 deputies, who promised to attend. In alarm the government forbade both the parade and the banquet. The deputies protested against this violation of the right of assembly, but decided not to attend the gathering. On the morning of February 22, a large crowd of students and workingmen gathered in the Place de la Concorde and shouted "Hurrah for reform!" They sang the Marseillaise, pillaged the shops, secured guns, and built bonfires at night. Actual revolution was scarcely dreamed of even by the Socialists and republican agitators. The next day the mob built barricades in the industrial sections of the city, fraternized with the national guard, and forced the king to dismiss Guizot and to promise a reform ministry. The outbreak might have ended there, had not the royal troops guarding the home of Guizot fired on the mob killing 23 and wounding 30 more. In anger the mob paraded their martyred comrades in carts through the streets to incite the people. The bells of Paris rang out the doom of the monarchy. The cry for reform was replaced by that of "Long live the Republic!"

February Revolution

By February 24 all Paris was in arms with 1,500 barricades thrown up to abolish despotism. The walls were covered with placards announcing: "Louis Philippe massacres us as did Charles X; let him go to join Charles XI" The king summoned Thiers to head the ministry and at the same time ordered the soldiers to crush the Revolution, but they refused to shoot down their comrades. Multitudes pressed towards the Tuileries, and fired at the windows. With the rattle of musketry in his ears, Louis Philippe hurriedly abdicated in favor of his grandson, the count of Paris, and, disguised as "Dr.

Smith," fled to Great Britain. His favorite minister, Guizot, soon followed him. In the afternoon the mob broke into the royal palace, destroyed the furniture, and burned the throne, shouting, "Down with royalty! The Republic forever!" The shortest and the least bloody of all the French revolutions was completely successful.

The Socialist Republicans with the red flag and a program of social democracy met in the Hôtel de Ville in eastern Paris and announced that the government had fled "leaving behind it a trail of blood that forbids it ever to retrace its steps." In the name of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity," they proclaimed a Republic, and promised to "guarantee labor to all citizens" and the right to form labor unions. The moderate Republicans, at the same time, with the red-white-and-blue flag, met in the chamber of deputies in western Paris and declared that "Royalty is abolished," and that "The Republic is proclaimed." Then the two groups joined and established a provisional government to organize "the national victory." On March 5 the people of France were asked to elect by direct, secret, manhood suffrage a National Constituent Assembly to draw up a new constitution. By this act France obtained complete political equality. The Revolution made in Paris was accepted without question by the rest of the nation.

To appease the working classes, the provisional government on February 26 decreed "the immediate establishment of national workshops" and Louis Blanc became "the minister of public works" to organize them. But the scheme was started under fatal handicaps with the definite object of discrediting it. All sorts of unemployed men were formed into a "workshop army," as a part of the national guard, and set to digging trenches at forty cents a day. The working day was reduced to ten hours in Paris and to eleven hours "in the country." By May 100,000 men in Paris were given employment. In vain did Louis Blanc protest against this unwise method of solving the labor problem. Soon the working days were reduced to two out of each week. Early in May the total abolition of the national workshops was ordered by the Assembly. Many thousands were on the verge of starvation and, feeling themselves betrayed by the very government they had helped to create, again flew to arms and built barricades. Four days (June 23–26) of fearful carnage resulted. Some 10,000 were killed, 11,000 taken prisoners, the leaders shot, and 4,000 deported. There was far more bloodshed than in the earlier "Reign of Terror." Socialist newspapers to the number of thirty-two were suppressed. France was left divided into two hostile camps — the poor working classes, and the *bourgeois* Republicans determined to keep down the "vile mob."

National workshops

The "June Days"

Meanwhile the 9,000,000 voters had elected 900 members to the National Constituent Assembly. The peasants united with the moderate Republicans in electing about 800 representatives bitterly opposed to socialism in every form. Among the first acts of the new

body was the abolition of the "national workshops," which had never been scientifically or efficiently organized, as "an abomination of abominations." The idle workingmen were given the alternative of joining the army, or of working on public improvements in the country. "Socialism is dead," said one of the Socialists; "to mention it is to pronounce its funeral oration." The Assembly, standing for "the rights of property and public order," after repudiating socialism, abolished slavery, the censorship of the press, and capital punishment for political crimes. Provision was also made for primary education. The Republic was officially proclaimed on May 4, 1848, and the new constitution, modeled partly after that of the United States, was promulgated on November 4. It provided for a president, elected for four years by universal male franchise, with the right to choose his own cabinet. The council of state, selected by the lower house, served as sort of a senate presided over by a vice-president. The Assembly of 750 members, chosen for three years by the people, was clothed with full power of legislation. All of the substantial gains of the previous revolutions were reaffirmed. The machinery of the Second French Republic was now ready to be put into operation.

The Republic proclaimed

The question still confronting France was, Who would be elected president? A motion to disqualify members of former reigning houses for the office had been lost in the Assembly. The Republicans divided their strength by setting up two rival candidates. In the Assembly sat a man, elected by five different departments, whose name was to make him the first and only president of the Second Republic — Louis Napoleon, nephew of Napoleon I. In the election for president on December 10, 1848, Louis Napoleon received 5,400,000 votes, while the three other candidates combined had less than 2,000,000. Ten days later, he took an oath to remain "faithful to the democratic-republic," and as president said: "I shall regard as enemies of the country all those who endeavor to change by illegal means that which France has established." How he carried out his promise will appear later.

Election of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte as president of France

The people of Europe had been more or less liberalized by (1) the gradual growth of intelligence; (2) the Industrial Revolution; and (3) the series of political and social revolutions since 1776. The persistence of remnants of the old *régime* in various parts of Europe, and the efforts of autocratic rulers to curb progress, resulted in a new determination to get rid of them. Hence in 1848 Europe was more ripe for revolutionary propaganda than ever before. The Revolution of 1848 in France seemed to set Europe on fire with a spirit of emulation. The greatest and most widespread wave of disturbance of the nineteenth century swept across Europe from Britain to Italy, and from Spain to Russia. The entire system of reaction built upon the victory of Waterloo, the Congress of Vienna, and the international concert which followed, went tumbling to the ground about the

head of its chief architect, Metternich, who deserted the continent he had controlled so long.

3. The Revolution in Germany

Prussia, like Austria, had scarcely been touched by the Revolution of 1830. But immediately following the February revolt of 1848 in Paris, the contagion spread to the Rhine Valley and to Poland, and soon Berlin, the seat of the proud Hohenzollerns, was ablaze with revolution. Led by agitators from the Rhine Valley and Poland, huge mass meetings of workmen and students were held in the parks and beer halls of Berlin. Tumults and street fighting, amidst shouts of "Liberty and Equality" scared the king into granting reforms and calling a provisional diet to discuss a constitution for Prussia. News of the recent overthrow of Metternich in Vienna reached Berlin on March 13 and encouraged the people to stand more firmly for their rights. When on March 19 a crowd gathered in front of the royal palace to thank the king for the concession he had granted, hot-headed republicans began to incite them to violence. The king ordered the square cleared, and an accidental shot caused a wild fight with shouts of "Treachery! Murder! To arms! The barricades!" In a few hours the capital was an armed encampment of rebels. Horrified at this uprising, the king promised to remove the troops, to redress all the grievances of the people, and to take the lead in unifying the whole German nation. When the martyrs, about 200, who had been killed in the revolt, were borne in solemn procession to the royal palace, the king was called out to view the victims of his troops. He appeared on an upper balcony and the angry rabble shouted "Take off your hat!" The quaking despot removed it. "Come down!" the people yelled. Down he went, expressing his regrets at the death of his subjects, and bowing in grief before the dead. Meanwhile Crown Prince William, the future leader of German unification, fled for safety to Great Britain. The whole city was draped in mourning for several days by royal order as an expression of sorrow for the massacre.

Prussia

On May 28, 1848, the Constitutional Assembly met in Berlin. A constitution omitting the title "King by the grace of God," and providing for a legislature of two houses, universal franchise, jury trial, and personal rights, was laid before the Assembly, but was voted down at once by the conservative "Junkers." Then the king dismissed the Assembly. In 1850 he granted Prussia a constitution, which was more liberal than might have been expected. It guaranteed many personal liberties, established a parliament with two branches, and introduced the undemocratic system of voting by classes. The king said that the constitution was so modern that it "made his stomach ache." It was soon replaced by another, which increased the rights of the crown and retained the special voting

Prussian constitution of 1850

strength of the wealthier classes. This remained in force from 1850 until the Revolution of 1918.

Like an electric spark the Revolution of 1848 spread over the smaller German states. Within a few weeks nearly all of them had secured more democratic constitutional governments. So frightened was the ruler of Prussia that he asked Great Britain to join the central and eastern powers on the continent in confining the revolution to France. The people in the small German states, particularly in South Germany, demanded not only local reforms, but also a united, liberalized German national state. Some bold spirits openly advocated a republic. The old federal Diet at Frankfort flew into a panic and revoked every objectionable measure it had passed. Then it granted freedom of the press, ran up the outlawed revolutionary flag, and appointed a committee to modernize the constitution of the Confederation.

Lesser German states

Meanwhile the German liberals, ignoring the Diet, took the initiative into their own hands and elected a national Constitutional Convention by universal male franchise. This inexperienced body of 568 delegates, representing the patriotic hopes of the German people for a free, united country, met at Frankfort on May 17, 1848. "We are here to create a constitution for Germany," said the president, von Gagern. "Our call to the work and the authority to proceed have their origin in the sovereignty of the people." All the proceedings were ordered printed so as to let the nation know what was being done. One party in the Convention wanted a democratic empire; another a federal republic. The popular Archduke John of Austria was elected temporary "Administrator of Germany" to the disappointment of Prussia. Then the work of creating a constitution for the new German state began. Months were consumed in discussing the "rights of the German man" although rapid action and agreement were necessary if the movement was to succeed at all. Every day of delay was exploited by the reactionaries. It was decided to include in the new state only the German portion of Austria, which made Austria unalterably opposed to the Convention. Finally, the Convention voted to call the unified Germany an "Empire," and 28 out of the 35 states offered the office of "Emperor of the Germans" to King Frederick William IV of Prussia. But, encouraged by the reactionaries and threatened by Austria, he indignantly rejected the honor saying, "I want a king's crown, not one picked up in the gutter like that of Louis Philippe." When Austria joined Prussia in repudiating the constitution, it was quite evident that the day of unification and freedom for Germany had not yet come.

The Frankfort Parliament

The liberals in the Convention now advocated a violent revolution to save the constitution, while the conservative members demanded a new election to measure public opinion. In some of the small states like Saxony, Baden, and the Palatinate, the people broke out in violent demonstrations in favor of the constitution, but

Prussian troops suppressed them. When the Convention censored Prussia for arbitrary acts, she withdrew her delegates. Other states then followed Prussia's example. The remaining 105 radicals removed the Convention to Stuttgart and voted 5,000,000 thalers to finance a revolution. At last, on June 18, 1849, the king of Württemberg ordered his troops to disperse this remnant of the Convention.

Failure of liberalism and unification

After thirteen months of vain effort, the Convention had done little more than to make it easier for the next generation, under Prussian leadership, to realize the dream of national unity. Reaction set in once more over all Germany. By 1850 the old authorities were again in control, most of the reforms were withdrawn, and the old régime was restored. The Diet resumed its power, and the Germanic Confederation, created at the Congress of Vienna, continued under Austrian guidance. Everywhere the liberals were persecuted. Tens of thousands of republicans left Germany, and men like Carl Schurz, Franz Sigel, and Dr. Jacoby fled to the United States.

4. The Revolution in the Hapsburg Dominions

The Hapsburg dominions included Austria, Hungary, Bohemia, and a large portion of Italy. The Revolution of 1848, which swept over these regions like a forest fire, was a rather unique mixture of liberal hopes and nationalistic ambitions. The result was a condition of utter chaos in which it appeared for a time as if the Austrian Empire would fall to pieces. The Austrians, Hungarians, Slavs and Italians all wanted liberty, equality, and representative constitutional government, but the last three groups also demanded independence of Austrian rule. In fact, they wanted separation so much that they sacrificed the coöperation necessary to the success of a joint revolution and, consequently, in the end, lost both liberalism and nationalism.

News of the uprising in France early reached Vienna, the home of Metternich, which at last became the storm center of a violent revolution, that caused the Empire to totter to its foundations. Politically, Austria was the very embodiment of the spirit of absolutism. Economically, she lagged far behind Great Britain, France and Prussia. A few silver and gold mines were in operation, and the mining of salt was a paying industry, but the transportation was so poor that no coal was produced until after 1830, and then only in small quantities. Agriculture, which claimed the attention of most of the people, was backward. Woolens, linens, cottons, and hardware were made on a small scale under the domestic system. Bohemia was famous for its fine glassware. Socially, the people complained of the continuance of serfdom, inequality, privilege, and injustice. The eight universities had only 7,000 students, and there were but seven academies and thirty high schools in the whole Empire. In the cities a middle class was just beginning to emerge. In short the despotism, ignorance, and lack of progress of Austria, as compared with the

Austria

nations of western Europe, supplied the best material for a flame of revolt. Metternich early scented danger and said: "I am an old practitioner, and I know how to discriminate between curable and incurable diseases. This one is fatal, here we hold on as long as we can; but I despair of the issue." On March 13, 1848, crowds of students and workingmen, shouting "Down with Metternich!", surrounded his house. The white-haired old prince, now past seventy, resigned his office because he had lost "the confidence of the people," and fled in disguise to Great Britain, where he was warmly welcomed by his good friend, the duke of Wellington. All Vienna celebrated his departure. The emperor promised reforms and called a Constitutional Convention. The old régime of spies, censorship, and feudalism was abolished. A new constitution, modelled after that of Belgium and granted to Austria on the emperor's birthday, April 25, was as liberal as any on the continent. But pressed too hard by the revolutionists for further changes, the feeble old emperor fled from Vienna to Innsbruck.

In the emperor's absence the Constitutional Convention, elected by universal male franchise, met on July 22 at Vienna. It represented all parts of the Empire except Hungary and was a Babel of tongues and races. The liberals were in a majority and even the peasants had 92 delegates. Time was fatally wasted in festivities and in idle discussion, however, instead of being devoted to the formation of an imperial constitution. Feudal dues were abolished everywhere and social equality proclaimed. The emperor was invited to return, and in August reëntered his capital. But by this time a medley of nationalistic revolutions had broken out in Hungary, Bohemia, Croatia, and Italy. When the imperial government ordered Austrian troops to march against the Hungarian rebels, the people of Vienna once more became violent. Barricades were built and the minister of war was hanged to a lamp-post. A second time the emperor ran away but ordered his generals to crush the Revolution. An imperial army captured the capital city of Vienna on October 31. A score of the leaders were executed, and the Austrian Revolution came to an inglorious end. The Convention was removed to Moravia, but before its work was completed, an imperial constitution was proclaimed, and the Convention disappeared.

The Constitutional Convention

For some years before 1848 the Hungarians, led by the patriots Kossuth and Deak, had demanded reforms and a separation from Austria. No country in Europe was more mediaeval than Hungary. The revolt in Vienna gave the Magyars their opportunity. In a patriotic outbreak, they demanded their own national government and an independent ministry. The old emperor was forced to grant these concessions. Kossuth and Deak were made members of the new Hungarian government. Then a diet, elected by the people, met and abolished the privileges of the nobles and the feudal dues of the peasants. Hungary was modernized and made self-governing, with

Hungary

its own flag, army, money, and diplomatic agents to foreign countries. The new constitution, which was drawn up, granted freedom of the press and religion, and trial by jury. The only tie that bound the Hungarians to Austria was a common ruler, and even that slender thread was broken when Emperor Ferdinand abdicated on December 2, 1848, in favor of his nephew, Francis Joseph I.

The situation in Hungary was complicated by the fact that under Hungarian rule were Croats, Serbs, Slovaks, and Rumanians, who also wanted their independence and complained that the new constitution did not give them their rights. The imperial government at Vienna encouraged these separatist movements for the purpose of weakening Hungary, and went so far as to appoint Baron Jellachich as *ban*, or governor, of Croatia with the expectation that he would organize the rebellious Slavs as an independent nation directly under the emperor. Encouraged in this manner, the Slavs declared their independence of Hungary, and then joined the Austrians in a war to defeat the Magyars. Incensed at these maneuvers, Hungary proclaimed her complete independence of Austria and appointed Kossuth as president. Tsar Nicholas of Russia was induced by Austria to join her in a war against Hungary. By the fall of 1849 Hungary was defeated on the battle field and became once more a mere province of Austria. Kossuth fled to Turkey, and then proceeded to Great Britain and the United States, where he made passionate appeals for the restoration of his country. His last days were spent in Italy hoping in vain for Hungarian freedom, which he did not live to see fully realized (d. 1894). Other leaders were put to death or imprisoned. The emperor withdrew the right of self-government, and annulled many of the reforms. For another generation Hungary felt the displeasure of the autocratic house of Hapsburg.

Bohemia

In Bohemia, as in Hungary, there had been a nationalistic revival before 1848, but Metternich had held it firmly in hand. During the Revolution of 1848 the Bohemians petitioned the emperor for reforms including a popularly elected diet of their own, and the right to use their own language in public offices. He promised equality of rights and called an assembly to form a constitution for Bohemia. The assembly was elected, but never actually met, because meanwhile during a pan-Slavic congress held in Prague there arose a bitter conflict between the Germans and the Czechs, which gave the Austrian military commander, General Windischgrätz, whose wife was slain by the mob, an excuse for bombarding the city of Prague into submission. By the end of 1849 all constitutional government in Bohemia ceased. The German language was again officially used in the schools and public offices. All Bohemian newspapers were suppressed. Bohemia had to wait until the World War to secure her independence.

Since 1815 Italy had suffered impatiently under the Austrian yoke. Lombardo-Venetia was ruled directly from Vienna, and Austrian princes sat on the thrones of Tuscany, Lucca, Modena, and Parma.

The hope of emancipation was kept alive by memories of the earlier revolutions; by Mazzini's "Young Italy" and the Carbonari, whose members wanted a republic; by the clericals who wished a federation under the pope; and by wiser heads, who looked to Charles Albert, the liberal king of Piedmont, to create a constitutional monarchy. News of the flight of Metternich from Vienna fired the Italians *Italy* once more with the spirit of revolt — first in Milan, then all over northern and central Italy. But, unfortunately, united action was lacking. Pope Pius IX repudiated the movement for independence. The king of Naples withdrew his troops from the north. Tuscany also deserted the national cause. Piedmont, Lombardo-Venetia, Parma, and Modena were left to carry on the struggle against Austria alone. Under the leadership of Charles Albert they made a desperate but vain stand against the fresh troops that were rushed down from Austria. Charles Albert, defeated in battle, abdicated in favor of his son, Victor Emanuel II, the future unifier and first king of modern Italy. By making a timely peace he saved his throne and also the constitution, which a decade later was adopted by the entire nation. All of the new Italian republics, which had been proclaimed, were overthrown and the Hapsburg régime restored. Mazzini, Cavour, Garibaldi, and Victor Emanuel II had learned valuable lessons for the future.

The democratic Revolution of 1848 in the Austrian Empire was defeated by the various independent, national revolts. The imperial government used one against the other, and in the end defeated them all. Had the revolutionists firmly united against autocracy, the outcome might have been quite different. The constitution granted to the whole Empire and abrogated in 1851, was never really put into operation. Reaction and clericalism triumphed. Yet certain positive gains came out of the movement. For one thing feudalism was abolished. Taxes were more equitably levied thereafter. The middle class and the workingmen gained more confidence in their own strength. The people came to know something of the meaning *Results* of legislative bodies and constitutions, and were better prepared for the regeneration and modernization of the Empire a generation later. Italy's liberation was postponed only ten years. On the shaky imperial throne sat a new, vigorous, young ruler, Francis Joseph I, who had restored absolutism but was to live to see his work undone. Though he lost Italy some years later, he was able to hold together the remainder of the motley Empire, until it crumbled to pieces in 1918 under the shock of the World War, in the midst of which he himself died.

5. The Chartist Movement in Great Britain

The Great Reform Bill of 1832 satisfied the middle class, who through their power in the House of Commons were soon in control of Great Britain. But they showed little disposition to extend the

benefits of political liberty to the masses of the people, who thus neglected began to develop a program of action. The legal sanction of trade-unions in 1825 had awakened a new sense of class solidarity among the working people. This stir among the wage-earners produced some progressive measures. A series of factory laws were passed beginning in 1802. In 1833 slavery in the British colonies was abolished, the first grant of public money for elementary education was made, and an act was passed to regulate the hours and conditions of labor in the textile industry. The Poor Law of 1834 was a compromise measure of the Whigs designed to correct some abuses of the earlier relief acts and practices without a complete adoption of a constructive policy in dealing with the poor, the needy and the aged. Relief for all able-bodied persons was abolished. A central board of three commissioners was given authority over all the more or less aristocratic local officials in the distribution of aid to those adults who were physically unfit, in the provision for the support and education of the poor children, and in "the government of the workhouses." For the more efficient administration of the problem of relief, the commissioners were empowered to unite single parishes into "unions" under a "Board of Guardians of the poor" elected by the local ratepayers. While this arrangement was more economical and an improvement over the old system of the distribution of relief through arbitrary overseers, yet it was far from satisfactory to the common people. The aged and the poor were sent off to the prison-like workhouses. The description of the hardships of the working classes in Dickens's *Oliver Twist* and *Hard Times* were true to life. The Poor Law of 1834 was extended to Ireland in 1836 and to Scotland in 1845.

British Reforms, 1800–1840

The discontented wage-earners, feeling that the Poor Law was intolerably oppressive and inadequate, inaugurated an organized protest against it. To protect their own interests, they formed organizations such as the "National Consolidated Trade Union," which advocated an eight-hour day and a "new moral world." A general strike was suggested as the best means of forcing Parliament to grant workers their rights. The manufacturers answered this labor agitation by a mutual agreement to exclude all members of these workingmen's associations from their employment, and induced the government to brand the trade-union as an "unlawful conspiracy" and even to condemn several of the most active labor leaders to deportation. The poorly-paid workers could not cope with the powerful government, of course, and the proposed strike failed.

Continued discontent

Intellectuals and philanthropists now took up the cause of the workers, and under their leadership the scene of combat was changed from the economic field to the political arena. At the same time discontent among the laboring classes was augmented by several years of bad harvests and a shortage of food, and by an economic depression, which shut down the factories and caused widespread

unemployment. A comparatively small group centering in London started the Chartist movement in 1838. They urged a series of political reforms to enable the working people to improve their lot through legislation in a peaceable manner. In imitation of *Magna Charta*, the Chartists drew up the "People's Charter," written by Francis Place, which demanded universal male franchise, secret ballot, equal one-man districts for parliamentary elections, yearly parliaments, the abolition of all property qualifications for seats in the House of Commons, and salaries for all members. The "Workingmen's Parliament" in London in 1839 presented a petition, signed by 1,200,000 names, to Parliament asking for the enactment of the provisions of the "Charter" into law, but it was not even discussed in the House of Commons. Clubs, newspapers, and mass-meetings continued the agitation throughout the nation. A second petition with 3,000,000 names, many of them unfortunately "faked," was presented in 1842 but had no better success. After the repeal of the Corn Laws and the extension of free trade, accompanied by a decline in the cost of living and a revival of employment, the agitation subsided somewhat.

The Chartist movement

The Revolution of 1848 in France almost precipitated a revolution across the English Channel. That winter happened to be one of great suffering among the working people. The 500 Chartist societies with 50,000 members became intensively active. Huge gatherings were held in all the industrial centers and in the large cities. The labor world was tremendously stirred. An enormous Peoples's Parliament of 500,000 people was called to meet in London on April 10 to present to Parliament a third petition signed, it was said, by nearly 6,000,000 names. Never had the whole nation been more excited, or alarmed. Wellington forbade the proposed procession, and stationed 170,000 special constables from the middle class throughout London to keep the peace. But the expected half million dwindled to 50,000. Falling into the hands of incompetent and indiscreet leaders, the movement was discredited. The monster petition, which filled six carriages, was duly presented to Parliament, and was found to contain such fictitious names as "Pug Nose" and "Wellington" added to swell the number. Although nothing was done by Parliament, yet revolution did not result as on the continent. The British people move slowly towards reforms, and are not easily stampeded into hasty action. The objects of the Chartist movement were gradually achieved in the advances made towards a democracy in the years to follow. After 1848 trade-unions and coöperative societies occupied the minds of the lower classes.

Chartist agitation

6. Effects of the Revolution of 1848 in Other Countries

There was scarcely a civilized country in the world that was not affected in some way by the Revolution of 1848. King William II of Holland was forced to name a commission to revise the Dutch

constitution, which changed the government from an autocracy to a limited monarchy. The States General was called to adopt it and

Holland in November it was promulgated. The crown was made hereditary in both the male and female branches of the house of Orange. The upper house was chosen by the provinces and not by the monarch; the lower house was elected by the direct vote of the taxpayers. The ministry was made responsible to the parliament for the king's acts. Freedom of worship was guaranteed, and primary education was placed under state control. Provinces and communes had their local rights guaranteed. With this constitution, Holland became a modern, constitutional state, which has continued with few changes to the present time. In Belgium the number of voters was greatly increased by a reduction of the property qualification for voting.

Modern Switzerland, like Holland, dates from 1848, and its creation was instigated by the Revolution in France. The federal constitution of that year, modelled after that of the United States in many respects, still endures. In the central legislature, the Council of

Switzerland State has two members from each sovereign canton, while the National Council is elected by universal manhood suffrage. The executive consists of the Federal Council of seven members chosen for three years by the legislature, and one of them is selected as president. The year 1848 was followed in Switzerland by an era of

Denmark remarkable prosperity. A new constitution was secured in Denmark in 1849, which forced the king to share his political power with the legislature of two houses. Although the revolutionary fire had

Spain burned out in Spain in the earlier uprisings, yet agitation forced some liberal changes to be made in the constitution in 1855. The movement

Poland in Poland did not gather sufficient momentum for an outbreak until 1863. In Russia the Crimean War diverted the attention of the people away from the Revolution in western and central Europe. A revolu-

Ireland tionary wave could not roll across the continent without touching Ireland. A rebellion broke out there in 1848, but it was poorly organized and easily suppressed. In the United States the European struggles for freedom led to an increase in the agitation for the suppression of Negro slavery and for further social and humanitarian legislation.

The Revolution of 1848, which raged across Europe like a hurricane, incited no less than fifteen separate revolts. More than half the monarchs were either deposed or compelled to grant reforms. France, Prussia, Piedmont, Holland, Denmark, and Switzerland received new constitutions. The reform movements in Great Britain and in central Europe were thwarted by the forces of conservatism. Thousands of liberals were forced to flee from the latter to freer countries. Still there were permanent gains for liberalism and nationalism in nearly every land. The middle class gained more power, and although the peasants and workingmen secured few political concessions, nevertheless, their economic position was bet-

tered in many places. Henceforth absolutism, where it still survived, was usually on the defensive.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

The Political Revolutions

1. *France*

J. Jaurès, *Histoire socialiste*, Vol. VII, *La restauration*, by R. Viviani (1906); Vol. VIII, *La règne de Louis Philippe*, by J. E. Fournière (1906); Vol. IX, *La république de 1848*, by G. Renard; G. Weill, *La France sous la monarchie Constitutionelle*, new edition (1912); *Histoire du parti républicain en France de 1814 à 1870* (1900); P. Thureau-Dangin, *Histoire de la monarchie de juillet*, 2d edition, 7 vols. (1888–1892); L. Blanc, *Histoire des dix ans, 1830–1840*, English translation, 2 vols. (1844–1845); J. Tchernoff, *Le parti républicain sous la monarchie de juillet; formation et évolution de la doctrine républicaine* (1901); L. von Stein, *Geschichte der sozialen Bewegung in Frankreich*, 3 vols. (1850); O. Festy, *Le mouvement ouvrier au debut de la monarchie de juillet*, 2 vols. (1908); A. Blanqui, *Des classes ouvrières en France pendant l'année 1848*, 2 vols. (1849); A. Crémieux, *La révolution de février: étude critique sur les journées de 21, 22, 23 et 24 février, 1848* (1912); J. A. R. Marriott, editor, *The Revolution of 1848 in its Economic Aspects*, 2 vols. (1913); P. de la Gorce, *Histoire de la seconde république française*, 7th edition, 2 vols. (1914); C. Mazade, *Thiers*, (1884); A. Bardoux, *Guizot* (1894); H. R. Whitehouse, *The Life of Lamartine*, 2 vols. (1918).

2. *England*

W. N. Molesworth, *The History of England, 1830–1874*, 3 vols. (1874); J. McCarthy, *The Epoch of Reform, 1830–1850* (1897); J. R. Rose, *The Rise and Growth of Democracy in Great Britain* (1898); Sir Spenser Walpole, *History of England since 1815*, 6 vols. (revised edition, 1902–1905); G. C. Brodrick and J. Fotheringham, *Political History of England, 1801–1837* (1906); S. Low and L. C. Sanders, *Political History of England, 1837–1901* (1907); J. A. R. Marriott, *England since Waterloo* (1913); G. Slater, *The Making of Modern England* (new edition, 1915); G. M. Trevelyan, *British History in the Nineteenth Century, (1782–1901)*, (1922); W. J. Amherst, *The History of Catholic Emancipation, 1771–1820*, 2 vols. (1886); B. Ward, *The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation, 1830–1850*, 2 vols.; Sir T. E. May, *Constitutional History of England since the Accession of George III*, Edited and continued by F. Holland, 3 vols. (1912); J. R. M. Butler, *The Passing of the Great Reform Bill* (1914); Sir G. Nicholls, *A History of the English Poor Law*, new edition (1898), 2 vols., Vol. III by T. Mackay (1899); S. and B. Webb, *English Local Government, 1688–1835*, 3 vols. (1906); B. L. Hutchins and A. Harrison, *A History of Factory Legislation* (1904, 1911); B. H. Holland, *The Fall of Protection, 1840–1850* (1913); R. G. Gammage, *History of Chartism* (1854, 1894); E. Dolléans, *Le chartisme*, 2 vols. (1913); P. W. Slosson, *The Decline of the Chartist Movement* (1917); M. Hovell, *The Chartist Movement* (1918); Sir L. Stephen, *The English Utilitarians* (1900); A. V. Dicey, *Lectures on the Relation between Law and Public Opinion in England during the Nineteenth Century* (2d edition, 1914); W. L. Davidson, *Political Thought in England: the Utilitarians from Bentham to J. S. Mill* (1915); Sir G. O. Trevelyan, *The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay*, 2 vols. (1876); S. Walpole, *Life of Lord John Russell*, 2 vols. (1879); J. Morley, *Life of Richard Cobden* (1881); G. Wallas, *Life of Francis Place* (1898); Earl of Rosebery, *Sir Robert Peel* (1899); Sir H. Maxwell, *The Life of Wellington*, 2 vols. (3d edition 1900); Gibbins, *English Social Reformers* (1902); C. M. Atkinson, *Life of Jeremy Bentham* (1905); G. M. Trevelyan, *The Life of John Bright* (1913); *Lord Grey of the Reform Bill* (1920).

3. *Germany and Austria-Hungary*

H. von Treitschke, *Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, 5 vols. (1890–1896), English translation (1915); A. W. Ward, *Germany, 1815–1870*, 3 vols. (1916–1919); C. E. Maurice, *The Revolutionary Movement of 1848–1849 in Italy, Austria-Hungary, and Germany* (1887); K. Marx, *Revolution and Counter Revolution, or, Germany in 1848*, edited

by E. M. Aveling (1896); H. Blum, *Die deutsche Revolution, 1848–1849* (1897); P. Matter, *La Prusse et la révolution de 1848* (1903); G. Lüders, *Die democratische Bewegung in Berlin im Oktober 1848* (1909); F. Bancroft and W. A. Dunning, *The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz*, 2 vols. (1907); H. Friedjung, *Oesterreich von 1848 bis 1860*, 2 vols. (1908–1912); J. A. Helfert, *Die Oesterreichische Revolution*, 4 vols. (1869–1889), (Enc. Brit.); C. M. Knatchbull-Hugessen, *The Political Evolution of the Hungarian Nation*, 2 vols. (1908); C. Sproxton, *Palmerston and the Hungarian Revolution* (1919).

4. *Spain, Latin America and the United States*

G. Hubbard, *Histoire contemporaine de l'Espagne*, 6 vols. (1869–1883); C. E. Chapman, *A History of Spain* (1919); B. Mitre, *The Emancipation of South America* (1893); L. A. Lawson, *The Relation of British Policy to the Declaration of the Monroe Doctrine* (1922); W. S. Robertson, *The Rise of the Spanish American Republics; History of the Latin American Nations* (1922); W. F. Reddaway, *The Monroe Doctrine* (1898, 1906); J. H. Latané, *The United States and Latin America* (1920); F. J. Turner, *The Rise of the New West* (1906); W. Macdonald, *Jacksonian Democracy* (1906); E. Channing, *History of the United States*, Vol. V (1920); J. R. Commons, *History of Labour in the United States*, 2 vols. (1910).

5. *Italy*

W. R. Thayer, *Dawn of Italian Independence*, 2 vols. (1893); W. J. Stillman, *The Union of Italy, 1815–1895* (1898); G. Pepe, *Histoire des révolutions et des guerres d'Italie, 1847–1849* (1850); L. C. Farini, *The Roman State, from 1815 to 1850*, English translation by W. E. Gladstone, 4 vols. (1851–1854); A. Pouchbois, *Histoire de Pie IX et de son pontificat*, 6 vols. (1877–1888); R. M Johnston, *The Roman Theocracy and the Republic, 1846–1849* (1901); G. M. Trevelyan, *Garibaldi's Defense of the Roman Republic* (1907); *Manin and the Venetian Republic* (1923); Bolton King, *Joseph Mazzini* (1902); H. R. Whitehouse, *The Collapse of the Kingdom of Naples* (1899).

6. *Holland, Belgium and Switzerland*

P. J. Blok, *History of the People of the Netherlands*, English translation by Ruth Putnam and others, 5 vols. (1898–1912); H. W. Van Loon, *The Rise of the Dutch Kingdom, 1795–1813* (1915); R. C. K. Ensor, *Belgium* (1915); L. van der Essen, *A Short History of Belgium* (1916); P. Seippel, *La Suisse au dixneuvième siècle*, 3 vols. (1899–1903); W. D. McCrackin, *Rise of the Swiss Republic* (2d edition, 1901); W. Oechsli, *Geschichte der Schweiz im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (1903–1913); *History of Switzerland, 1499–1914*, English translation by E. and A. Paul (1922).

7. *Poland and the Balkans*

T. Schiemann, *Geschichte Russlands unter Kaiser Nikolau I*, 4 vols. (1904–1919); W. A. Phillips, *Poland* (1915); E. H. Lewinski-Corwin, *The Political History of Poland* (1917); W. Miller, *The Ottoman Empire, 1801–1913* (1913), new edition, 1922; F. Schevill, *The History of the Balkan Peninsula from the Earliest Times to the Present Day* (1922); L. Sergeant, *Greece in the Nineteenth Century* (1897); W. Miller, *History of Greece in the Nineteenth Century* (1920); G. Finlay, *History of the Greek Revolution* (1877); W. A. Phillips, *The Greek War of Independence* (1897); R. W. Seton-Watson, *The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans* (1917); H. W. V. Temperley, *History of Serbia* (1917).

CHAPTER XII

POLITICAL AND SOCIAL TRENDS AND ACHIEVEMENTS TO 1850

1. The Leading Forces and Aspirations

Among the most important results of the revolutions in science, technology, politics and society in the century from 1750 to 1850 were the growing ascendency of the middle class, which gradually triumphed over the old agrarian aristocracy, and the slow rise of the industrial *proletariat* which came to challenge the dominion of the business classes or capitalists. It was natural that both of these classes should turn to the state and political action to advance their interests. The capitalists were most successful in the earlier phases of this process. They first demanded written constitutions, so that political institutions might be made more certain and permanent, industry and commerce protected against arbitrary invasion and confiscation by absolute monarchs, and the right of property made absolute and secure against the envious desires and aspirations of the lower classes. They were in large part successful in securing such constitutions, which in most cases embodied the ideals of the propertied and business groups. Once governments were established in accordance with these concepts, the middle class proceeded to abolish the older legislation which restricted the freedom of business enterprise, and then vigorously opposed any positive legislation designed to better the lot of the workers.

No sooner was constitutional and parliamentary government established than the *proletariat* also saw in this an opportunity to improve their status and conditions. They began to agitate for laws which would improve conditions of labor in factories, shorten the working-day, provide insurance against sickness, accidents and other incidents of industrial life, and give the workers ever greater part and power in public affairs. In many cases the landlords, partially out of hatred for the business classes, joined the *proletariat* in this struggle for social and economic justice. In England it was primarily the landlords, led by Lord Ashley, who put through the first great series of laws regulating labor in factories and mines. Some of the more radical of the proletarians became convinced that the contest for their rights and interests could never be carried on effectively within the restraints imposed by a state dominated by the capitalist or landlord classes. Hence, they demanded through socialism a political order controlled solely by the workers, or in

anarchism sought proletarian supremacy in a non-political, coöperative commonwealth.

2. An Era of Constitution-Making

One cannot study the history of the civilized world for the period of seventy years from the American Revolution to the Revolution of 1848, without being impressed with the fact that it was preëminently an era of written constitutions. These constitutions reflected the spirit of the age, and every popular upheaval had a constitution as a part of its program. Lord Morley said on one occasion that over 300 constitutions had been created between 1800 and 1880 in Europe alone but that their value depended upon "the forces behind them." So it was that the more democratic constitutions came from the hearts of the people, while others, granted by despotic rulers, like that of Prussia, meant little more than stingy concessions to stop the cry for greater reforms. By 1850 there was not a single state in the Old World, except Russia and Turkey, and none in the New World, in which a constitution had not either been granted or considered. In the long conflict of the people with autocratic rule the constitution stood as a landmark of victory in political and social progress. In public opinion it was both a safeguard against governmental tyranny and a guarantee of the protection of the people in their rights. England was the first nation in the modern world to develop a constitution, and her example was followed not alone in the English-speaking colonies but also in other enlightened states. In a period like the eighteenth century, when people everywhere felt the strong hand of political despotism, it seemed to be an absolute necessity that there should be written down in a fundamental document those sacred "rights of man" to which people clung so tenaciously.

Origins of modern constitutions

The first modern example of a written constitution came from the New World. About two months before the Declaration of Independence, the Continental Congress advised the colonies to create new governments. Within a year seven states drew up new constitutions — two of them, Virginia and New Jersey, before July 4, 1776. Connecticut and Rhode Island continued to use their old charters. The Constitution of Massachusetts, in 1780, was the first one in the world submitted to the people for ratification. These constitutions merely adapted the old political machinery of the colonial period to new needs, and included the rights for which the people were fighting England. They formed the basis for the federal constitution of 1787, and were widely known in France and Latin America. The Articles of Confederation served as a model for other nations where state jealousies prevented strong central governments. The federal constitution of 1787, born of compromise and ratified with difficulty by the suspicious commonwealths, is the oldest written national constitution on earth. It has served the needs of a growing nation and, with a few amendments, has survived the shocks of wars and panics. It

Written

has been copied or imitated in the New World and the Old. Under it has been developed one of the greatest democratic republics on the globe.

In the Old World the British constitutional government, with authority limited by law and controlled by public opinion, stood forth as a unique exception to what was found on the continent, where absolute types of government generally prevailed. The British constitution is not a written document drawn up at a certain time, like that of the United States. It has grown up through the centuries out of the political thought and experience of the nation. It is a "living thing" — the "child of wisdom and chance" — which meets the needs of Englishmen. It is partly written and partly practice and custom. The British Parliament is the oldest legislative body in existence. In theory, at least, the House of Commons may change the constitution at will. The American constitutions were deeply indebted to the British model, as of course was natural. While the nations of the world have copied many features of the written constitution of the United States, still the influence of British political institutions has been strongly felt in nearly every democratic state. The most important constitutional changes in Great Britain in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries have had to do with the right to vote and the curtailment of the power of the House of Lords. The Reform Bill of 1832 extended the franchise to the wealthier middle class. The Municipal Reform Act of 1835 gave 2,000,000 more men the right to vote for town councillors. Later acts gradually widened the privilege of voting, as in the United States, until the ballot finally was put into the hands of all men and women. And these modifications were made without violent upheavals. Lord Durham's "*Magna Charta* of the colonies," recommending home rule for English-speaking dependencies, was successfully applied to Canada in 1847 and later to other white colonies in the Empire. In recent years the tendency in Great Britain has been to increase the power of the prime minister, and to decrease the authority of the upper house.

The constitutions of England

Greatly influenced by both England and the United States, the French National Assembly issued the famous Declaration of the Rights of Man in 1791 and transformed the government from an absolute to a constitutional monarchy. During the sixty years following the Revolution of 1789, no less than eight constitutions were made in France. Those of 1791, 1814, and 1830 established limited monarchies. The two Napoleons set up a despotism under the screen of constitutional democracy. The constitutions of 1793, 1795 and 1848 created republics. That of 1793 was the most extreme example of democracy, but never went into effect. That of 1848 added to the rights of man, the rights of nations, and the rights of the laborer. Each of these documents is of great historical significance as a guidepost on the path of French political progress. On the continent France became the pioneer in political liberty and constitu-

French constitutions

tional government. Her laws and civic institutions were copied more or less in all the other countries. Since she was in close touch with Latin America, her influence was also felt in the creation of the young republics that sprang up there.

Constitutions in other Latin countries

In Spain and Portugal the Spanish constitution of 1812, based on that of 1791 in France, laid the foundations for whatever of constitutional government developed. This famous constitution was more liberal in its fundamental ideas than either that of the United States in 1787 or that of France in 1791. In a preamble the ancient "fundamental laws" of Spain are enumerated. Then follows the assertion that "Sovereignty is vested essentially in the nation, which has the exclusive right to make laws." The legislature consisted of one house called the Cortes, chosen every two years by the indirect vote of all men. The executive was nominally a king, who had a suspensive veto over the laws passed by the Cortes, but actually Spain was administered by a ministry. Political liberty and legal equality were guaranteed. The courts, the army, taxation, and education were modernized. Ample provision was made for liberal local self-government. Although the Roman Catholic Church was declared to be the "only true Church" of the Spanish nation, still the property of the church was secularized and the Inquisition was suppressed. This document was the creation of Spaniards imbued with the ideas of the French Revolution and they hoped that it would entirely discard the old régime. With every upheaval in Spain, as in 1820 and 1834, some form of the constitution of 1812 was adopted. Portugal was affected in like manner, although the constitution of 1852 was influenced by the British model. Latin America was especially affected by the constitution of 1812 in forming republican governments. In Italy, likewise, in the various revolts from 1820 to 1848, the people clamored for its adoption. When Charles Albert of Piedmont granted his state a constitution, which later became the fundamental law of the united kingdom of Italy, he incorporated into it many features of the Spanish instrument. The same thing was true of the constitution of the new Greece. In short, all the countries of southern Europe were influenced in their political growth more or less by the Spanish constitution of 1812. A notable exception was Sicily, whose constitution in 1812 was the first on the continent to be modelled after that of Great Britain, but it survived only two years.

Central and eastern Europe

In central and eastern Europe, where autocracy was still enthroned, the written constitution played a less significant role. The constitution formed in 1814 at the Congress of Vienna for the Germanic Confederation was designed to safeguard the right of the princes and not the German people. It lasted until 1867, although it was almost discarded in 1848. Loosely speaking, it resembled the American Articles of Confederation. During the revolutionary waves of 1830, and 1848, some of the lesser German rulers gave their people constitutions, but most of them were only temporary, disap-

pearing in waves of reaction. In Prussia, Frederick William III promised to grant a constitution, but he never did so. His son, Frederick William IV, boasted that he never would allow "a blotted parchment" to come between "God Almighty in heaven and this land." Yet the Revolution of 1848 forced him to call a constitutional convention which drew up a modern constitution. The king rejected it, but in 1850 he himself proclaimed a constitution that left no room for the intrusion of democracy and that continued down to the close of the World War. Austria under Metternich was almost untouched by any move for a constitution, except in Italy, until the Revolution of 1848 produced several constitutions. The imperial constitution formed by a popular convention was never put into operation. That granted by Emperor Francis I for the whole empire was almost immediately withdrawn. The movement for a national constitution in Bohemia never materialized. The Hungarians, after declaring their independence of Austria, drew up a model constitution, but it disappeared before the victorious Austrian troops aided by Russia. After 1850 all of the Austrian Empire was more completely under the autocratic sway of the Hapsburg house than before. Before coming under the influence of Metternich, Tsar Alexander I of Russia had a vision of constitutional government for his Empire, but it vanished completely after 1820. The constitution which he granted to Poland was lost in the unsuccessful revolt in 1830.

In the small states bordering on France and Germany, permanent constitutions of a more or less democratic character were secured during the upheavals in 1830 and 1848. Belgium secured hers in 1831 through a national congress. The Dutch formed a constitution in 1848. The British constitution served as a guide for both these countries. In 1848 Switzerland established a federal republic with a constitution like that of the United States. Denmark entered the list of constitutional states in 1849. Riots in the streets of Stockholm, Sweden, caused the king to propose parliamentary reforms, but the old-fashioned Riksdag refused to vote them and the matter dropped.

Varieties of these constitutions

Between 1776 and 1850 well on towards a hundred written constitutions were created throughout the world. For the most part they represented political victories won by the people for democracy and nationality. Many of them stood as protests against the oppression of a motherland, such as the new American states against Great Britain, Spain, and Portugal. Others embodied hostility to control by other lands, as Belgium against Holland, Greece against Turkey, and Italy and Hungary against Austria. Some stood as revolts against tyrannical rulers as in France, Spain, Germany, and Austria. Others incorporated internal demands for reform as in Switzerland and Holland. Taking these documents as a whole, they measure the decline of absolutism and mark the progress of the world in liberty and equality. France formulated more constitutions during this period than any other nation, but none of them endured for a very

long time. Many of these fundamental laws were merely temporary and represented a transitional phase of history. None of them have lasted to the present time without any modifications, and not more than half a dozen even with modifications have endured to our day. Wherever democratic institutions have been most advanced and hence most stable, as in Great Britain and in the United States, the fewest constitutional changes have occurred.

3. The Germs of Socialism

Social liberalism

Socialism, in various forms, was another force that appeared in the world before 1850 as a foe not only of the evils inherited from the old régime, but also of the abuses of middle-class rule under the new régime of constitutional government. The roots of socialism ran back at least to the American Revolution and the French Revolution of 1789, which had given an impetus to all sorts of schemes for reconstructing society. It was asserted that society as it was organized after the overthrow of Bourbon absolutism denied to the poor both justice and the right of economic existence. As early as 1794 Noël Babeuf said: "When I see the poor without the clothing and shoes, which they themselves are engaged in making, and contemplate the small minority who do not work and yet want for nothing, I am convinced that government is still the old conspiracy of the few against the many, only it takes a new form." Hence he advocated the compulsory nationalization of wealth, social equality, and the abolition of poverty. This was to be brought about gradually by the state's assumption of all property on the death of the owners. His newspaper and the popular songs he wrote spread his ideas far and wide. Reports of an uprising against the Directory led to his arrest in 1796 and to his execution the next year. To him has been applied the term "Father of French socialism."

4. The "Utopian Socialists"

Nature of Utopian socialism

The word "socialist" was probably used for the first time by Robert Owen in 1835 in a newspaper letter in Great Britain. It quickly sprang into popularity with a certain group of reformers, and by 1838 had spread to France. With idealists like Saint-Simon, Owen, and Fourier "Utopian Socialism," named after Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*, began to attract attention. These men advocated the formation of social groups, who should live together in common somewhat like a large family. Profit-sharing enterprises, and coöperative industries and stores, are modern survivals of this idea. The scheme did not wholly succeed, and later socialists were rather disposed to disclaim it. Since that day socialism has become a factor of world-wide significance, and it will prove advantageous to understand the ideas of these pioneers.

One of the earliest Utopians was Henri Saint-Simon (1760–1825), a wealthy, well-educated French nobleman, who fought for the free-

dom of America under Washington. He took no active part in the French Revolution, although he was probably in sympathy with the moderate party. During the Terror he was imprisoned, and later through land speculation he accumulated a fortune. His interest in social experiments cost him his fortune so that by 1800 at the age of forty he was in want and glad to accept a place paying him $200 a year, from a former valet, and a small allowance from his family. In 1817 he began to write books setting forth his socialistic ideas. Perhaps the most important of his writings was *The New Christianity*, which was left unfinished at his death. He insisted upon a reorganization of society for the emancipation of the masses of the poor people. The social system — "the golden age of humanity" — which he urged, would have created a common ownership in all land and capital and hence would have abolished individual ownership and the practice of inheritance. This change was to be accomplished not by a violent revolution but by a scientifically managed industrial state. Consequently, he appealed to Louis XVIII to start a new era in which men of science and the industrial leaders should advise on national policies in both politics and industry. "From each according to his capacity and to each according to his need" was his slogan. He was a thinker rather than a practical leader, and had only a few followers, whose devotion to his ideas laid the foundations for modern French socialism.

Henri de Saint-Simon

Another Frenchman, Fourier (1772–1837), of the *bourgeois* class, the son of a cloth merchant, who served in the revolutionary army, worked out a plan for a new society in which all would live in "harmony." The people were to be divided into small industrial communities, called *phalanges*, of around 1800 persons each. Of the earnings of the group, after each citizen received a fixed sum, labor was to receive five parts of the remainder, capital four, and talent three. The members were to live and work in common — free, happy, and peacefully. During the last ten years of his life, it is said that he waited daily in his home at noon for the coming of some rich person, who would carry out his plan. He had a few readers and disciples in France and elsewhere. An experimental community was set up in 1832 near Versailles but it soon failed. Another at Guise still exists. After his death, a *phalange* was planted in America in the Brook Farm Colony in Massachusetts, and thirty-three others were attempted, but without success. Such men as Horace Greeley, Charles A. Dana, and Nathaniel Hawthorne were interested in the experiment.

Charles Fourier

The founder of British socialism was Robert Owen (1771–1859). By his own ability and a fortunate marriage, he became manager and part-owner of some cotton mills at New Lanark, Scotland. There he built up a model community, where good wages were paid, factory conditions were improved, homes were erected for the workers, schools were organized for the children, and a common store was opened to sell goods to the people at cost. All profits beyond 5 per

Robert Owen

cent went to improve the community. This experiment, which was based on a careful study of the prevailing evils of the factory system, won Owen great fame as a social reformer. For thirty years in New Lanark there was no crime, no poverty, no drunkenness, and no religious bigotry. "We reduced the hours of labor," Owen said, "educated all the children from infancy, greatly improved the condition of the adults, diminished their daily labor, paid interest on capital, and cleared upwards of $1,500,000." He devoted his life and his fortune to the cause of social betterment, and hoped, in the first place, to organize these communities everywhere and then to unite them into a world republic. In 1825 he went to the United States and at New Harmony, Indiana, with his own means established a colony, which proved unsuccessful. In 1828 he settled in London to spend the rest of his days advocating his peculiar socialistic views. To him is usually given the credit of coining the word "socialism." One of the results of his work was the establishment of coöperative societies among the workers of Great Britain and her colonies, and elsewhere in the world.

Although the Utopian Socialists had comparatively little influence on the wage-earners, nevertheless their peaceful, philanthropic, and humanitarian efforts set the people to thinking about social reforms, and called the attention of observing statesmen to the need of solving the grave problems growing out of the Industrial Revolution. The Utopians, for the most part, opposed the belief that the state should keep its hands off all social and industrial questions and let "natural laws" settle them. Saint-Simon wanted either the state or the church to do the reform work. Fourier ignored the state and desired each community to manage its own affairs. Owen had the same idea, but remained on friendly terms with the British rulers. With the decline of "Owenism" in Great Britain, the "Christian socialists," led by men like Charles Kingsley, flourished for several years. Kingsley's novels explained the evils of the competitive industrial system and maintained that socialism, rightly understood, was only Christianity applied to social reform. All these men were looked upon as dreamers and fanatics. Their ideas failed and were repudiated for the reason that they were regarded as an attack on Christianity, the sanctity of family life, and the sacred freedom of business. Not many years passed by before the germs of Utopianism reappeared in the new theories of communism and, later, in scientific socialism, which was to find millions of ardent adherents all around the globe.

Christian socialism

5. Louis Blanc and French Socialism

France, it must be remembered, after the Revolution of 1830, like Great Britain after the Reform Bill of 1832, and other countries as well, was in the hands of the powerful middle class. The exclusion of the *proletariat* from political power led to a sharp breach between

the two classes that had united in opposition to the evils of the old régime, and to the autocracy of the conservative system of control advocated by Metternich and his royal friends. The *bourgeoisie*, swept into authority under Louis Philippe, became conservative; the laboring classes, deprived of the franchise which might have been used to right their wrongs, became revolutionary. Saint-Simon and Fourier had won followers among the educated; the new socialism made its appeal directly to the wage-earners.

Transition in socialist theory

It was Louis Blanc (1811–1882) who gave socialism in France a new meaning, which won the workers. Born in Spain of French parents, he studied law in Paris, established a journal called *The Review of Progress*, and began a study of the labor problem. Convinced that the competative system of industry sacrificed the weaker members of society, he demanded the equalization of wages, and the organization of "social workshops" in which the workmen of each branch of industry should share in the profits. His book on *The Organization of Labor*, in 1839, captivated the working people. He said that political reforms were simply a means of securing social changes, hence he wanted the workers to gain control of the government, the courts, and the army so as to be able to use them to revolutionize industry and society. He advocated a democratic state that would act as "the banker of the poor" by replacing private industries with national workshops. After the state had successfully organized these workshops out of national funds and under national officials, the workers would gradually take them over, choose their own officers, develop the industries, and divide the earnings. Private capital, invited to invest in these enterprises, would be assured a fair rate of interest until the collective capital accumulated out of the business could replace it. At first wages were to be paid according to ability, but as education improved men, wages would become equal.

National workshops

Blanc's scheme appealed to the workers as a gospel of a new age. Tens of thousands of recruits in the large industrial centers soon began to talk about the "right to vote," the "right to work" and the "crime of private property" in revolutionary tones. Blanc, on the contrary, was moderate both in the reforms suggested and in the means of realizing them. Changes should come, he said, not through violence, but through the ballot in the hands of the people. When the Revolution of 1848 established universal male franchise and the new government declared that the cause of the workers was the supreme concern, victory seemed assured. Although Blanc was given a place in the provisional government and public funds were supplied to employ idle workers, still the *bourgeoisie*, supported by the peasants, held the upper hand and never put into operation the plan for national workshops. Indeed the socialistic movement was soon discredited, and the appropriation of public money to allay unemployment stopped altogether. The outbreak of the disappointed

Louis Blanc and the Revolution of 1848

workingmen in Paris was suppressed with an iron hand. Blanc fled to London in despair. When he returned to France soon after Napoleon III's deposition in 1870, he declared that he was no longer a "socialist," but a republican.

6. Lassalle, Marx, and German Socialism

The socialist movement subsided in Great Britain and France by 1850 without leaving any visible permanent results. But it was revived in Germany by Ferdinand Lassalle, Frederick Engels, and Karl Marx. Early in the nineteenth century Fichte, the philosopher, in his pamphlet, *The Closed Trading State*, had advocated state regulation of the production and distribution of goods, but with little effect. Weitling and Rodbertus had both preached certain doctrines that were socialistic. After the Revolution of 1830 Büchner in Hesse founded the secret society called "The Rights of Man," which demanded a social revolution and addressed a pamphlet to the peasants beginning, "Peace to the cottages. War on the palaces!" In Paris German workmen and refugees in 1836 organized the "League of the Just," which soon had branch clubs in Germany, Switzerland, Great Britain and Belgium. The purpose was to study and to discuss social and economic questions. A prominent place in the membership was held by Jews, among whom were Marx and Engels.

Ferdinand Lassalle and the origins of socialism in politics

The earliest conspicuous champion of socialism in Germany was Ferdinand Lassalle (1825–1864), a college-trained, prosperous Jewish merchant. While living in Paris, he became acquainted with the socialistic movement led by Blanc. During the Revolution of 1848, he joined Engels and Marx in fomenting a social revolution in the crowded Rhine Valley. He was imprisoned for six months for resisting the authorities, but that experience only made him more active as a propagandist. With an income of $3,000 from a befriended widow, and an inheritance from his father, he lived in luxury himself, while he posed as the friend of the poor and aided every democratic movement. Like Blanc, he pleaded for universal suffrage as the medium through which the social-democracy was to be realized, and he accepted Blanc's plan for national workshops. The state, he held, was not merely a policeman to prevent robbery and to protect property, but an instrument through which the highest welfare of humanity was to be attained. At Leipzig in 1863 he organized a "Universal German Workingmen's Association" and was its first president. His life was cut short by a fatal duel the next year. Lassalle was the real founder both of German socialism as a national movement and of the socialist party as a great political force.

Like Lassalle, Karl Marx (1818–1878) was a German Jew, whose family had accepted Christianity. In the university he studied law, but his heart was in history and philosophy. At the age of twenty-four he became editor of the *Rhine Gazette* through which he made a bitter attack on Prussian despotism. In 1843 he married into the

Prussian lower nobility, but the young couple were not destined to spend their lives in peace and plenty. Going to Paris to study French socialism, he met Engels and Heine, the poet, both his countrymen, and came into close touch with the French socialists, who quickly converted him to the cause. Exiled from one country to another, he finally settled in London, a poverty-stricken student of world betterment, forced to support himself with his pen. Among his writings was a series of articles for the New York *Tribune* on topics of the day. In January, 1848, with Engels, Marx published the classic *Communist Manifesto*, which set forth the following revolutionary and international socialistic principles:

Karl Marx

1. "The history of all society hitherto has been the history of class struggles." One class gains wealth, and then obtains political power by ousting another class. This process will go on until the middle class will inevitably be succeeded by the working class. Just as the middle class in the Revolution of 1789 destroyed feudal property, so the wage-earners would destroy middle-class private property, *free trade, religion, and the family.*

Marxian or "scientific socialism"

2. These changes would be brought about by the confiscation of land rent; direct taxes; the abolition of inheritance; a state bank; public ownership of all means of transportation and communication; national factories and land-cultivation; compulsory labor; the redistribution of the people between the country and the towns; and free public education.

3. In the new Coöperative Commonwealth, workers, both mental and physical, would receive the full value of all their labor — and hence the class struggle would disappear. This change was written in the very nature of human progress, and would come either peaceably by law, or through force.

4. Socialist "comrades" were urged to put class interests above all national interests. The workingmen of all countries should unite for the international union of peace and fraternity, and publicly proclaim their aims. "Let the ruling classes tremble at a communistic revolution. The *proletariat* have nothing to lose but their chains; they have a world to gain. Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

This *Manifesto*, it should be remembered, was drawn up in 1847 by two young Jews in exile, as the first expression of what might be called an international workingmen's congress held in London, and based on the "League of the Just." It must be viewed as a by-product of the political upheavals raging in Europe in 1848 which resulted from the decade of falling wages, unemployment, and degradation of the working people of Europe after the panic of 1837. It is preeminently a document of world history because it has "made the tour of the earth," and has been translated into almost every known language.

At the outbreak of the Revolution of 1848 in Germany, Marx

hastened home to lend his aid. With Engels and Wolf he published *The Rhenish Journal*, a radical socialist paper. After the revolt failed, he was tried for inciting a rebellion, and exiled. In London his completed socialist scheme was set forth in his book, *Capital* — the "Bible of German social democracy" — in 1867. The "International Association of Laborers" was organized in 1864 by an international committee of fifty members to spread socialist ideas. It soon had branches in various parts of the world, its activities were supervised by a standing council, and its work was discussed in annual congresses, the first of which was held in 1866 at Geneva. From this time onward socialism spread rapidly among the working classes, and socialist political parties were formed in many countries to work for the completion of the democratic revolution.

Growth of socialism

The Marxians rejected the doctrine of equality, and the social order and nationalism of the middle class. They believed that it was only a matter of time until the workingmen would rule and that internationalism on class lines would prevail. They also rejected state socialism as urged by Louis Blanc and Lassalle along with middle-class democracy. Viewed historically, Marxian socialism was a revolt against those vague promises of 1789 to give political freedom to man, which instead put the middle class in power. This resulted, it was believed, in the economic vassalage of the great masses of people in the industrial states and the rise of a new class of unenfranchised laborers, who were denied both political liberty and social equality. It was the aim of Marx and his followers to complete the revolution for this uneducated and unorganized group until it became the dominant force in the state. Marx and his followers believed it unwise to coöperate with the capitalistic state in securing social and economic reforms, as these would only weaken the socialistic case against capitalistic society.

The revolutionary parties before 1848, representing democracy, socialism, and communism, were small groups in the cities, ignored and scorned by the general public, and hounded to secrecy by the police. The Revolution of 1848, fomented to a considerable degree by these parties, aroused the hopes of all radicals.

7. Anarchism

The term "anarchist" was invented by the Frenchman, Proudhon (1809–1865), a contemporary of Blanc and Marx. As a poor printer in Paris, he became deeply interested in the lot of the factory hands. "What is Property?" he asked in his first important book. His answer, "property is theft," attracted wide attention. His second work on *The Philosophy of Poverty*, an extreme anarchistic treatise, led Marx to reply in his *Poverty of Philosophy*. Proudhon wanted every man to be free and a law unto himself. "Government of man by man in every form is oppression," he said. He dreamed of a society based on justice, liberty, and equality, with property enjoyed by all but

Anarchism versus socialism

"owned" by nobody. The Golden Rule was to form the constitution of the world. His ideal was a federation of voluntary groups of laborers and farmers with little political government.

A Russian nobleman, Bakunin (1814–1878), educated in Germany and living in Paris, joined the radical workingmen and took part in the Revolution of 1848. The next year he was arrested in Dresden, handed over to Russia, and exiled to Siberia. Escaping to the United States, he went from there to Great Britain, and then back to the continent. Like Proudhon, he rejected all kinds of government, but unlike him, he became the apostle of terrorism and "universal revolution" to secure the "liberty of man." When he joined the socialists, the Marxians expelled him in 1872. He died an exile in Switzerland. Later advocates of anarchism have been Kropotkin and Reclus.

Michael Bakunin

8. Social, Economic, Religious and Educational Reforms

The British government after 1815, to offset the discontent engendered by the forces set loose by the upheavals in the New World and the Old and by the Industrial Revolution, was induced to enact a few reforms. In 1819 Peel and Owen secured the passage of an act which excluded children under nine from working in cotton mills, and forbade the employment of children under sixteen for more than twelve hours a day. This reform grew out of an official report showing that children from three years up were working sixteen hours a day. The act of 1819 was extended in 1825 and 1831. Between 1815 and 1840 the condition of the workers in their homes and in the factories was more unsatisfactory than ever before or since. The Factory Act of 1833 forbade the employment of children under ten in mills and factories and limited their working day to eight hours. No persons under eighteen could be employed at night, and such work was restricted to twelve hours. In 1833 some 56,000 children were employed in 3,000 factories; and in 1838 the number was reduced to 29,000 in 4,000 mills. The hours of labor were further reduced by the acts of 1844, 1847, and 1850, and the reforms applied to other than textile industries. The act of 1847 limited the day of women and children to ten hours. The Mines Act of 1842 forbade the employment of women in mines and collieries, and of boys under ten years of age.

Factory conditions improved in England

Barbarous criminal laws still existed in Great Britain, but in 1821 the death penalty for about one hundred petty crimes was replaced by milder punishments. In 1824 the law of 1800, which forbade workingmen to organize for their own protection through the fear of political conspiracy, was repealed. The workers were now permitted by law to "enter into any combination to obtain an advance or to fix the rate of wages, or to lessen or alter the hours or duration of the time of working, or to decrease the quantity of work," or to quit work, or to induce others to do the same, without being subjected to punishment under law. At the same time employers were given

Workers permitted to organize

full liberty to change wages, hours, and the quantity of work. But violent strikes and boycotts by the workers were forbidden under threats of imprisonment at hard labor for not more than two months. There was no opportunity under this act to introduce "closed shops." The next year a supplementary act forbade the use of "force" or "threats" against "the person or property of another." In case after case the courts decided that interference by workers with the free course of trade was criminal. After 1824, however, trade-unions multiplied, and in 1834 the "Grand National Consolidated Trades Union" claimed 500,000 members, but it was soon destroyed by an adverse attitude of the courts. Workers in particular industries were active in forming larger organizations after 1840. A "trade council" was organized as early as 1848 in Liverpool, and the first "Parliament of Labor" was held in 1868 in Manchester. Not until 1871, however, were trade-unions given a satisfactory status. The growth of trade-unionism, for a half-century or more following the issuance of the *Communist Manifesto*, helped to undermine its doctrines among wage-earners, who were gaining by direct bargaining with the capitalist system one valuable concession after another.

Trade-unions

The laws against Dissenters and Catholics were repealed in 1828–9, but the Jews had to wait until 1858 before they secured full political rights. After the passage of the Reform Bill of 1832, a whole series of reforms was enacted. Some 750,000 black slaves in the British colonies were freed by the act of 1833 and the sum of $100,000,000 was paid to their owners. The Poor Law was reformed in 1834 to encourage thrift and economy. Able-bodied paupers were set to work, and money for the poor was spent more efficiently. Boards of health promoted sanitation and prevented disease. Civil officials took over from the clergy the registration of births, marriages, and deaths. Prisons were improved, and the pillory and whipping post were discarded. The penny post came in 1840. The repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 lowered the cost of living for the working classes. The Factory Act of 1833 required the children in the mills and factories to "attend some school," and the $100,000 voted for education in that year increased gradually until in 1863 it amounted to $4,000,000. In 1844 attendance at school was made compulsory. Little attention was given to the problem of housing until 1867, although in 1864 factories were required by law to provide better ventilation. These measures clearly show that the middle class saw the necessity of improving the lot of the working masses in their living and working conditions even if the vote was still denied them.

Other social reforms

On the continent no country by 1850 could show such a record of reforms for the general welfare of the common people as in Great Britain. France had made some progress, and some changes had occurred in other countries, but reaction and autocracy thwarted most efforts to aid the working classes. Such reforms as were secured came through great national upheavals, and were incorporated in new

Continental Europe

constitutions. In Great Britain, on the contrary, the reforms came gradually as the sense of governmental responsibility grew. But both in Great Britain and on the continent reforms came too slowly and the people, in consequence, were left in a state of chronic discontent. The protection of French workers in the factory system was begun by a series of laws passed in 1803, 1806, 1813, 1814, 1841, and 1848. Of these the law of 1841 was the most important. In France in 1833 primary schools were established in the communes, and under Louis Philippe school attendance was stimulated. Of the 6,961 persons tried for crime in France in 1830, 1,354 of them were women, 114 were children under 16, and 1,161 between 16 and 21. Of the whole number tried, 4,319 could neither read nor write, and only 129 had a good education.

The Prussian laws of 1839 and 1853 were even more enlightened and comprehensive than the similar English legislation. In Prussia, in 1819, compulsory attendance at school for children between the ages of seven and fourteen was required. An elementary school was organized in every parish, and each town had a "burger school." A public school of commerce was instituted in 1829, there were 33 great normal schools in 1831, and 2,225,000 children were in school by 1834. A special department of education was in operation as early as 1819. Throughout Germany in 1830 there were 16,000 students in the 19 universities.

In the United States by 1850 a new democracy, extending from the Atlantic sea-board to the middle west had developed. The north Atlantic states, supplied with an abundance of immigrant labor, was feeling the Industrial Revolution. The northwest, with free labor, was devoted to farming, trapping, and lumbering, while the South was agricultural and with slave labor less progressive. A strong wave of humanitarian feeling was sweeping over the Republic. Private societies and state institutions cared for the sick, blind, deaf, dumb, insane, crippled, impoverished, and aged. New types of prisons, clean hospitals, well-kept poorhouses, and attractive asylums began to appear. In 1824 the first reformatory was founded in New York City. As late as 1829 it was estimated that there were 3,000 prisoners for debt in Massachusetts, 10,000 in New York, 7,000 in Pennsylvania, and 2,000 in Maryland, but between 1821 and 1845 the laws permitting debtors to be sent to prison were repealed. Temperance societies were organized about 1840 and grew rapidly in number. The numerous abolition societies and their newspapers kept alive the agitation over Negro slavery, which was soon to be settled by a civil war.

The United States

With the advance in American democracy came the awakening of labor. The introduction of the factory system created a large class of workingmen living on their wages. Pay was low and the hours were long, often about fifteen a day. In some states the workers, with others, were still taxed for religion. Child labor was abused and

children had few opportunities for schooling. "Women and children were urged on with the cowhide." "Mechanics' Associations" were early organized to protect the interests of the workingmen, but labor unions were regarded by good people as "iniquitous." Strikers were arrested and punished for "conspiracy." Not until 1842 did the courts of any state decide that workers had the right of organization and collective bargaining. The first labor paper, *The Workingmen's Advocate*, was printed in New York in 1825 by British immigrants. From that time on labor unions multiplied and trades-associations were formed in the large cities. In 1834 a national "republic of labor" was instituted with yearly conventions. By this time labor became active in politics and began to work for its own interests through the ballot. As early as 1830 the Workingmen's Party was organized in Syracuse, N.Y., but its candidate for governor received only 3,000 votes. Soon many states had such parties. By political pressure and by strikes, the ten-hour day was secured in some cities, and in 1840 President Van Buren established it as the standard for all government employees. Laws to protect women and children also appeared in some of the states. All of these measures were signs of a growing humanitarianism in the New World.

This period was one of intense religious activity in America. The Congregational church was disestablished in New England. New sects like the Shakers and Mormons were born. Some of the older denominations split over the question of slavery, or doctrinal issues. Missionary societies were formed to work among the Indians and foreign pagans. Interest in education was growing, and much was said about "Woman's rights." Girls were admitted first to the public schools; then to the special academies established for them; and in 1835 Oberlin College was opened to women. Labor organizations early demanded the substitution of free public schools for the "pauper schools." Horace Mann secured the opening of the first normal school in 1839. Under Mann and Barnard, New England improved her system of free common schools. With national grants of land, the western states took the lead in creating free public school systems. The old colleges adopted higher standards, and new colleges and state universities were founded. Newspapers of all sorts were started in the cities and towns. The New York *Sun* was the first paper to sell for one cent in 1833. Libraries were opened, and lyceums and lecture courses both informed and amused the people. The mail service was improved and the postage stamp came into use. All these agencies were helping to develop a splendid type of intelligent citizens in the New World.

9. Achievements to 1850

A review of the century preceding 1850 shows that four mighty forces were transforming the civilization of the western world from mediaeval to modern: (1) the political and social revolutions, begin-

ning with that of 1776 in America and ending with that of 1848 in Europe, produced a new type of government and a new society; (2) the intellectual revolution gave a new conception of man and his institutions, and of the earth on which he lives; (3) the Industrial Revolution changed the work, transportation, communication, and ways of living in the world; and (4) the humanitarian changes were improving the lot of millions of the poorer and less fortunate human beings. In western Europe the middle class, constituting perhaps less than 20 per cent of the people, had almost completely displaced the aristocracy as the source of political power. Through their ability, brains, and wealth, they were moulding the civilization of the world. But after destroying the privileges of the nobles and the clergy, they built up privileges of their own, and through the Industrial Revolution and their control of government, they amassed large fortunes. The day laborer and the farmer had beyond question improved their lot by uniting with the middle class to secure political, social, and industrial changes. To a limited extent the right to vote, and through the ballot to share in government, had been extended to them in the more progressive states. But the inadequacy and futility of the fine words about liberty and equality led them to feel that the complete democracy for which they had struggled had not yet been realized. Even in the United States, where democracy advanced more rapidly than elsewhere, it was not until about 1850 that the last state gave all white men the right to vote. In Europe it was only after a long and bitter struggle that the common people secured the right of self-government. By 1850 this right was only partially enjoyed in a few countries. The socialist movement, with all its fantastic ideas, led by dreamers and followed by the working classes, must be viewed historically as a democratic effort. If it accomplished no more by 1850, it at least forced the middle-class governments to begin a series of badly needed social, economic, and educational reforms.

Social progress in the early nineteenth century

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

C. Borgeaud, *The Adoption and Amendment of Constitutions in Europe and America* (1895); W. A. Dunning, *A History of Political Theories*, 3 vols. (1905–1920); C. Gide and C. Rist, *Histoire des doctrines economiques depuis les Physiocrates jusqu'à nos jours*, translated, *History of Economic Doctrines* (1915); L. H. Haney, *History of Economic Thought* (2d edition, 1920); F. A. Ogg, *Social Progress in Contemporary Europe* (1912); W. D. Guthrie, *Socialism before the French Revolution* (1907); G. Isambert, *Les Idées socialistes en France de 1815 à 1848* (1905); R. T. Ely, *French and German Socialism in Modern Times* (1898); J. Rae, *Contemporary Socialism* (new edition, 1908); T. Kirkup, *History of Socialism* (revised edition, 1913); W. Sombart, *Socialism and the Socialist Movement*, English translation by M. Epstein (1909); J. R. Macdonald, *The Socialist Movement* (1911); S. P. Orth, *Socialism and Democracy in Europe* (1913); J. Longuet, *Le Mouvement socialist international* (1913); B. Russell, *Proposed Roads to Freedom* (1918); F. S. Nitti, *Catholic Socialism*; English translation (1890); P. T. Moon, *The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France* (1921); J. S. Penman, *The Irresistable Movement of Democracy* (1923); C. Raven, *Christian Socialism* (1922); C. W. Stubbs, *Charles Kingsley and the Christian*

Social Movement (1900); F. Mehring, *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemocratie* (1904); M. Beer, *Geschichte des Sozialismus in England* (1913), English version by the author, *A History of British Socialism*, 2 vols. (1919–1920); G. Weill, *Histoire du mouvement social en France, 1852–1910* (2d edition, 1910); M. Hillquit, *History of Socialism in the United States* (new edition, 1910); E. V. Zenker, *Anarchism: a Criticism and History of the Anarchist Theory*, English translation (1898); B. R. Tucker, *Instead of a Book* (1897); K. Marx, *Capital: a Critique of Political Economy*, English translation, 3 vols. (1909–1916); F. Engels, *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific*, English translation by E. Aveling, 3d edition (1911); J. Spargo, *Socialism: a Summary and Interpretation of Socialist Principles*, (revised edition, 1909); R. C. K. Ensor, *Modern Socialism, as set forth by Socialists in their Speeches, Writings, and Programmes* (3d edition, 1910); J. T. Stoddart, *The New Socialism, and Impartial Inquiry* (1909); P. J. Proudhon, *What Is Property?* English translation by B. R. Tucker, 2 vols. (1902); E. D. Bax, *Babeuf: the Last Episode of the French Revolution* (1911); F. Podmore, *Robert Owen, a Biography*, 2 vols. (1906); J. Spargo, *Karl Marx, his Life and Work* (1910); J. Tchernoff, *Louis Blanc* (1904); W. H. Dawson, *German Socialism and Ferdinand Lassalle* (1899); G. Brandes, *Ferdinand Lassalle* (1911); Oncken, *Lassalle;* L. T. Hobhouse, *The Labour Movement* (3d edition, 1912); S. and B. Webb, *History of Trades Unionism*, (new edition, 1911); G. J. Holyoake, *The History of Coöperation in England: its Literature and its Advocates*, 2 vols. (revised edition, 1906); J. R. Commons, editor, *Documentary History of American Industrial Society*, 10 vols. (1911); W. A. Hinds, *American Communities and Coöperative Colonies* (revised edition, 1908); J. R. Commons and others, *History of Labour in the United States*, 2 vols. (1918); H. de B. Gibbins, *English Social Reformers* (1902); B. L. Hutchins and A. Harrison, *A History of Factory Legislation* (1911); K. Schirmacher, *The Modern Woman's Rights Movement*, English translation by C. C. Eckhardt (1912); W. L. Blease, *The Emancipation of English Women* (1910); E. R. Hecker, *A Short History of Women's Rights* (1910); *The Encyclopædia Britannica*, new volumes, 30, 31, 32, (1922); A. L. Lowell, *Governments and Parties in Continental Europe*, 2 vols. (1897); *The Governments of France, Italy, and Germany* (1915); F. A. Ogg, *Social Progress in Contemporary Europe* (1912); *The Governments of Europe* (1920); *The Economic Development of Modern Europe* (1917); W. B. Munro, *The Government of European Cities* (1909); W. F. Dodd, *Modern Constitutions* (1908); H. A. L. Fisher, *The Republican Tradition in Europe* (1911); S. P. Orth, *Socialism and Democracy in Europe* (1913); Lord Bryce, *Modern Democracies*, 2 vols. (1920); H. A. Gibbons, *An Introduction to World Politics* (1922).

PART V

THE DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONALISM AFTER 1850

CHAPTER XIII

NATIONALISTIC STRIVINGS BEFORE 1850

1. Origins of Nationalism

From the earliest times there has been a tendency among the inhabitants of the earth to group themselves into nations based on a common descent, a common language, a common set of ideals, and common institutions. When such a nation occupies a definite territory and organizes its own government, it becomes a nation-state. The product of this process may be called nationalism, which has been and still is one of the greatest creative forces in modern world history. With the break-up of the Empire of Charlemagne nation-states such as England, France, Germany, Italy, and Spain began to appear. But for centuries the unifying force of imperialism and of the Mediæval Church, on the one hand, and the disintegrating power of feudalism, on the other, hindered the growth of nationality. With the decay of the political power of the feudal lords and the decline of the idea of a universal church and empire, these nation-states under despotic kings began to emerge as the dominant forces in world civilization. By 1789 only one such state had come into being in the New World, China and Japan were living their own peculiar life in Asia largely shut off from the rest of the world, and six powerful states dominated Europe. England, France and Spain were true nation-states, while Prussia, Austria, and Russia included various nationalities. There were nine petty states in Italy and over three hundred in Germany under the weak bond of the Holy Roman Empire. Thus the vast area of middle and southeastern Europe was still unnationalized. The smaller states such as Portugal, Holland, Denmark, and Sweden played an inferior rôle in world affairs.

Origin of the national state

Nationalism, as a popular idea, began with the American and French Revolutions, which emphasized political liberty, social equality, fraternity, and patriotism. Out of these movements grew the belief that a group of people with a common history, mutual sympathies, joint hopes, and the same institutions, had a right to govern themselves. The Americans were the first people to create a nation-state founded upon these ideas. Through the Revolution of 1789 the French became the pioneers of this concept on the continent of Europe. Upon learning that Louis XVI had fled from Paris, a Frenchman said: "Well, if the king has escaped, the nation remains." Rousseau declared: "It is the men who constitute the state." The Third Estate in searching for a new name to replace the States General

adopted the significant title "National Assembly." The Declaration of the Rights of Man asserted that sovereignty resided "in the nation." In the rural districts the people shouted: "We are not provincials; we are Frenchmen," and all over France "Vive la Nation," resounded. The "federations" everywhere proclaimed "a union of hearts" for the "Nation, King, and Law." It was "an armed nation" that went forth to combat autocratic Europe. Unfortunately French nationalism soon degenerated into an aggressive, militant impulse, and lost its earlier high idealism. The Napoleonic wars swept away old boundary lines in Europe and gave a new impulse to national patriotism everywhere. Napoleon was the first European statesman to realize the power of national sentiment, and he used it not only in France, but also in Poland, Germany, Italy and Spain. In fact in every conquest he urged the people to rise against their despotic masters and to assert their own rights as a free nation. After producing this great national awakening throughout Europe, he ruthlessly overrode it to attain his ambition for world dominion. Strangely enough, it was this new force that accomplished the overthrow of Napoleonic imperialism. "The Battle of the Nations" heralded the coming of an unconquerable foe before which Napoleon's unstable empire crumbled to the dust. The teacher of nationalism was repudiated although his teaching was accepted.

Rise of nationalism

2. Nationalism after 1815

The opportunity to reconstruct Europe on national lines faced the Congress of Vienna. Instead of profiting by the new spirit to lay lasting foundations for the peace and security of the peoples of Europe, the principle of nationality was ignored. The autocratic rulers of Europe were hostile to this new popular passion and deliberately refused to take it into account. As a result, a large part of the history of Europe after 1815 was taken up with the undoing of the grave blunders of the Congress of Vienna. Nationalism in the hands of the middle class became the greatest force in world history after 1815. To secure the reality of national unity and independence was set forth as the supreme ambition of national groups in both the New World and the Old. Men felt that it was just as important to belong to a nation as to be members of a family — perhaps more so. The sense of nationality developed in intensity as self-government grew in the world. With a religious fervor all energies were directed to increase the power, wealth, and greatness of the nation-state. The series of revolutions in Europe and in Latin America up to 1850 were all patriotic efforts to realize national unity, independence, and democracy. It has already been seen how minor uprisings occurred in 1820 in Spain, Portugal, and Italy; how the revolutionary wave of 1830 found echoes in many lands; and how the great Revolution of 1848 shook the entire world. As a result of these nationalistic strivings, new nation-states like Belgium, Greece, and the Latin-

Congress of Vienna ignored nationalism

New nation-states

American republics were created, and a new national spirit was awakened in Germany, Italy, Bohemia, Hungary, Poland, and the Balkans that was to find realization in the coming years.

The nationalistic spirit produced a new patriotic literature all over Europe, wherever the iron heel of absolutism did not crush the freedom of speech and of the press. In Great Britain Shelley, Keats, Byron, and Coleridge fired the English-speaking peoples with their writings on liberty and nationality. The modest Wordsworth in thinking of the French Revolution, which as a young man he saw first-hand, wrote of "human nature seeming born again," and preached Rousseau's "back to nature" democracy. Shelley was in continual rebellion against the repressive policies of his day. Byron denounced the accepted ideas and institutions of the age, and aroused British indignation by ignoring social usages. Both these writers lived in voluntary exile during their later years, and Byron gave his life to make the Greeks free. By contrasting Great Britain at that time with the feudal period, Scott enabled his countrymen to appreciate the meaning of progress. English literature made passionate appeals for political and social reforms. Froude eulogized the origins of English nationalism under the Tudors. Macaulay wrote impressive history to praise the Whigs and to discredit the Tories. Carlyle distrusted democracy, but he assailed the industrial régime that made a "swine's trough" of civilization by holding up money as the standard for judging a man's worth. Dickens, who has been called the "social-reform novelist," caused the English to laugh and weep over his attacks on the charity schools, the law courts, the insane asylums, the workhouses, and the impoverished wage-earners. The keen satire of Thackeray portrayed the weaknesses of the nobility and of the ruling middle class. George Eliot pointed out the ethical shams of the period. Many of Mrs. Browning's poems were inspired by the Italian nationalistic romanticism.

Patriotic literature in England

In Germany the tyranny of Napoleon gave rise to a remarkable series of pamphlets, poems, and songs. Fichte's *Addresses to the German Nation* preached a holy type of national patriotism through education. Körner sang: "In the North breaks the dawn of Freedom." Arndt praised the fatherland in "What is the German Fatherland?" Schenkendorf in his poems, "Freedom," "Mother Tongue," and "Andreas Hofer" kept the patriotic fires burning. Pfizer said, "Nationality is the first condition of humanity as the body is the condition of the soul." Such was the patriotic literature which Metternich denounced as "immoral" and sought to suppress through the Carlsbad Decrees. Poets like Fritz Reuter paid for their liberalism with imprisonment. Goethe, the cosmopolitan man of letters, said that at Valmy in 1792 a new epoch in world history had opened. Five years later in *Hermann and Dorothea*, however, he spoke of the "terrible Revolution" which had gone astray. *Faust* was completed during the troubled times of the Revolution of 1830.

National patriotism in Germany

Its champions

Schiller in his play, *The Robbers*, and in his historical works, revealed his interest in the downfall of tyranny and in the progress of mankind. Still like Goethe and Lessing he was more of a cosmopolitan than a nationalist. Although his *Wilhelm Tell* was a "national drama," yet he believed that "the most powerful nation is but a fragment." It was Hegel, the philosopher, who glorified the nation-state and said that world unity would be secured through it. A keen interest was taken in collecting historical documents showing the early life of the German people. A small band of professors of history in 1847 established *The German Newspaper* to urge national reforms and unity. Von Ranke and Mommsen began to write the history of the world in a scientific manner. Jacob Grimm devoted himself to a study of the German language. "Young Germany," a society composed of university men, who "fought for democracy with their pens," as Heine, Börne, and Gutzkow did, was disbanded and its members either exiled or sent to jail. Heine's wit and sarcasm went straight to the heart of despotism. "Lay on my coffin," he said, "a sword, for I was a brave soldier in the Liberation War of humanity."

Nationalism in Italy

Consumed with a burning patriotism the Italians in poems, songs, novels, and dramas, spoke for democracy and national unity. Gioberti, a priest, lashed the Jesuits but urged unification under the leadership of the pope. Manzoni in his novels praised the revolution and denounced autocracy. Leopardi in fine odes pictured Italy helpless and despised. Carducci hated the Roman Church as the enemy of Italian freedom and was beyond all others the poet of united Italy. He took as his heroes Garibaldi and above all Mazzini, who "imbibed nationalism with every breath," who declared that "nationality is sacred," and who said: "I swear to dedicate myself wholly and forever to strive to constitute Italy one free, independent, republican nation." Balbo in his *Hopes of Italy* explained what faults must be corrected before the Italians could be free. The poet d'Azeglio lauded the liberals for the persecution they underwent in the cause of liberty.

Victor Hugo in France

The popular literary idol and champion of democracy in France was Victor Hugo. For representing Charles X as a mere puppet of his minister, the king forbade the appearance of one of his plays. Hugo urged sane reforms at home and advocated the independence of submerged nations such as Poland abroad. In his *Napoleon the Little*, and *The History of a Crime* he denounced the betrayal of free France by Napoleon III and was exiled for nearly twenty years. In his best known novel, *Les Misérables*, he lashed the unjust social standards. His poems breathed forth a scorn for political power that became oppressive. Chateaubriand, who helped to make Rousseau known to America, was also a valiant knight of Christian democracy. The French romanticists, who followed the style of the Middle Ages rather than the classical period, perpetuated the revolutionary spirit.

Other patriots

Lamartine, a poet-statesman, and sincere lover of liberty, vindicated the Revolution in his *History of the Girondists*. George Sand in her

books made the common people her heroes, and supported Utopian socialism. Balzac contributed a careful analysis of the middle class.

Other countries — Spain, Portugal, Belgium, Poland, Greece, the United States, and even the new states of Latin America, developed a patriotic literature, which also urged progress and reforms. Art and music likewise contributed their share to national pride and glory. The drama was used to arouse national feeling. The church and the school, as a rule, were faithful servants of the state in teaching a new faith in the national group. Emperor Francis of Austria told the professors of the University of Pavia: "Your duty is less to make learned men than faithful subjects," but his idea of loyalty to the person of the monarch was quite generally giving way to loyalty to the state. Thus all the agencies of civilization reflected the growing spirit of nationalism and helped to cultivate it.

Nationalism elsewhere

3. Secret Societies

In the eighteenth century the Freemasons formed a secret society for propagating humanitarian principles and religious freedom. They were spread pretty much over western Europe and formed sort of an international fraternity. The Roman Catholic Church regarded the order as dangerously hostile and revolutionary, and hence condemned it repeatedly as heretical. After the French Revolution it became merely a peaceful society without any special political aims. In the strongly Catholic countries, such as Spain, Portugal, and Italy, its membership was composed of political radicals and free thinkers. In general, it stood for a liberal constitutional system, and championed the cause of nationalism. With strict rules, secret rites, and a guarded but extensive membership, particularly among the middle and upper classes, it easily served as a cloak for political conspiracies against absolutism in both church and state. Alexander I in 1822 forbade the order in Russia and Metternich was hostile to it. When the absolute monarchs sought to prevent the growth of national democracy by censoring the press, by preventing peaceful assembly, and by suppressing free speech in discussing political problems, the radical groups resorted to this secret society, and formed others. The *Carbonari* originated in southern Italy as a mystical brotherhood with revolutionary tendencies. National freedom and political liberty were their watchwords. This society, which had members in all social ranks, helped to foment the revolutions of 1820 in Spain, Portugal, and Italy. It spread to France and to other parts of the continent, and was a factor in the nationalistic uprisings of 1830 and 1848.

Freemasons champion nationalism

Carbona

In 1831 Mazzini left the *Carbonari* and formed a more aggressively nationalistic society called "Young Italy." Its members, all under forty, dedicated themselves to the liberation of Italy as a unified republic. Tens of thousands of "Young Italians" inspired with the patriotism taught by their order, fought in the Revolution of 1848.

A dozen years later they saw their dream of national unity realized.

Mazzini's "Young Italy"

Mazzini, with a world vision, wanted to emancipate all oppressed and submerged nationalities. Consequently he planned to organize a "Young Hungary," a "Young Poland," a "Young Ireland," and so on, and eventually to unite all of them into an international society known as "Young Europe" to offset the power of the autocratic rulers.

In quite a few of the European countries the students in the universities formed secret societies dedicated to patriotic purposes. Those in Germany were the most conspicuous, and they played a dramatic role in many of the patriotic demonstrations. The *Tugendbund* originated in the patriotic outburst against Napoleon, and some of the finest men in Germany were among its members. Later it was reorganized to combat the reactionary measures of Metternich. The *Burschenschaft* was formed in 1815 at Jena for "honor, liberty, and fatherland." In two years it had spread to sixteen universities. Its purpose was to secure a free, united German nation. These two societies took an active part in the revolutions of 1830 and 1848.

Student societies

4. Other Forces Promoting Nationalism

A study of the first half of the nineteenth century makes it clear that various factors were combining to make nationalism a widely contagious and effective force in European life. In most states middle-class democracy and nationalism worked together as natural allies.

Democracy and Nationalism

There was this difference, however: democracy was the program of a particular class or party, while nationalism was a sentiment that united all classes and parties. There was an exception, in Austria, where in 1848 nationalism among the different racial groups was so strong that it defeated both unity and democracy. August Comte was formulating the middle-class theory of the national state by insisting upon law as its basis. He held that laws govern social phenomena just as really as they govern nature. J. S. Mill in England set forth his utilitarian theory to justify the part played in society by the middle class as champions of nationalism.

The Industrial Revolution, and the changes it wrought, played no small role in the national unification of various countries. The steam engine was a valuable ally of nationalism. Its application to ships in the second and to railroads in the third decade of the last century worked for political unity. Between 1830 and 1840 Great Britain, France, Belgium, and the United States began to construct railways. From 1842 to 1853 Austria, Prussia, Spain, Russia, and Portugal subsidized railroad building. Large scale industry was stimulated by the rapid transportation by land and sea. From 1815 to 1848 coal and iron were sources of wealth which forced statesmen to think in new terms. The extension of the franchise to the men who ran the ships and engines, who dug the coal and created the steel, united the interests of the masses with the new economic-political

Effect of the Industrial Revolution

age. The telegraph, cable, telephone, and newspapers served to give both unity and wide distribution to news calculated to arouse national pride and international hatreds, and enabled governments to create and spread patriotic propaganda designed to inflame citizens against their neighboring states. It was these new methods of communication which laid a permanent basis for national psychical and cultural solidarity.

Nationalism a dominant issue

In the period from 1848 to 1871 Europeans seemed to care less for political liberties and constitutions than for nation-building. Nationalism, therefore, became the predominant issue, and helped to make Europe what it is today. Men fought for nationalism as they earlier fought for freedom and equality. Up to 1849 nationalism was sporadic; after 1850 it became better organized, allied itself with militarism, created new nations like Italy, Germany, and the Balkan states, and by taking on an exaggerated character prepared the way for the World War in 1914.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

E. KREHBIEL, *Nationalism, War and Society* (1916); J. H. ROSE, *Nationality in Modern History* (1916); R. MUIR, *Nationalism and Internationalism* (1917); S. HERBERT, *Nationality and Its Problems* (1921); J. F. SCOTT, *Patriots in the Making* (1916); G. P. GOOCH, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (1913); G. E. PARTRIDGE, *The Psychology of Nations* (1919); W. B. PILLSBURY, *The Psychology of Nationality and Internationalism* (1919).

CHAPTER XIV

FRANCE UNDER LOUIS NAPOLEON BONAPARTE
1848–1871

1. The Rise of Louis Napoleon Bonaparte

Louis Napoleon before 1848

The Second French Republic had lasted just four years when Louis Napoleon, nephew of Napoleon I, was elected president by the magic of his historic name. Born in the palace of the Tuileries in 1808 and exiled from France in 1816, he passed his youth in Switzerland and Germany, where he was well educated. In 1832 at the death of the son of Napoleon I, Louis Napoleon became the Napoleonic heir. The Poles offered to make him their king, and he gained more fame by joining the national uprising in the Papal States. For sixteen years he waited and plotted to rule France. With his pen he kept himself before the eyes of France as the champion of the Revolution of 1789, and the standard bearer of nationalism. When the bones of Napoleon I were brought back to Paris in 1840, Louis Napoleon reaped the benefit of the wave of patriotic and nationalistic enthusiasm that swept over the land. When imprisoned by Louis Philippe in the fortress of Ham, he posed as a martyr of French nationalism, and tried to win both wage-earners and capitalists to his cause. Escaping from prison in the guise of a workman, he fled to London in 1846, where he remained until the Revolution of 1848 opened the way for his return to France.

President of the Second French Republic

Four different departments elected him to the National Assembly, and he immediately became the leading candidate for the presidency of the Second French Republic. He stepped into power by the will of the nation as the guarantor of social justice, law, order, and nationalism.

Policy of President Napoleon

The chief concern of President Bonaparte was to build up about him a powerful personal party. The workingmen were won by professions of sympathy with their aims, by adulation, and by such measures as voluntary old age pensions (1850). Education was put into the hands of the clergy, soldiers were sent to Rome to protect the pope's temporal power, and the loyalty of the Catholics was won by favorable laws. The middle class was pleased with the protection given to business and the enforcement of order. In 1850 the Assembly, controlled by the *bourgeoisie*, passed a law limiting the right to vote to men who paid taxes in the commune where they voted. Thus about 3,000,000 floating laborers were disfranchised, and naturally they raised an uproar. When the Assembly refused to amend the constitution in order to make President Napoleon eligible for re-

election, he decided to overthrow it, appeal to the people, and take power into his own hands. A *coup d'état* was carefully planned for December 2, 1851, the anniversary of both the coronation of Napoleon I and the battle of Austerlitz. President Napoleon's trusted friends were put in command of the army. On the morning of December 2 the Parisians read huge placards saying that the Assembly was dissolved and that universal franchise was restored. The people were asked to entrust the "Prince-President" with the revision of the constitution to save the Republic. About 27,000 prominent Republicans were either arrested or exiled, some 10,000 being sent to Algeria and Cayenne. When some of the workers of Paris, who resented this usurpation of authority, rebelled, they were suppressed by force after 150 of them had been killed. Louis Napoleon, following the footsteps of his illustrious uncle, was master of France. On December 21 by a vote of 7,500,000 to 650,000 the people abdicated their sovereignty and delegated to the new Caesar the power to form a new constitution modelled after that of the Year VIII under Napoleon I. The victory was celebrated at Notre Dame on New Year's day.

Usurps power by coup d'état of 1851

Act approved by the people

The new constitution, proclaimed in January, 1852, extended the term of President Napoleon for a period of ten years and empowered him to name his own cabinet. The legislature consisted of three bodies: (1) the Council of State, appointed by the president, to prepare laws; (2) the Legislative Body of 250 members, elected by universal male franchise, to discuss and vote on laws; and (3) the Senate, whose members were appointed for life by the president, to serve as the guardian of the constitution. Under this government, France was only a veiled dictatorship, for practically all power was in the hands of the "Prince-President." Nationalism flourished, but democracy was paralyzed under Louis Napoleon's "reign of liberty."

The new constitution

2. The Second Napoleonic Empire at its Height

The next ambition of Louis Napoleon, now 44 years of age, was to assume the title of emperor. Shrewd maneuvering paved the way for the transition. The profile of the new Napoleon appeared on the coins, and the Napoleonic eagles once more became emblems in the army. He toured the country accompanied by loyal newspaper men, who reported how the people greeted him with spontaneous shouts of "Long live the Emperor!" He knew the right words to say to socialists, republicans, and monarchists — to peasants, laborers, and capitalists — to clericals and anti-clericals. When it was thought that the moment was ripe, the Senate on December 1, 1852, proclaimed the "Prince-President" as Napoleon III, emperor of the French. Nearly 8,000,000 votes approved the change from a republic to an imperial dynasty, and his coronation followed. The "republican" constitution with a few alterations became the fundamental law of the Empire, which was destined to endure for eighteen years. The imperial throne during that period was upheld by bayonets.

Prince-President becomes Napoleon III

Popular approval of the change

Popular approval of the transformation of the democratic Republic into the autocratic Empire was due primarily to two conditions: (1) the fear of property owners that socialism would destroy private property; and (2) the desire of the workingmen to see the middle class thrust out of power.

Home policy

Under the home policy of Napoleon III from 1852 to 1860 France seemed to be more stable and more prosperous than she had been for seventy-five years. A display of democracy, even though it was a sham as revealed in the strict supervision of the press, won the radicals and the liberals. A brilliant court satisfied the conservatives and apparently did not displease the common people. The encouragment of business in many directions placated the middle class. Banks were opened, saving institutions were established, and money was freely used to exploit the natural resources. In 1855 through telegraph service to Crimea was in operation, postage was reduced, steamship lines were run to America and Asia, and in 1860 there were 5,500 miles of railroads in use. The value of exports had climbed to over $3,500,000,000 and speculators on the Paris bourse spoke of the "Golden Age of business." Favorable trade treaties were made with Great Britain and Prussia.

The workers were encouraged to organize coöperative societies, and the cost of living was kept down. Trade-unions were legalized, guilds were suppressed, and the right to strike was recognized. State insurance against death and injury was guaranteed. Many citizens were employed in building wagon roads and railways, in improving harbors, rivers, and canals, in constructing bridges and public buildings, and in planting forests and draining swamps. Paris with 1,297,000 inhabitants was transformed into a beautiful, modern city with large parks and fine boulevards. Agriculture was encouraged by the sale of common lands to small farmers, by the organization of boards of agriculture, by the creation of elementary agricultural schools, and by the offer of prizes for the best grains, fruits, and stock. In 1860 France was growing 235,000,000 bushels of wheat, while Russia was producing only 227,000,000 bushels and the United States but 142,000,000 bushels. The 336 beet refineries were turning out over 228,000,000 pounds of sugar.

Prosperity and contentment

As a result of this rural prosperity, the poor huts of the people were replaced by comfortable houses and large barns. The international expositions held in Paris in 1855 and 1867 greatly stimulated trade and industry. In the midst of all this activity Emperor Napoleon kept in touch with the people by visiting country fairs, riding in railway engine cabs, inspecting factories and mines, meeting the workers in banquets, and encouraging the use of his title of "Emperor of the workmen." His pious wife, Empress Eugenie, aided all kinds of charity, and was popular with the masses. The clergy were mollified with their control of education and with the continuance of French troops in Rome to safeguard the rights of the supreme pontiff.

Indeed, the French people were kept too busy making money to think of the loss of their liberty. Perhaps never before had so many millionaires appeared in France in so short a time. While the country enjoyed this material prosperity, little intellectual freedom was tolerated. The press and freedom of speech were rigidly controlled. Many professorships of history and philosophy in the universities were abolished. Through a system of spies all gatherings were watched and nearly 2,000 persons were arrested for criticizing the government.

3. The Decline of the Second Empire

Foreign policy

The foreign policy of Napoleon III, like that of Napoleon I, caused his downfall. The "Napoleonic idea" required the obliteration of the treaties of 1815, and dread of such a course caused Europe to become suspicious. While he posed as a pacifist in Europe and the friend of oppressed nationalities, yet this attitude awakened distrust. Although French law required all citizens to serve in the army for seven years, nevertheless the army was a military display rather than an efficient war machine and the officers were corrupt and incompetent.

Colonial empire

To meet the clamor of the business men for markets and raw materials, overseas colonial possessions were acquired. Algeria had already been won (1830) and New Caledonia was secured in the Pacific. To these beginnings of a new colonial empire, Cochin China and Annam were added in 1858, commercial concessions were secured from China in 1860, and a protectorate was established over Cambodia in 1863. While the United States was engaged in the Civil War, Napoleon III planned to extend his colonial empire to the New World. He induced Great Britain and Spain to join him in 1862 in seizing the customs houses of Mexico in order to collect debts due their citizens. Within four months the claims of the other two powers had been paid and they withdrew, but Napoleon III sent over an army of 30,000 men, set up an empire in Mexico, and put Maximilian, the brother of Francis Joseph of Austria, on the throne.

Mexico

The resistance of the Mexicans, and the insistence of the United States upon the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine, caused Napoleon to withdraw his troops. But his dupe, Maximilian, was shot, and Austria was angered at the failure of the project. At home French capitalists were disgruntled at the useless expense; the Catholics were disappointed; and the workingmen were incensed at the loss of life and high taxes.

Results

The throne of Napoleon III had received its first shock, and the "black shadows" which he feared began to appear.

Napoleon's relations to Europe

On the continent of Europe the foreign policy of Napoleon III was scarcely more successful. With Great Britain and Sardinia, he supported Turkey in the Crimean War against Russia in 1854-6. Russia was defeated, it is true, but at a cost to France of 75,000 lives

and $400,000,000. About the only satisfaction Napoleon received was the honor of holding the peace conference in his capital. In 1859 he joined Sardinia in the effort to drive Austria out of northern Italy. Again victory favored the French arms, but Napoleon withdrew from the war before Italy was freed and united. Although he received for his aid Nice and Savoy and annexed them to France, yet the French liberals and the Italians denounced him as a traitor, and he had made an enemy of Austria. His aid to revolutionists and liberals alienated the conservatives. Converted to the national policy of free trade, Napoleon III made a commercial treaty with Great Britain, which reduced the duties on British goods, and thereby aroused the indignation of the commercial classes in France, who complained that their interests were betrayed. The next problem that engaged the attention of Napoleon III was the unification of Germany under the leadership of Prussia. There he committed his final blunder.

Napoleon blind to Bismarck's plans

Napoleon was strangely blind to Bismarck's plans to drive Austria out of Germany and to create the new German Empire. In the short war against Austria, Bismarck urged him to a policy of neutrality, and Napoleon consented, believing that the war would exhaust both powers and thus strengthen France. When the victory of Prussia opened his eyes, he demanded that the South German States be omitted from the North German Union. Bismarck yielded, but when Napoleon asked for the cession of the Rhenish Palatinate to France, Bismarck merely shrugged his shoulders — and showed the note to Bavaria to whom the land belonged. This request of Napoleon threw Bavaria into the arms of Prussia. When Napoleon then insisted upon the right to annex Belgium, Bismarck shook his head and soon informed the British government, which was inclined to preserve the independence of Belgium. When, as a last resort, Napoleon begged for the grand-duchy of Luxemburg, Bismarck had the powers neutralize that territory. Like old Mother Hubbard, Napoleon had not secured even a bone in the diplomatic cupboard.

At last Napoleon saw the drift of affairs beyond the Rhine under the master plotter. The prospect of a single, strong German state ruled by Prussia stared him in the face and frightened him. He permitted the slogan "Revenge for Sadowa," the battle that gave Prussia the victory over Austria, to spread over France. The French army was reorganized, and Napoleon frantically bid for allies in the struggle which events seemed to forecast. But Russia remembered the Crimean War; Austria, the Italian War; Italy, Nice and Savoy; Great Britain, Belgium; the South German States, the Palatinate; and the United States, Mexico. The press in both countries, France and Prussia, hurled taunts, insults, and false charges against each other. "Chauvinists" in France and "Jingos" in Germany talked of the superiority of race, blood, institutions, and civilization. Only a small group of republicans in France and socialists in Germany sought to allay the rising war fever. The Empress Eugenie wanted

Preparations for war with Prussia

Few pacifists

war to reëstablish the waning popularity of her husband, and even Napoleon believed that a popular war would "gratify the military and domineering instincts of France." Bismarck was determined to have war to complete the unification of Germany. The one wanted war to save an empire; the other to create one.

With both governments bent on war, any irritating incident would have served as a pretext. It so happened that the Spanish throne was vacant at the time through the deposition of Isabella by the liberals, who invited a Catholic cousin of the king of Prussia to take the crown. Bismarck strongly advised acceptance of the offer. Napoleon, alarmed at the prospect of the union of the two thrones under the Hohenzollern house, notified Prussia that such an arrangement would be ground for war. Spain then announced that Prince Leopold had withdrawn his consent to receive the crown. Napoleon, unsatisfied, was persuaded by warlike advisors and ministers to insist that William I of Prussia should promise that a Hohenzollern would never again be a candidate for the Spanish throne. A telegram sent from the Prussian king at a resort known as Ems to Bismarck at Berlin, describing the French demands, was deliberately revised by Bismarck so that it would have the effect of a "red rag upon the Gallic bull" and at the same time lead the Prussians to feel that their monarch had been insulted. The contents of the revised telegram reached Paris on July 14, 1870, the national holiday, and set France on fire. Napoleon summoned his cabinet and decided on war. Ollivier, the prime minister, said that he accepted the war "with a light heart." The press proudly boasted that this was "the war of the nation." "To Berlin! To Berlin!" shouted the frenzied Parisians.

Vacant Spanish throne

The Ems telegram

War declared on Prussia

Both countries hurriedly mobilized, and the Franco-Prussian War began. Lacking competent generals the French were easily defeated. On September 2, 1870, Napoleon III surrendered himself and 81,000 men at Sedan. When the news reached Paris two days later, a mob rushed into the parliament building shouting, "Down with the Empire! Long live the Republic!" Gambetta, Ferry and Favre from the Hôtel de Ville proclaimed the Third French Republic. Empress Eugénie fled to Great Britain, where the dethroned emperor later joined her to die in 1873. The Empire upheld by bayonets crumbled to the ground when the bayonets were surrendered to a foreign foe.

Franco-Prussian War

Napoleon dethroned

4. The Causes of the Collapse of the Second Empire

In a survey of the eighteen years, during which Napoleon III sought to mould the destiny of the French nation, the forces that led to his downfall may be clearly seen:

Forces causing his downfall

1. The veiled despotism of Napoleon's Empire, resting on force, was certain to meet defeat at the hands of a people that had passed through the democratic awakening of 1789, 1830, and 1848. Seeing this himself, he tried to save his throne by granting amnesty to the liberals in 1859; by allowing parliament to criticize the government;

Despotism

by permitting the debates to be published; and by relaxing the press laws. The power of the clergy in education was also curtailed. Finally a series of decrees in 1869 changed the constitution so as to give the legislative body full control over legislation.

Foreign policy

2. Napoleon's foreign policy, particularly the ill-starred Mexican venture, the betrayal of Italy, and the blind diplomatic dealings with Prussia, brought isolation and defeat. At home he was not strong enough to secure an efficient military system. The soldiers lacked supplies, maps, organization, and morale; and the army was corrupted by dishonest contractors and politicians.

Growth of republicanism

3. The growth of the republican party was a standing menace. The muzzled press became more hostile, and when the censorship was removed, it took revenge in biting criticism. Suppression of the brainy men of France, such as Lamartine, Guizot, Thiers, Victor Hugo, Jules Simon, Émile Zola, and Anatole France, made them bitter opponents of the "crowned conspirator." Hating the gaudy court of the "imperial charlatan," they were tireless in their demands for liberty, free elections, a free press, free speech, and modern education. Gambetta was preaching a parliamentary republic, universal franchise, the separation of church and state, and a free public school system. "Caesarean democracy," he said, "is incompatible with the ideals and methods of true democracy."

Disease

4. An incurable disease sapped the vitality of Napoleon III during the later years of his reign. He became timid, fearful, indecisive, and irritable. The empress and other strong characters about him guided his policy. With his own judgment impaired, he made grave mistakes, and paid the penalty in defeat and disgrace. In attempting to please all parties, he lost the support of each. In ruling France as an autocrat, he alienated the friendship of democracy. In trying to build up an empire, he encountered the opposition of French liberals. In his rôle as arbiter of Europe, he alienated all his allies in the hour of need. And finally in an effort to save his throne he lost it. The Empire which rested on force fell with the defeat of the army.

5. Alsace-Lorraine and the World War

There can be no doubt that French nationalism was far more notably stimulated by the defeat of Napoleon III in 1870 than by any positive act of his reign. The loss of Alsace-Lorraine and the humiliation of defeat stirred the French patriots to an undying aspiration for revenge and glory. Paul Déroulède and Maurice Barrès organized the League of Patriots, which devoted itself to professional agitation in the matter of the hatred of Germany and the necessity of the recovery of the "ravished provinces." The sentiment of revenge was kept alive by such ceremonials as the draping of the Strassburg statue. Delcassé, and later Poincaré, directed French foreign policy primarily with the end in view of such alliances as would make possible a

successful war against Germany. In many cases the German conduct towards France was such as enabled these French patriotic leaders to play with success upon the pride and courage of their fellow countrymen. There can be no question that the problem of Alsace-Lorraine after 1871 played a greater part than any other single factor in the diplomatic entanglements and intrigues which brought on the World War.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

G. L. Dickinson, *Revolution and Reaction in Modern France* (1892); E. Bourgeois, *Modern France*, 2 vols. (1919); H. A. L. Fisher, *Bonapartism* (1908); A. Guérard, *French Civilization in the Nineteenth Century* (1914), E. Lavisse, editor, *Histoire contemporaine de la France* (1918); P. de la Gorce, *Histoire de la Seconde République française*, 2 vols. (7th edition 1914); *Histoire du second empire*, 7 vols. (4th edition 1913); J. Jaurès, editor, *Histoire socialiste*, Vol. X, *Le second empire* by A. Thomas (1907); E. Ollivier, *L'empire libéral*, 17 vols. (1895–1904); P. Guedalla, *The Second Empire* (1922); F. A. Simpson, *The Rise of Louis Napoleon* (1909), *Louis Napoleon and the Recovery of France* (1923), E. Levasseur, *Histoire des classes ouvrières en France de 1789 à 1870*, 2 vols. (1904); G. Weill, *Histoire du parti républicain en France de 1814 à 1870* (1900), *Histoire du mouvement social en France, 1852–1910* (2d edition 1911); P. L. Fournier, *Le second empire et la législation ouvrière* (1911); H. Berton, *L'évolution constitutionelle du second empire* (1900); P. F. Martin, *Maximilian in Mexico: the Story of the French Intervention, 1861–1867* (1914); E. C. Corti, *Maximilian and Charlotte of Mexico*, 2 vols. (1924).

CHAPTER XV

THE UNIFICATION OF ITALY

1. Preparation

Forces preparing the way for unification

For seventy years the Italians had been preparing for national unity. Inspired by the common traditions of a glorious past, the French Revolution kindled among them a desire for freedom and nationality. Napoleon I, by forming the "Kingdom of Italy," aroused anew their national hopes. Against the unjust settlements of the Congress of Vienna, the Italians revolted in 1820, in 1830, and in 1848. Two parties were working for national unity — one frankly espousing a republic through revolution; the other advocating moderate reform measures. Secret societies like the Freemasons and the *Carbonari* kept alive faith in Italian emancipation. Mazzini's "Young Italy" radiated a contagion of national, republican patriotism, and intensified a common hatred for the minions of Metternich who ruled Italy. Gioberti inspired the faithful Catholics with the thought of a federal union under the newly-elected pontiff, Pius IX. The middle class looked to Victor Emmanuel II of Sardinia and Piedmont, the strongest native ruler, to take the lead in expelling Austria and in establishing Italy as a constitutional kingdom. But republicans, clericals, and monarchists all had one goal — the expulsion of Austria and the national "resurrection" of the motherland.

Count Cavour

One of the most successful nation-builders of the nineteenth century was the blonde Italian, Count Cavour, the "Bismarck of Italy." Born in Piedmont in 1810, he imbibed the liberal ideas of his age and became a foe of absolutism and clericalism. Hating military life, he resigned his command in the army after the unsuccessful Revolution of 1830, and became absorbed in his books and farming. He visited France, Great Britain, and Germany to study the social and economic conditions, and returned to Italy a liberal reformer, suspected and watched by the police. He had no sympathy with socialism, but called himself a "progressive constitutionalist." The British government was his ideal — a king with his powers curtailed by a constitution, and a legislature of the middle class to guarantee liberty and prosperity. Through his modern newspaper, *The Resurrection*, he urged the establishment of agricultural societies, mechanics' institutes, industrial associations, and banks to aid capital and labor. During the Revolution of 1848, he sat in the national parliament at Piedmont and was soon recognized as the foremost liberal nationalist. He took an active part in forming the constitution of that year for

Piedmont — a document that was to become, a decade later, the fundamental law of the new Italy.

In 1852, at the age of 42, Cavour, this man of "diabolic energy," became prime minister of the cabinet of Victor Emmanuel II. With an almost uncanny wisdom he saw the problems confronting Italy: (1) that Piedmont must take the lead in ousting Austria and in unifying Italy; (2) that somehow the coöperation of all Italian states must be insured; and (3) that foreign aid must be secured. Henceforth all his strength of body and soul was devoted to the successful solution of these problems. His first concern was to develop the resources of Piedmont for her task ahead. With the aid of the middle class, he favored a policy of free trade, encouraged commerce, stimulated manufacturing, built railroads, reclaimed idle lands for farming, improved education, and secured larger taxes by a juster distribution. The prosperity of Piedmont shot up by leaps and bounds, and the national finances were soon in a flourishing condition. Since the Catholic Church was opposing unification, he drove out the Jesuits, closed the useless monasteries, and advocated a "free church in a free state." The army was enlarged, arsenals were built, and the fortresses on the frontiers were modernized. Piedmont was now ready to play her part.

Problems to be solved

To win the hearty coöperation of the other Italian states was not an easy task, because their rulers were all hostile to the project of unification. Hence, Cavour, in secret conferences with republicans like Mazzini and revolutionists like Garibaldi, won them to the cause of national unity under constitutional monarchy. "Independence and unity" became his motto in approaching the business men all over the peninsula in many different ways. The intellectuals were easily convinced that his plans were practical. The anti-clericals were induced to look to Piedmont for guidance. The powerful secret organizations, such as the National Union, Freemasons, *Carbonari*, and "Young Italy," were used to reach the people in the cities and in the country. The second part of the program was thus accomplished. The Italian people were united even if the governments were not.

Coöperation of other Italian states won

The third part of Cavour's plan, namely to secure outside military aid, required shrewd diplomacy. When Cavour sent 17,000 Sardinian soldiers to fight with France and Great Britain in the Crimean War, he won their friendship, and gained permission in 1856 to plead the cause of Italian unification before the Congress of Paris. Just how to induce Napoleon III to form a military alliance with Piedmont for the specific purpose of driving Austria out of Italy seemed to be a hard nut to crack. Certain conditions, however, were favorable to Cavour's project. The emperor of the French was of Italian blood, he had fought as a *Carbonaro* in 1830 against the pope, and, like Napoleon I, he was eager to substitute French for Austrian influence in Italy. Besides, he posed as the champion of oppressed nationalities. At the same time he had no desire to see a strong Latin

How foreign aid was secured

state created south of the Alps, and he also feared the effect of intervention upon the French clerical party. The masterful Cavour in 1858 met him at Plombières in France "by accident" and persuaded him to agree, secretly: (1) that 200,000 French troops would help drive Austria out of Lombardy-Venetia, which was then to be annexed to Piedmont; (2) that Parma, Modena, and parts of the Papal States should also be added to Piedmont; (3) that Tuscany and the rest of the Papal States should be formed into a central kingdom; (4) that Rome and the surrounding country should be left to the pope, who should become the president of a confederated Italy; and (5) that, as compensation, France should be given Nice and Savoy, and likewise, the advantage of a marriage of a Bonaparte prince to the daughter of Victor Emmanuel. Napoleon, as a further condition, expressly stipulated that Austria must be made to appear the aggressor in the coming conflict.

Treaty with Napoleon

2. The Italian War for Independence

In 1859 Cavour said "I will now fire the powder" and adroitly maneuvered to precipitate war with Austria. It was reported that on New Year's day Napoleon had openly insulted the Austrian ambassador in Paris. Victor Emmanuel on January 7, announced that he was ready to champion the cause of Italy. A great wave of patriotic enthusiasm swept over the nation. Prince Napoleon, a cousin of Napoleon III, went to Turin on January 13 to claim his bride and the treaty of alliance was thus cemented. The army of Piedmont was reorganized on the Prussian model, and disturbances were fomented in Lombardy and Venetia by Cavour's agents. Austria, furious at these events, refused England's offer of mediation and threatened war. An ultimatum was sent to Piedmont demanding demobilization within three days. Since this was just what Cavour wanted, the ultimatum was rejected, whereupon on April 19, Austria declared war on Piedmont. Italy was ablaze with a spirit of defiance, and preparations for resistence were hurried up everywhere. Public opinion throughout Europe denounced Austria for brutally attacking a small power. French armies with Napoleon at their head poured over the mountain passes to free Italy "from the Alps to the Adriatic." The next parliament, Cavour told the Piedmontese, "will be that of the kingdom of Italy."

Opening of war with Austria

In a war lasting about two months, victories at Magenta and Solferino drove the Austrians out of Lombardy into Venetia. Hapsburg princes were dethroned in Tuscany, Parma, and Modena, and the northern part of the Papal States renounced the temporal power of the pope. All these peoples demanded union with Piedmont, and the creation of the new Italy was in full swing. Alarmed at this prospect, and at the reports of the mobilization of Prussia, Napoleon on July 11, without consulting Piedmont, made a separate armistice with Austria. Cavour, in a fit of rage, urged Victor Emmanuel to continue

the war alone and, when the king refused to follow such a foolish course, resigned his premiership. But within six months he had swallowed his disappointment and was back at his old post. The peace of Zürich, signed on November 10, 1859, ended the war. It gave Lombardy, but not Venetia, to Piedmont. Much more had been gained, however, for Austria was defeated and Italian unification could not now be checked by either Austria or France. When Napoleon received Nice and Savoy, after a favorable vote, he had to consent to the annexation of central Italy to Piedmont because of the unanimous demand of the peoples of the small states. In April, 1860, the first Italian parliament was opened by Victor Emmanuel in Turin, but that city was not destined to be the capital. The flame of nationalism had swept the length of the peninsula.

Napoleon makes separate peace with Austria

Unification begun

3. Completion of Italian Unification

The next move in Italian unification was made by the Italians without foreign aid. It brought to the front one of the most striking figures of the war for independence, Guiseppe Garibaldi (1807–82), whose exploits read like the romances of the Middle Ages. Born in Nice in 1807, and trained for the navy, he became an ardent republican. For conspiring with Mazzini to set up a republic, he was forced to flee to South America, where for ten years he helped the Latin-American republics to gain their independence. Then he returned to Italy ready to join anybody or any cause to free his native land. First he thought of joining Pope Pius IX in 1847 in a movement for Italian unity. The next year he recruited 3,000 volunteers to help Piedmont defeat the Austrians. With the failure of the Revolution of 1848, he went to New York, where he made some money as a business man. In 1854 he returned home and bought the small island of Caprera, from which he studied the Italian movement. Won over by Cavour in 1859, he helped to drive the Austrians out of Lombardy with his "Hunters of the Alps." The next year, secretly aided by Cavour, with about a thousand soldiers, poorly armed, and wearing red shirts and slouch hats, he left Genoa for Sicily. Within three months he had taken possession of the island of 3,000,000 inhabitants, and proclaimed himself dictator in the name of Victor Emmanuel. With his thousand "Red Shirts" now increased to 4,000, he sailed for Naples, where he soon had 50,000 patriots under his command. The city of Naples was easily taken, the Bourbon king, Francis II, fled, and Garibaldi assumed a dictatorship over the entire kingdom of Naples. Meanwhile Victor Emmanuel hurried down to Naples, making an easy conquest of the Papal States on the way. The Neapolitans at once voted for annexation to the new Kingdom of Italy. On February 18, 1861, the national parliament, representing 22,000,000 Italians, met at Turin, and on March 17 proclaimed Victor Emmanuel king of Italy "by the grace of God and the will of the people." Within two years Italy had become a free, united nation. Cavour

Garibaldi

Sicily and Naples conquered

Victor Emmanuel King of Italy

died of exhaustion four months later but with joy in his heart. Garibaldi in a bitter mood, feeling that his services were not adequately rewarded, retired to his rocky island home.

Venetia secured in 1866

The third step in national unity was taken five years later, when, in the Austro-Prussian War, Italy joined forces as an ally with Prussia. Although the Italians were severely defeated, still the Prussian victory over Austria was sufficiently decisive to enable Italy to secure Venetia, which, after a favorable popular vote, was annexed to the new kingdom.

Rome becomes the capital

The fourth step in Italian unification came four years later in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870. From the outset Cavour insisted that Rome must be the new capital. His successor, Ricasoli, said: "To go to Rome is not merely a right; it is an inexorable necessity." It was a knotty problem. French bayonets upheld Pius IX as the undisputed sovereign of Rome, and the pope had excommunicated the leaders of the new kingdom as "sacrilegious usurpers" of his property. Repeated attempts of Garibaldi and other patriots to seize Rome were frustrated. When the Franco-Prussian War broke out, the French soldiers were withdrawn. The Italians took Rome on September 20, 1870, and the Romans voted for annexation. The temporal power of the pope, which had endured for over a thousand years, came abruptly to an end. In vain did he hurl bulls of excommunication against the invaders and call upon faithful Catholics to rush to his assistance. The king and parliament now removed to Rome as the national capital. A dream that reached back to Dante had come true.

Trentino and Triest secured in World War

The final step in the unification of Italy came with her entry into the World War in 1915. In the settlement of territorial boundaries, Trentino, Triest, and portions of the eastern shores of the Adriatic were secured, together with over 1,000,000 people. On St. Helena Napoleon I prophesied: "Italy, isolated between her natural boundaries, is destined to form a great and powerful nation. Italy is one nation — unity of language, customs, and literature, must within a period more or less distant, unite her people under one sole government. And Rome will, without the slightest doubt, be chosen by the Italians as their capital." His prediction was fulfilled within a little more than a generation after his death. A new nation took its place among the powers of Europe henceforth to play an important role in world affairs. Once more the work of the Congress of Vienna was undone.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

J. P. Trevelyan, *A Short History of the Italian People* (1920); B. King, *A History of Italian Unity, 1814–1871*, 2 vols. (1899); *Joseph Mazzini* (1902); J. A. R. Marriott, *Makers of Modern Italy* (1889); R. S. Holland, *Builders of United Italy* (1908); E. Masi, *Il Risergomento Italiano*, 2 vols. (1918); R. de Cesare, *The Last Days of Papal Rome, 1850–1870*, English translation by H. Zimmern (1909); G. S. Godkin, *Life of Victor Emman-*

uel II, First King of Italy, 2 vols. (1879); E. MARTINENGO-CESARESCO, *Cavour* (1898); W. R. THAYER, *The Life and Times of Cavour*, 2 vols. (1911); P. ORSI, *Cavour and the Making of Modern Italy, 1810–1861* (1914); G. GARIBALDI, *Autobiography of Guiseppe Garibaldi*, English translation by A. Werner, 3 vols. (1889); G. M. TREVELYAN, *Garibaldi and the Thousand* (1909); *Garibaldi and the Making of Italy* (1911); *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic* (1907).

CHAPTER XVI

THE CREATION OF THE NEW GERMAN EMPIRE

1. Growth of Nationalism

Early preparations for German unity

The Germans in the Rhine Valley, bordering on France, and in the small states, were early inoculated with the spirit of the French Revolution. The reorganization of Germany by Napoleon hastened the spread of French ideas of democracy and nationalism. In 1815 patriots like Stein urged the Congress of Vienna to create a united German nation. But that body, through the influence of Metternich, solved the problem by forming the weak Germanic Confederation, which checked national growth for half a century. It satisfied the princes, but not the people, who kept alive the dream of a free, unified fatherland through patriotic plays, sermons, poems, songs, secret societies, and the universities. The revolutions of 1830 and 1848 sought in vain to realize the hope of German nationalism, but they kept the idea alive. The tragic failure of the Frankfort Parliament to create a constitutional German state left in its wake dire results. Absolutism, instead of democracy, triumphed in Germany until overthrown by the Revolution of 1918. Had Germany succeeded in establishing a republic in 1848, or a constitutional monarchy, the whole subsequent history of Europe might have taken a different course. It must be remembered, likewise, that the Customs Union, formed between 1818 and 1853 under the direction of Prussia, unified the German states in their business interests, and thus laid the foundation for later political unity. The Industrial Revolution produced an intelligent, wealthy middle class that sought to break down despotism and to gain a share in government. The industrial classes, attracted to Marxian socialism, became the foes of the remnants of the absolutism of the old régime. All these forces made the national unification of Germany a generation later easier.

Prussia supercedes Austria in German affairs

For thirty-five years after the Congress of Vienna, Austria, as the dominant power in Germany, resisted the growth of democracy and nationalism. After 1848, however, Prussia gradually gained an ascendancy over Austria in German affairs both industrially and politically. The German people saw clearly that Austria, with her non-German nationalities, was unsuited for German leadership. With the successful unification of Italy under the guidance of the king of the largest Italian state, the conviction grew in Germany that Prussia should be entrusted with the same task. Patriotic Germans

felt that their problem, like that of the Italians, was (1) to get rid of Austria, and (2) to unite all the strictly German states into one strong nation under Prussian guidance. *Problem before Germany*

2. Bismarck's Plans for the Unification of Germany

In 1861 William I, at the advanced age of 63, came to the Prussian throne. He had served in the campaign of 1814 against Napoleon I, and had spent his whole life in the service of the army to which he was deeply attached. The destiny of Prussia, he was convinced, rested with the army, and in 1849 he wrote: "Whoever wishes to rule Germany must conquer it." With a slow, methodical mind, he was a well-meaning man of few but forceful words. Deeply religious, he believed in the divine right of kings, and thought that a benevolent despotism was the best form of government for Prussia. He was honest, industrious, level-headed, kind, and wise in choosing able advisers. To Generals von Roon and von Moltke he entrusted the reorganization of the army. When the Landtag, controlled by the progressive party, refused to increase the army from a war footing of 215,000 to 450,000 men, he appointed Bismarck as prime minister in 1862 to solve the problem. *William I*

For twenty-eight years, Bismarck, one of the ablest men of his day, moulded the history of Germany and influenced the affairs of Europe. He was born in Prussia when the Congress of Vienna was in session, and hence at the time of his elevation to the premiership he was 47 years of age. He was a typical representative of the landed aristocracy, known as the "Junkers," who believed that the people were incapable of ruling themselves. As a university student, he gave more attention to beer-drinking and duelling than to his courses in law. Dismissed from the civil service for "deficiency in regularity and discipline," he lived the happy life of a Prussian landlord, married a devoted wife, and occasionally visited Berlin. In 1847 he was elected to the Prussian diet, and soon gained fame for his contempt of parliamentary institutions. A flimsy "sheet of paper," called a constitution, he said, should never be allowed to come between God's chosen ruler and his subjects. Liberals were foolish dreamers, who would ruin the state, if not held in check. A House of Commons might suit the British, but it never would the Prussians. Interrupted by hoots and hisses while making a tirade against popular government, this huge, blonde giant calmly pulled a newspaper out of his pocket and continued to read it until the disturbance subsided, then went on with his defiant speech. More absolutist than the king himself, in 1848 he raised a troop of farmers to save the monarch from the Berlin mob. He danced with glee, when the parliamentary movement failed at Frankfort in 1848 and Prussia refused to enter a "shameful union with democracy." Sent as a Prussian delegate to the revived Diet at Frankfort in 1851, he served in that body for eight years carefully studying the problem of German unity. As early as 1853 *Bismarck*

he declared that there was not enough room in Germany for both Austria and Prussia, and thereafter one finds him speaking more and more as a German and less as a Prussian.

To let him "cool off" he was sent as ambassador to Russia in 1859, where he became familiar with the Russian tongue, and gained the tsar's friendship. Three years later, his ambassadorship was shifted to France, where he came to know Napoleon III, whom he called "a great unrecognized incapacity." By 1862, when he was recalled to be the prime minister of Prussia, he was an accomplished diplomat, well-acquainted with European politics, and well understood the value of an oily tongue, or a vinegar face — of a lie or blunt frankness — to gain his point. His promotion by William I was greeted with a storm of disapproval by the liberals throughout Germany. Called to head the Prussian cabinet for the purpose of forcing the Landtag to pass a favorable army bill, this man of clear vision and iron will sought by threats and compromises to secure the desired legislation, but all in vain. During four years of open conflict, in violation of the Prussian constitution, but with the king's consent and the approval of the house of lords, he decided to rule Prussia as a dictator without a budget and in defiance of the popular branch of the legislature. Giving "state necessity" as an excuse, he collected taxes without parliamentary sanction and reformed the army. The liberals fumed and threatened him with impeachment. The queen, and the crown prince and his English wife, declared that his arbitrary acts would provoke insurrection. To the hesitating king, Bismarck said: "Death on the scaffold, under certain circumstances, is as honorable as death on the battlefield." His boldness, in the end, terrorized his opponents into silence.

Bismarck becomes Prime Minister of Prussia

Autocracy of Bismarck

The goal of Prussian policy, as Bismarck saw it, was first to drive Austria out of Germany and then to unify the separate states into one German nation under Prussian leadership. Since a powerful army was necessary to accomplish this purpose, he refused to allow even the constitution and the parliament to block his course. "Germany does not look to Prussia's liberalism, but to her military power," he asserted. "The great questions of the day are not to be decided by speeches and majority resolutions — therein lay the weakness of 1848 and 1849 — but by blood and iron." Hence he bowled over all opposition and followed his own arbitrary course under the conviction that Prussia was divinely called to create a new German nation. To him was given a holy commission to realize the plans which his masterful brain had formulated: (1) An unconquerable fighting machine must be created in Prussia. (2) Through military force, Prussia's political power and territory were to be increased. (3) At the right moment Austria must be driven out of German politics by a successful war. (4) Then Prussia would unite all the German states under her rule. (5) Finally the new Germany, militarized and Prussianized, would become a dominant power in Europe.

Bismarck's political philosophy

Plans for the unification of Germany under Prussia

3. The First Step — War with Denmark

Within a short time, under the genius of Roon and Moltke, Prussia had the best trained army on earth, and Bismarck was ready to strike the first blow. It came in a war on little Denmark over the Schleswig-Holstein question. These two duchies formed the slender neck of the Danish peninsula. Holstein had a German population of 500,000; Schleswig, 250,000 Germans and 250,000 Danes. Although the duke of Schleswig-Holstein had inherited the throne of Denmark, yet the duchies were not a part of Denmark proper. Holstein belonged to the German Confederation; Schleswig did not. During the nineteenth century, nationalism had struck root in Denmark, as elsewhere. The patriotic party, known as Eider-Danes, demanded the incorporation of the duchies. A number of attempts to accomplish this aim had been frustrated by opposition of the Germans in the duchies and in Germany itself. In 1863 Christian IX, the new king, was forced to yield to the nationalists and proclaim a constitution which involved the incorporation of Schleswig, but not of Holstein. This was contrary to a promise given to Austria and Prussia in 1851. Seeing a chance to add rich territory, which contained the fine Kiel harbor, to Prussia, Bismarck asked Austria to join in settling the question of ownership. On the understanding that the fate of the duchies should be settled by mutual agreement, Austria consented, without any regard to public opinion within the duchies, to a joint ultimatum demanding the abrogation of the new constitution. When the ultimatum was rejected, these two German powers in 1864 waged a brief war against Denmark and forced her to surrender both duchies, together with the duchy of Lauenburg.

War with Denmark

In the disposition of the spoils of war, Austria and the people of the small German states wanted the duchies admitted to the Confederation as another state. Bismarck, on the contrary, was determined by hook or crook to annex them to Prussia. Since such a course meant war with Austria, for which he was not quite ready, he signed the treaty of Gastein in 1865 by which (1) Prussia purchased Lauenburg outright from Austria; (2) Prussia administered Schleswig with the right to dig the Kiel canal; and (3) Austria administered Holstein. But Bismarck regarded this settlement as only temporary until he could insure the neutrality of Europe and then draw his doomed rival into his spider's web.

Treaty of Gastein

4. The Second Step — the Austro-Prussian War

In coolly plotting war against Austria, Bismarck first wished either to secure allies, or at least to pledge the powers of Europe to neutrality. Great Britain would hardly intervene. Bismarck's friendship with Tsar Alexander II, and the offer of Prussian troops to put down the Polish revolt in 1863, assured him of Russian neutrality. The Russians had never forgiven the Austrian attitude during

War on Austria the second step

the Crimean War. France was more uncertain, however, so Bismarck personally visited Napoleon III, urged the cause of nationalism, which Napoleon professed to champion, and fed his vanity with vague suggestions of "compensations" in Belgium, or in the Rhine Valley — such remuneration as Napoleon had received from Piedmont for aid in the war against Austria. Feeling that Prussia might be defeated, or at least be drawn into a long, weakening conflict, Napoleon agreed not to help Austria. To offset the power of the small German states, which he believed would join Austria, Bismarck secured an offensive alliance with Italy by promising her Venetia. Thus the plot was adroitly laid, and both Prussia and Italy began to arm for the encounter with a common foe.

With the mailed fist and the shining armor ready, with Europe pledged to neutrality and Italy an active ally, some plausible excuse for provoking Austria into war was the next move. There was not room enough for both Prussia and Austria in Germany, and only a successful war would give Prussia the supreme position. The Schleswig-Holstein settlement was used as a pretext for war. To win the German liberals, the "Parliament tamer" now proposed to reorganize the Confederation on the basis of universal suffrage and Prussian control in north Germany, two conditions which Austria could not accept. Then he accused Austria of violating the convention of Gastein by favoring the formation of a single state out of the two duchies. Austria replied by bringing the question before the Diet of the Confederation. On the ground that the treaty of Gastein was broken by Austria, Prussia rushed an army into Holstein to drive out the Austrians, and proceeded to exclude Austria from the Confederation. The Diet, by a small majority, ordered the federal troops to uphold Austria's claims to Holstein. Prussia then promptly withdrew from the Confederation, and the Austro-Prussian War began.

Pretext for the war

The Seven Weeks' War, with Prussia and Italy on one side, and Austria and the small German states on the other, was decided on July 3, 1866, in the great Prussian victory at Sadowa (Königgrätz). Superior training, the needle gun (a new type of breech-loading rifle), the railroad and telegraph, and the generalship of Moltke, won the battle that was to reorganize central Europe and to affect the whole world. Meanwhile the hostile German states were overrun. Italian troops, although defeated, had contributed to Prussia's triumph by dividing Austria's forces. William I and the military leaders were determined to humiliate Austria by entering Vienna and there levying a huge war indemnity. But Bismarck, with other plans in his head, objected and even threatened suicide, before the stubborn king consented to the moderate peace — the "sour apple" — proposed by the empire-builder. The treaty of Prague on August 23 (1) dissolved the German Confederation and authorized a new state which excluded Austria; (2) gave Schleswig-Holstein to Prussia; (3) bestowed Venetia upon Italy; and (4) levied on Austria a light war-

Prussian triumph

Results

indemnity. Prussia's leniency later won Austria as a friend and ally. It proved one of the master-strokes in Bismarck's diplomacy. The commanding position enjoyed in Germany and Europe by Austria under Metternich now passed to Prussia under Bismarck.

5. The Third Step — the North German Federation

The defeat of Austria gave Bismarck the opportunity for which he had been waiting to increase the size, population, resources, and strategic position of Prussia. The addition of Schleswig-Holstein to the Hohenzollern possessions carried with it the valuable naval station at Kiel, and a chance to construct the great ship canal later. Furthermore Hanover, Hesse-Cassel, Nassau, and Frankfort, the old capital, were all added to Prussia. As a result of these changes, territory as large as two Hollands, more than five millions of people, and vast natural resources fell to Prussia, which now comprised two thirds of the land and two thirds of the inhabitants of Germany. The realm of the lordly Hohenzollerns was now a connected territory with a population of 25,000,000 stretching from Russia to France, and one of the great powers in Europe and the world. All these annexations were made without consulting the wishes of the peoples concerned. "Our right," explained Bismarck, "is the right of the German nation to exist."

Creation of the North German Confederation

Bismarck next turned his attention to the political reorganization of Germany. After abolishing the German Confederation, which for so many years had been an obstacle to national progress, the twenty-one little states north of the river Main were induced to join Prussia in 1867 in a new union called the North German Federation. The new constitution for this Federation extended the Prussian system of government to all of north Germany, and it was accepted at first by the princes and later by the people. The king of Prussia was made hereditary president with power to choose the federal chancellor, but the parliamentary system was deliberately avoided. The legislature consisted of two houses: (1) the Federal Council (Bundesrat), representing the sovereign princes of the various states; and (2) the Reichstag, elected by universal manhood suffrage. The recognition of a general franchise was about the only way in which the new constitution differed from the Prussian system of government. Even Bismarck, the foe of constitutional government, was forced at last to recognize the democratic forces of the modern world. This constitution, like that of Piedmont in Italy, was adopted four years later for the new German Empire.

Popular approval of Bismarck's measures

Government

At the insistence of Napoleon III, Bismarck had recognized the "international independent existence" of the four states — Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, and Hesse-Darmstadt — but these states were bound to Prussia by a secret "offensive and defensive alliance." The next move of Bismarck was to extend the Prussianized North German Federation over these four South German States. To accomplish this purpose, he devoted his

South German States

energy to the consolidation of the political and military institution of the new federal state in the north and to preparations for the last of his series of wars.

6. The Fourth Step — The Franco-Prussian War

Significance of the Franco-Prussian War

The Franco-Prussian War was perhaps a needless, a worse than useless, conflict. It added nothing to the progress of humanity and little to the civilization of the world. It gave birth to the new German Empire and the Third French Republic, it is true, but the gain was offset by the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine and by the humiliation of a proud, mutilated nation burning with a desire for revenge. Furthermore it helped, more than any other single incident, to lay the foundations for the World War of 1914.

Fundamental causes

The fundamental causes of the conflict were: (1) the ambition of Bismarck to use the enthusiasm engendered by a patriotic war for the purpose of uniting Germany under Prussian leadership; (2) the desire of the French empress and her supporters, by a popular victory, to stop dangerous discontent at home, to insure the permanency of the Napoleonic dynasty, and to curb the growth of a dangerous rival; (3) the indiscretion and foolhardiness of the duke of Gramont, the French foreign minister in 1870; and (4) the jealousy, hatreds, and misunderstandings of two arrogant peoples, swept off their feet by an exaggerated patriotism which had been incited by their governments. Believing that war with France "lay in the logic of history," Bismarck welcomed it to further his imperial plans by putting on the cap-sheaf of German unity. Smarting with chagrin over the failure to receive "compensations" to match Prussia's expansion, and viewing with alarm the rise of a powerful neighbor across the Rhine, Napoleon III was determined to check Prussia's further disruption of the balance of power on the continent. The press, pulpit, schools, and armies were used by both governments to arouse a militant patriotism. Bismarck's "reptile fund" and paid journalists filled the European newspapers with inspired reports; and preachers, teachers, and officials were instructed what ideas to spread among the people. The same policy was employed in France. A few level-headed people in both countries denounced the coming struggle as indefensible. France frantically but ineffectually sought allies; Prussia looked only for assurances of neutrality, and gained them.

The occasion for the war

The occasion for the war was skilfully manipulated by Bismarck to make France appear as the aggressor. When he encouraged the Spanish political leaders in offering the vacant Spanish throne to a relative of King William I, France was in an uproar over the "disturbance of the European balance of power." The newly elected king, Leopold, resigned the crown of Spain, but Empress Eugenie, a Spaniard, and the French war party persuaded Napoleon to insist that William I should promise never to permit a Hohenzollern to occupy the Spanish throne. Benedetti, the French ambassador, presented

this somewhat insulting demand to William I, who refused to make the promise. From Ems the king telegraphed Bismarck a calm account of the incident. Assured by Moltke and Roon that they were prepared for the war, Bismarck revised and shortened the telegram so as to make it appear to the Prussians that Benedetti had insulted William I, and to the French that the Prussian king had slandered France. He then gave it to the newspapers to be sent over the world. It produced the desired effect: excited mobs marched up and down the streets of Paris shouting "To Berlin! To Berlin!"; and angry Germans answered "To Paris! To Paris!" Mobilization began in both countries. The French minister of war told the emperor that the army was prepared "down to the last button on the last gaiter of the last soldier."

On July 19, 1870, the French parliament, with only ten dissenting votes, declared war, but against Prussia alone. Within two weeks a million men were under arms in Germany, north and south. Through Prussian spies, German officers knew more about the geography of France than the French themselves. Everything was arranged for the comfort and efficiency of the soldiers from food and beer to stockings and toothpicks. The German military machine began a hurried advance towards France. The French were prepared in spirit but not in military equipment. Their army was poorly organized, badly led, and in chaos looking for the "last button." Officers had lost their poor maps; soldiers had lost their officers; horses had lost their harnesses; guns had lost their ammunition; and, worst of all, France had lost the sympathy of the world. The newspapers of that day quite generally sympathized with the Germans. Americans remembered Mexico; Great Britain was still incensed at Napoleon's project to annex Belgium; Russia had not forgotten the Crimean War; Italy recalled her betrayal, and Austria her losses, in 1859. Napoleon's declaration of war on a neighbor, it was said, was a violation of the spirit of the French Revolution and of his own fine words about nationalism and peace. Today, however, historians, as a rule, are of the opinion that while the war was not unwelcome to Napoleon, it was really engineered by Bismarck.

Comparison of the two armies

The German generals planned to defeat the French armies at Metz and Strassburg, the two fortresses which guarded the entrance into France, and then capture Paris. Metz was surrounded, and on September 2, Napoleon and 81,000 men were captured at Sedan. After abolishing the French Empire, the provisional government under Gambetta proclaimed a levy on the whole nation to repel the invader. At last the Germans reached the gates of Paris, and never was a more courageous defense made. The people laughed at starvation and ate cats, dogs, birds, and rats, and even the wild beasts in the "animal park." Gambetta fled in a balloon to Bordeaux, where with fiery words he sought to incite the country people to rescue Paris. On October 27 Metz with 173,000 men surrendered, and a

French defeat

Siege of Paris

month later Strassburg with 19,000. Paris, subdued by starvation and the cold, accepted an armistice on January 28, 1871. The final

Treaty of Frankfort

treaty of Frankfort, May 10, 1871, (1) levied on France a war indemnity of $1,000,000,000; (2) provided for the occupation of northern France by a German army until the sum was paid; and (3) gave Alsace-Lorraine not to Prussia but to Germany. The militarists were bent on destroying France. "The enemy must be *destroyed and under our feet; a Blücher, with his hatred of France,* is lacking," said one of them. Had Bismarck had his own way, it is probable that Lorraine might not have been taken. "I do not like the idea of having so many Frenchmen in our house against their will," he remarked. He agreed to buy the railroads in the ceded districts for $65,000,000 but insisted upon trade concessions, which in France were called the "industrial Sedan." Germany won a great

Results

military triumph, but at a terrific cost. She got unity, money, territory, and glory, but she also received the undying hatred of a dismembered nation. Within fifty years, in the World War, France had her revenge, and Germany in 1918 paid in defeat for her victory in 1871.

7. The Foundation of the German Empire

While the German armies were overwhelming France, Bismarck took advantage of the psychological moment to complete the unification of the German nation. He concluded treaties with the four South

Creation of German Empire at Versailles

German States by which they entered the North German Confederation under special concessions in postal and military matters. The name of the Federation was changed to the German Empire, and its president, the king of Prussia, became the German emperor. Ten days before Paris surrendered, in the hall of mirrors of the royal palace at Versailles, so memorable in the life of the Bourbon despots and the French Revolution, occurred an historic ceremony. King William I of Prussia, on a raised dais, in the presence of the kings, princes, and generals of Germany, was offered the imperial crown by a representative of the king of Bavaria in the name of his fellow monarchs. Bismarck read the imperial proclamation, which completed the first part of his life-work. For miles around Paris the booming of guns and the cheers of German soldiers announced the birth of the German Empire. In 1919 another event of historic importance occurred at Versailles. There the envoys of the German

Treaty of Paris in 1919

nation, whose emperor, William II, the grandson of William I, had been forced to abdicate by military defeat and internal revolution, signed a humiliating treaty of peace restoring Alsace-Lorraine to France and agreed to pay a war indemnity about fifty times as large as that levied on France in 1871.

The constitution of the North German Federation of 1867, slightly modified, was adopted as the imperial constitution April 14, 1871, and it lasted until overthrown by the Revolution of 1918.

Bismarck became the chancellor of the Empire. Now that Germany was unified, he felt that his next task was to Prussianize it. This done, his next ambition was to assure the leadership of Germany in the international affairs of Europe. To Germany the consequences of the victorious war were greater than she foresaw. The annexation of the territory of a neighboring state left the troublesome "Alsatian question" on her hands — a problem that soon assumed in principle an international significance. "Think of it always," said Gambetta, "and never speak of it."

Imperial constitution

Alsace-Lorraine

The war gave Germany an indisputable hegemony in European politics. It completed Italian unity and abolished the pope's claim to temporal power. It definitely shut Austria out of all German affairs, turned her attention towards the Balkans, and made her an ally of Germany. It ended the neutrality of the Black Sea and reopened the Near Eastern Question. It destroyed the Napoleonic Empire like a second Waterloo and created in France the Third Republic.

Results

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

H. VON TREITSCHKE, *Deutsche Geschichte im neunzehnten Jahrhundert*, English translation, 7 vols. (1915–1919); W. H. DAWSON, *The German Empire: 1867–1914*, 2 vols. (1919); A. WARD, *Germany, 1815–1914* (1919); H. VON SYBEL, *Die Begründung des deutschen Reiches durch Wilhelm I*, 7 vols., English translation by M. L. Perrin and G. Bradford (1890–1898); W. ONCKEN, *Das Zeitalter des Kaisers Wilhelm*, 2 vols. (1890–1892); E. DENIS, *Le fondation de l'empire allemagne, 1852–1871* (1906); G. B. MALLESON, *The Refounding of the German Empire, 1848–1914*, new edition (1914); F. SCHEVILL, *The Making of Modern Germany* (1916); E. MARCKS, *Kaiser Wilhelm I*, 5th edition (1905); *Bismarck: eine Biographie*, Vol. I (1909); *Otto von Bismarck, ein Lebensbild* (1918); M. BUSCH, *Bismarck — Some Secret Pages from his History*, English translation, 2 vols. (1898); J. W. HEADLAM, *Bismarck and the Foundation of the German Empire* (1899); M. SMITH, *Bismarck and German Unity*, 2d edition revised, (1910); P. MATTER, *Bismarck et son temps*, new edition, 3 vols. (1914); C. G. ROBERTSON, *Bismarck* (1919); E. BRANDENBURG, *Die Reichsgründung*, 2 vols. 2d ed. (1922); R. H. LORD, *The Origins of the War of 1870* (1924); J. H. ROSE, *The Development of the European Nations, 1870–1900*, 2 vols. (1905); E. OLLIVIER, *The Franco-Prussian War and its Hidden Causes*, English translation by G. B. Ives (1912); H. DELBRÜCK, *Der Ursprung des Krieges von 1870* (1893); H. VON MOLTKE, *Geschichte des deutschen-französischen Krieges von 1870–71*, English translation by C. Bell and H. W. Fischer, 2 vols. (1891); A. SOREL, *Histoire diplomatique de la guerre franco-allemande*, 2 vols. (1875); A. CHUQUET, *La guerre de 1870–1871* (1895); J. JAURÈS, *Histoire socialiste*, Vol. XI, *La guerre franco-allemande*, by Jaurès (1908); E. PALAT (P. LEHAUTCOURT), *Les origines de la guerre de 1870: la candidature Hohenzollern, 1868–1870* (1912); *Histoire de la guerre de 1870*, 7 vols. (1901–1908); *Guerre de 1870*, 2 vols. (1910); J. FAVRE, *Le gouvernement de la defense nationale, 1871–1872*, 3 vols. (1871–1875); G. MAY, *Le traité de Francfort* (1909); R. FESTER, *Die Genesis der Emser Depesche* (1915).

CHAPTER XVII

FORMATION OF THE DUAL MONARCHY OF AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

1. Obstacles to a Centralized Empire

National and cultural diversity of Austria-Hungary

The Austrian Empire, in its racial makeup, had the most composite character of any country in Europe except perhaps Turkey and Russia. The majority of the population was Slavic — Czechs, Slovaks, Poles, Ruthenians, Slovenes, and Serbo-Croats — forming a fringe around the Empire from Bohemia to the Adriatic. They differed greatly both in customs and speech. In the center of this Slavic sea were the Hungarians, and to the southwest the Italians. The German Austrians in the west, forming less than a third of the total inhabitants of the Empire, in practice ruled all the others. There was no national unity, of course, and also very little imperial patriotism. On the contrary the nationalism of the various racial groups tended strongly towards disunion. The motley Empire was held together by force and loyalty to the Hapsburg house, whose representative after 1848 was Francis Joseph, an unsympathetic and despotic, but just, ruler. When Italy in 1859 wrested Lombardy away from Austria, the eyes of Francis Joseph were opened to the need of reform. Hence the worst "hereditary abuses" were swept away, grievances were redressed, the local diets were restored, and in 1861 a new constitution was given to the whole Empire establishing a centralized form of government. This document provided for an imperial parliament with two houses meeting annually. The Chamber of Lords was composed of hereditary lords and dignitaries appointed by the emperor. The lower house was chosen by the local diets. Thus, two years after the death of Metternich (1859), Austria abandoned absolutism, and became a constitutional monarchy. In the face of the reactionary policy of Bismarck in Prussia, Austria now became popular with the small German states. But the subject nationalities became more discontented than ever.

Reform after the defeat of 1866

A new chapter in the history of Austria began with her defeat in 1866 at the hands of Prussia. She was forced to surrender her leadership in Germany, which had been held for so many centuries, to the rival Hohenzollerns. Over 8,000,000 German Austrians were cut off from national union with their blood relatives. Henceforth they had to be content with ruling the polyglot Austrian Empire and with expansion farther and farther into the Balkans. At the same time Venetia was ceded to the Italian kingdom, and Austria was driven out of Italy as she was out of Germany. Furthermore defeat

at the hands of Prussia, encouraged the elements of discontent within the Empire to raise their voices. The people denounced the constitution of 1861, as putting political power into the hands of the landed nobility and the wealthy middle class. The Bohemians and Hungarians repudiated it because it treated them as provinces instead of separate, equal nations. Other groups assumed equally threatening attitudes.

2. The Compromise of 1867

The intensely nationalistic Hungarians said that Hungary had always been an independent state, joined to Austria only by a common monarch, who was the king of Hungary after he took an oath to respect their constitution and received the ancient crown of St. Stephen. If allowed to live their own national life, they said, they would coöperate with Austria in matters of common interest. But they wanted their own constitution of 1848, and not that of 1861 which deprived them of self-government. They refused to send representatives to the imperial parliament, and repeatedly threatened revolution between 1861 and 1866. The Austrian defeat in 1866 forced the emperor to give way. "What does Hungary want?" asked Francis Joseph of Francis Deak, the Hungarian patriot. "Only what she wanted before Sadowa," Deak replied.

Emperor Francis Joseph sought to settle the Hungarian problem by abrogating the constitution of 1861 and consenting to the new constitution of 1867, known as the Compromise (Ausgleich), which was drawn up with the advice of both Austrians and Hungarians. It formed an odd kind of a state called the Dual Monarchy, composed of the "Lands and Territories represented in the Parliament" (Austria) and the Kingdom of Hungary. In this new Austria-Hungary, each state had its own constitution, ministry, courts, officials, capital, and official language. But the two states had a common flag, foreign service, army, and ruler; and, in addition to three joint ministers, the "delegations" from the Austrian and Hungarian parliaments which sat alternately at Vienna and Budapest. The three joint ministers conducted foreign affairs, war and common finance. The "delegations" settled such matters as tariffs, trade, public debt, and railways for ten-year periods and voted the budget for foreign affairs and the army. Under the Compromise each state was liberal but not democratic, for universal franchise had not yet been won. Magyar nationality had at last secured the recognition of independence. The Dual Monarchy endured under Francis Joseph until it was broken up into four states by the World War.

Terms of the Ausgleich

3. Progress of Austria-Hungary after 1867

The Empire of Austria under the modified constitution of 1861, now included Germans, Slavs, and Italians, and formed a thick, irregular border around all of Hungary except in the east. It was

governed by the Reichsrat of two houses — the House of Lords made up of hereditary and life nobles, and bishops; and the lower chamber elected by the seventeen local diets under a restricted franchise. The ministry was responsible to the legislature. The kingdom of Hungary was a solid block of Hungarians, Rumanians, Slavs, and a small number of Germans. Its constitution was that of 1848 modified to meet the changed conditions. The legislature consisted of the aristocratic Table of Magnates, composed of 800 nobles and higher clergy; and the Chamber of Deputies chosen by a rigidly limited vote. Here, too, the ministry was responsible to the parliament. In local government Austria granted home-rule to all of her seventeen provinces through popularly elected diets; but Hungary was not so liberal.

Austria

Among the Slavs, who constituted so large a portion of the population of both Austria and Hungary, there was deep-seated discontent. How to appease them so as to hold them loyal was a difficult problem. The Czechs of Bohemia, the most progressive of the Slavic groups in 1868, demanded the same sort of independence as that accorded to the Hungarians. They claimed that they were also a separate nation, joined to Austria under a common ruler. Hence they insisted that the Kingdom of Bohemia be recognized as independent and that Francis Joseph be coronated at their capital, Prague. To avert revolution, Francis Joseph in 1871 admitted these claims of the Bohemians, and promised to place Bohemia on the same basis as Austria and Hungary, thus changing the Dual Monarchy into a Triple Monarchy. But the hatred and fear of the Germans and Hungarians for the Slavs was so pronounced that the promise was not fulfilled. The Germans, as the ruling minority in the Dual Monarchy, were afraid of losing their power; the Hungarians thought that an independent Bohemia would only lead other Slavs to demand autonomy; and both groups dreaded the complications of foreign affairs under a Triple Monarchy. Consequently, when the Italians also began to agitate for separation, the Dual Monarchy suppressed both the Bohemian and the Italian movements. As a result Slavic self-government remained the burning question in Austria-Hungary from 1867 down to the close of the World War. Indeed the Dual Monarchy was able to survive only through racial divisions and hatreds, which gave the governments the opportunity to play off one faction against another. The southern Slav problem, centering in Serbia, became an ever more active and menacing issue until in 1914 it produced the World War which ended the Dual Monarchy.

Slavic restlessness

In Austria during the ten years following the formation of the Compromise in 1867, the German liberals in control of the government tried to "Germanize" the Slavs and the Italians. The schools were secularized, and in 1869 the German language was made compulsory in all elementary public instruction. Marriage under the civil law was allowed, and equal political rights were granted to both

Catholics and non-Catholics. The pope characterized these laws as "damnable and abominable." The socialists and the "Young Czechs" raised a cry for the extension of the right to vote and also for social reforms. In 1873 the direct election of members to the lower house of parliament was permitted, but the former system of separating voters into four classes remained unchanged. Not until 1907 was an equal vote given to all men in Austria.

In Hungary the Magyars, who constituted barely half of the population ($8\frac{1}{2}$ million out of $16\frac{1}{2}$ million in 1900), sought to "Magyarize" the Slavs, Rumanians, and Germans. Their newspapers were persecuted, the Hungarian language was compulsory in the state schools, and ancient names of cities and districts were replaced by Hungarian names. All sorts of devices were used to prevent the non-Magyar groups from sending a majority of members to the Chamber of Deputies. Attempts to separate Hungary completely from Austria were checked by the threats of the emperor-king to proclaim universal franchise in Hungary, which would have turned the government over to the non-Magyars and to the lower classes. Further, the fear of a pan-Slavic peril under the leadership of Russia prevented the separation. As the World War approached, Austria and Hungary forgot their differences and presented a united front to the "dread power of the north." In the growth of political liberty and social reform, while there was some advance in Austria, Hungary lagged far behind the more progressive nations of the world. Hungary, like Russia, remained an archaic agricultural autocracy.

Hungary

Although Austria-Hungary possessed rich natural resources, such as coal, iron, and oil, with good inland waterways and railways, and plenty of cheap labor, still the Industrial Revolution made slow headway. Agriculture was the predominant occupation, particularly in Hungary, where trade and commerce were mostly in the hands of the Germans and the Jews. The exports consisted chiefly of farm products, glass, earthenware, and beer. Sufficient advance was made, however, in industries and mining, to produce in Austria a middle class of wealth and power, and also an active city *proletariat*.

Shut out of both Germany and Italy, Austria-Hungary began to look towards the Near East. The Balkan states seemed to be a fruitful field for expansion. In that region the foreign policy of the Dual Monarchy was (1) to uphold the integrity of Turkey; (2) to encourage the small states to stand on their own feet and look to Austria rather than to Russia for guidance; (3) to place every obstacle in the way of Russian political or economic expansion; and (4) to develop the resources of the Balkans for the advantage of Austria-Hungary. The consequences of this policy will be discussed later.

Austria-Hungary and the Balkans

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

J. A. VON HELFERT, *Geschichte Oesterreichs vom Ausgange des Wiener October Aufstandes 1848*, 4 vols. (1869–1886); H. M. Hozi

MANN, *Le Compris austro-hongrois de 1867, étude sur le dualisme* (1904), C. M. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN, *The Political Evolution of the Hungarian Nation*, 2 vols. (1908), A. DE BERTHA, *La Hongrie Moderne, 1849–1901* (1901); *La constitution hongroise* (1898), R. W. SETON-WATSON, *Racial Problems in Austria-Hungary* (1908); *Corruption and Reform in Hungary* (1911); *The Southern Slav Question and the Hapsburg Monarchy* (1911); R. SIEGHART, *Zolltrennung und Zollenheit: Die Geschichte der oesterreichisch-ungarischen Zwischenzoll-Linie* (1915); E. DENIS, *La Bohême depuis la Montagne Blanche*, 2 vols. (1903), T. VON SOSNOSKY, *Die Balkanpolitik Oesterreich-Ungarns seit 1866*, 2 vols. (1913–1914); R. P. MAHAFFY, *Francis Joseph I, His Life and Times, an Essay in politics* (new edition, 1915); LOUIS LEGER, *A History of Austria-Hungary* (1896).

CHAPTER XVIII

THE CONSOLIDATION OF RUSSIA

1. The Despotism of Tsar Nicholas I

Tsar Nicholas I (1825–1855), who succeeded Alexander I, was a devout champion of an intense, narrow nationalism. A man of striking personal appearance, by nature and experience a soldier, and happy in the midst of his army, he ruled "Holy Russia" as a military camp in which disobedience was treason and a desire for liberty, sedition. He loved Russia with a mad passion, and planned to make her great and famous, not by imitating the dangerous western democracies but by developing her own peculiar institutions through a process of "Russification." Her unique role in world history was to be played under the guidance of autocratic government and the Russian Orthodox Church. The Russian people were inspired to patriotism by a stirring national anthem; amused by a strictly Russian national opera; educated in national schools with a limited course of study; and encouraged to perpetuate their own ancient social and economic customs and practices. Hence, a high wall had to be built up against all pestilential ideas from liberal countries. Tsar Nicholas out-Metterniched Metternich in stopping travellers at the frontiers and in ordering all books carefully examined before being admitted to the country. Nor could Russians go abroad for business, pleasure, or study without permission. The press, music, the theaters, and the universities were all censored and watched by paid spies to prevent their inculcation of dangerous western doctrines. Out of 50,000,000 people in 1853, only 3,000 students were attending the universities. An army of secret police, called the "Third Section," authorized to make arbitrary arrests and to inflict punishments at will, preserved and perpetuated the autocratic régime. The treatment of subject racial groups was exemplified by the case of Poland, which was blotted from the map of Europe, its diet abolished, and 45,000 families scattered over Russia.

Nicholas I and Russification

The Orthodox Church was simply one of the strong arms of the autocratic state, and, consequently, efforts to win converts from that church to another faith were severely punished. Roman Catholics, Jews, and Protestants lived under harsh restrictions, were watched by the government police, and punished on the slightest pretext. The Orthodox clergy, like the army, were an instrument in the tsar's hands to enforce his will in keeping Russia "frozen." As the rule of Nicholas I neared its close, when he saw the floodtide of western

freedom sweeping into Russia in spite of his efforts to keep it out, he said: "My successor may do as he pleases, but I cannot change."

In foreign affairs Nicholas I followed the policy of expansion which both his predecessors and his successors pursued. In the so-called "will" of Peter the Great, now generally regarded as spurious, that monarch was made to say: "Neglect nothing to give the Russian nation European forms and customs. . . . Extend by every possible means towards the north along the Baltic, and towards the south . . . and by continually advancing reach out to Constantinople." The forger of this document, however, certainly interpreted clearly the policy of the Romanoff house during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Nicholas I obeyed this injunction by adding Georgia in 1829 and other provinces in the Caucasus, and by establishing a virtual protectorate over Rumania. Regarding Prussia and Austria as the defenders of absolutism, he had no thought of waging war against them, and indeed in 1849 he helped Austria to crush the Hungarian revolt. Regarding Napoleon III as a usurper, the tsar refused to address him as "My Brother." With Great Britain he attempted to arrange a friendly agreement by which they would divide the empire of the "Sick Man of the East," but the proposal was refused. By 1850 Nicholas I clearly revealed an ambition to play the role of "big brother" to the little Balkan national groups so that he might eventually absorb them, and "protector" to the Greek Catholics in the Turkish Empire so that he might use them to obtain possession of Constantinople. Turkey under British and French pressure rejected the Russian demand to be given the right to protect the Orthodox Christians, and in 1853 Russia broke off diplomatic relations with The Porte. The same year Turkey declared war on Russia, and four months afterwards Great Britain and France did the same. A year later Piedmont sent 17,000 soldiers to coöperate with the allies, and Austria was only prevented from a similar course by the hostility of Prussia. Defeated in the Crimean War by the western powers he despised, the soldier-tsar died in 1855, leaving to his son and successor, Alexander II, the task of making peace.

Foreign policy of Nicholas I

2. Tsar Alexander II 1855–1881

Alexander II ascended the Russian throne at a time when the people were loudly blaming the military bureaucrats for the humiliating defeat in foreign policy and war, and were clamoring for liberal institutions and reforms. He himself professed to see the dawn of a new day in Russia and was resolved to follow a moderate policy like that of the eighteenth-century enlightened despots. He was sensible, level-headed, humane, and had the wisdom to select intelligent ministers. His reign was devoted to an honest attempt to remedy the evils of his country, and the problems confronting him were not unlike those which Louis XVI had to meet in France. To attain his goal, he tried to keep in touch with the progress of the west and

Character of Alexander II

abandoned the negative policy of isolation. The gigantic Empire over which he ruled embraced the greater part of Europe, stretched across northern Asia, and included Alaska in North America. The population, which was 59,000,000 in 1836 rapidly increased in the next twenty years. Yet, as late as 1860, Russia, in spite of its size and wealth, was one of the most backward countries in agriculture, industry, and education in all Europe.

The most far-reaching reform instituted by Alexander II was the abolition of serfdom. While there were many free peasants, yet in 1836 a contemporary writer estimated the serfs on the crown lands at 12,000,000 and the "slaves" on the estates of the nobles at 23,000,000. A Russian lord "reckons the value of his property, not by the annual income of his estate, but by the number of souls, that is, of male peasants upon it. An estate is said to be worth so many souls instead of so many roubles per annum." By 1860 some 47,000,000 serfs lived either on the tsar's lands or on the large estates of the 100,000 noble families. In Russia alone of all Europe serfdom remained. About 90 per cent of the farm lands was owned by the state, the princes, and the nobility. These estates were separated into two portions — the crops of one part belonging to the aristocratic possessor; the other to the village peasants. The lot of the crown serfs was not so deplorable, because their farms were larger, and their dues and services were lighter than those on private estates, being money dues or "obrok," rather than onerous labor dues. But all serfs were bound to the soil, and were sold with the land like buildings and cattle. For the use of their little farms, they paid the lord dues in money or services in labor, as a rule three days a week. If the lord had no work, he might send his serfs to work in the mines or factories, or in the cities, and, of course, he took a certain percentage of their earnings. A day's labor of a serf included that of his wife and of his horse, if he had one. About 2,000,000 serfs were servants in the homes of the lords who were totally landless. Not only could the master sell his serfs, but he could also flog them, or send them to Siberia, or loan them to the tsar as soldiers. To be sure there were kind-hearted masters, who treated their serfs as children, but too often their overseers were cruel and heartless. Frequently the abused serfs retaliated in robberies, arson, and even murder, and many thousands ran away to become vagabonds. The law, such as it was, protected the serfs in their meager rights, but since the nobles themselves were the local judges, its enforcement was uncertain and often unjust. Turgeniev's *Sportsman's Tales* gives one of the best descriptions of the life of the serfs and their relations to their owners.

Alexander's reforms

In America the black man was the slave of the white man; in Russia the serf had the same blood as the owner. The Russians were conscious of the injustice of serfdom as a blot on their national honor, and ever since the French Revolution liberal patriots had urged emancipation. In northern Russia, particularly in Poland and along the

Abolition of serfdom

Baltic, serfdom had been quite generally abolished, and even in the south there were many settlements of free Cossacks. But it was left to Alexander II to play the role of Abraham Lincoln in Russia. First, in 1858 and 1859, he freed the serfs belonging to the imperial family, and then, in 1861, he celebrated the sixth year of his rule by issuing the Emancipation Law declaring serfdom totally abolished. The crown serfs were either made tenants on a long lease, or became free peasants with the privilege of paying for their lands on easy installments. Those working in the cities had only their freedom and became independent wage-earners. The lands of the nobles were divided into two parts, one remaining in possession of the lords and the other going to the peasants in the *mirs*, or villages, as common property. The *mirs* in turn parcelled out the land to the individual farmers for a given period, which by the law of 1893 had to be at least twelve years. The peasants had to pay the lords for these lands, but by agreement with the landlord the state supplied 80 per cent of the funds for these payments. These were regarded as payment in full and were distributed over a long period of time, to be collected in annual installments from the peasants. In 1863 the serfs in domestic service were freed and in 1866 the crown serfs were emancipated. About half of the arable land in Russia passed into the hands of the former serfs, and the remainder continued in the form of large estates until they were swept away by the Bolshevist Revolution.

To pay the nobles for the loss of their lands required a large amount of money. The state had advanced most of it, and now sought to collect it through taxes levied annually on the freed serfs for forty-nine years. This led to much discontent among the peasants, who complained that they were given the poorest sections of land, and were unjustly forced to purchase their own freedom. They grumbled about heavy taxes, and grew restless under the harsh tax-gatherers and tyrannical police. They talked much about the need of a "second emancipation" to give them their rights. Uprisings occurred in many places, but were put down by the strong arm of the paternal government. The *mir*, consisting of the heads of the family, determined the time to begin plowing, to plant the crops, and to reap them. No person could leave his land, even for a few days, without the *mir's* consent, unless he risked the forfeiture of his allotment of land. As a result of these harsh conditions, many peasants ran away and became factory hands in the cities, or laborers in the mines and forests. Once freed, the peasants were clamorous for more rights and privileges. These conditions must be taken into account to understand how the younger generation came to play such an important role in the upheavals of 1905 and 1917.

A whole series of excellent reforms accompanied the emancipation of the serfs. A new judicial system based on western models was decreed in 1863, and the next year a new code of laws, patterned after other European countries, was drawn up. The system of courts now

extended from local justices of the peace elected by the *zemstvos* to a court of last appeal. Court proceedings were open to the public and jury trial was provided for criminal cases, but political criminals were still tried secretly in the tsar's courts. A more modern system of local government was instituted by which the *mirs* were put under the control of assemblies composed of the heads of families. Above them district and provincial assemblies, called *zemstvos*, composed of representatives of the nobles, clergy, and *mirs*, levied local taxes and exercised rather wide legislative and administrative functions. These bodies were excellent training schools for self-government, and took an important part in the final overthrow of autocracy. Some attention was also given to the establishment of primary schools and technical education. The universities were allowed more liberty and more money, and the number of students increased rapidly. The press was granted a certain degree of freedom, and people were permitted to travel abroad. Steps were taken to utilize the enormous sources of natural wealth in the empire. The prospects seemed bright for a modernized Russia. *Other reforms*

The untimely and badly organized Polish revolt in 1863 aroused the hatred of the Russian nationalists, and was easily crushed by the tsar's troops without the aid of the Prussian soldiers offered by Bismarck. The Polish nobles suffered most, and the Roman Catholic clergy, who, it was believed, instigated the outbreak, were deprived of their ecclesiastical independence. The lands of the nobility were seized and given to the peasants without compensation to the former owners. The Roman Catholic monasteries were suppressed and their lands confiscated. Henceforth the Roman Catholic Church in Poland was ruled from St. Petersburg. Poland became the "Department of the Vistula" and disappeared from the map of Europe for more than half a century, while Lithuania was incorporated with Russia and renamed the "Department of the Northwest." *Polish revolt in 1863*

One of the most unfortunate results of the Polish insurrection was the change it produced in Alexander II. Statesmen of the old régime played on his fears, very much as Metternich influenced Alexander I until the humane tsar was convinced that a liberal policy fomented revolution instead of allaying it. Several attempts on his life, and the spread of radical ideas, caused him to revert to the harsh policy of Nicholas I. The *zemstvos* were deprived of much of their freedom and subjected to imperial authority. The press was again closely censored, and the schools and universities were carefully watched by spies. The hateful "Third Section" was revived and soon terrorized the whole country. Thousands of political suspects were arrested, and imprisoned or hurried off without trial to Siberia. Modern science and the social studies were rigidly excluded from the schools as dangerous. The army was "reformed" on the Prussian model and in 1874 compulsory service was required. These measures carried Russia backward instead of forward. *Alexan converts reaction*

Alexander's foreign policy

The foreign policy of Alexander II was centered in the desire to gain possession of Constantinople. To this end the tsar encouraged rebellion in Crete in 1865, and in 1870 aided the Bulgarians in securing independence in church matters. Taking advantage of the fall of Napoleon III, Russian rights on the Black Sea were enlarged, a navy was built, and Sebastopol was refortified in 1871. This policy led to the Russo-Turkish War in 1877–8, for the outbreak of which the tsar's attempted justification was the Turkish massacre of Christians in the Balkans. This time the western powers did not interfere, and Turkey was easily defeated. In the treaty of San Stefano (1878), Russia secured terms favorable to herself, besides special concessions to the Balkan states, but the European powers, in the Congress of Berlin in 1878, robbed Russia of most of the fruits of her victory.

As a result of the change of Alexander II from liberalism to absolutism during the latter part of his reign, there appeared an organized revolutionary movement. Many intellectual radicals in the universities and among the professional men, wished to abolish the mediaeval régime in Russia and to westernize the institutions of the country. They wanted a brand new Russia, and believed it could be created through education. When they were openly persecuted by the government, they organized secretly to spread their new gospel among the people. Many were forced to flee to Switzerland and to Great Britain. Herzen, a refugee in London, edited the *Bell* (*Kolokol*),

Reaction and "terrorism"

which was widely read in Russia. Clubs were organized to study history, industrial problems, and social conditions with the purpose of transforming Russia from an autocratic to a democratic nation. Propagandism, such as is described in Turgeniev's *Virgin Soil*, was carried on among the peasants and city workers to prepare them for the new order which was foreseen. A second group was composed of anarchistic socialists, inspired by the work and writings of Bakunin, who urged the destruction of the existing state, church, and family. Their recruits came from the workingmen and the ignorant peasants. Since peaceful means were denied them, they used bombs and assassinations. When balked in their propagandist efforts by the police, the majority of the revolutionists turned to terrorism. They formed a secret organization, which sought to frighten officials, nobles, and clergy into granting reforms, and had their own printing presses, system of spies, and laboratories for making deadly bombs. Members took an oath of implicit obedience to carry out all orders of the society's national committee. Within a short time six of the tsar's officers and nine government spies fell as the victims of their wrath. The terrorists were ferreted out and executed without mercy. At last, early in 1881, Alexander II was induced to authorize a special board to prepare a new series of reforms, but the decision was too tardy, for on March 13 a bomb ended his career.

The reform movement gave rise to the first great contribution made by Russia to the world's literature. Her novelists, historians, poets

and dramatists, through their native force and originality, and their deep moral earnestness in dealing with modern life, have aroused enthusiastic admirers in democratic countries. Gogol, the first novelist of original talent, in his *Dead Souls*, satirized all classes of society. Turgeniev, who spent many years in France and Germany, in his *Sportsman's Tales*, pictured the sad lot of the serf and did much to pave the way for his emancipation. His *Fathers and Sons*, pointing out the conflict between the old régime of autocracy and the new régime of democracy, inspired young Russians to new endeavors to modernize their country. Pushkin, the greatest Russian poet, sang paeans to liberty. Dostoievsky, sentenced to die for treason but instead exiled to Siberia, devoted his poverty-stricken life to explaining to the world the mind and heart of Russia. With his pen he painted the lot of the "humbled and injured" in the cities, the life of saint and sinner, the aristocrat and outcast, in all their human emotions. Leo Tolstoy, nobleman, novelist, and reformer, became a world-famous figure. His historical novel, *War and Peace*, caused people around the globe to think. In *Anna Karenina* he showed how true joy blesses those who practice the Golden Rule. He attacked injustice in government and society, and advocated non-resistance as the only moral weapon. Believing that the common peasant had achieved the most ideal life, he gave his estate to his wife, labored in the fields as a peasant, and ate the food of a humble farmer. So great was his influence that the government dared not lay hands on him. He delivered a powerful blow at autocracy and inspired millions to work for the dawn of a new day. Russian art depicted human suffering and human injustice, while Russian music was founded upon an inexhaustible wealth of unique folk-lore and its accompanying emotions.

Russian literature and Russian problems

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

A. Rambaud, *Histoire de la Russie depuis les origines jusqu'à nos jours*, 6th edition completed to 1913; English translation, 3 vols. (1881); R. Beazley, N. Forbes, G. A. Birkett, *Russia, from the Varangians to the Bolsheviks* (1918); A. Kornilov, *Modern Russian History*, 2 vols. (1917), (new edition 1924); T. Schiemann, *Geschichte Russlands unter Kaiser Nikolaus I*, 4 vols. (1904–1919); M. Kovalevsky, *Russian Political Institutions* (1902); J. Mavor, *An Economic History of Russia*, 2 vols. (1914); A. Thuns, *Geschichte der revolutionären Bewegungen in Russland* (1883); S. Stepniak (S. M. Krarchinskii), *Underground Russia* (1883); L. Kulczycki, *Geschichte der russischen Revolution*, German translation from the Polish, 3 vols. (1910–1914); P. Kropotkin, *Memoirs of a Revolutionist* (1899); *Russian Literature, Ideals, and Realities* (1915); A. Brückner, *A Literary History of Russia*, English translation by H. Havelock (1908); W. L. Phelps, *Essays on Russian Novelists* (edition 1916); A. J. Beveridge, *The Russian Advance* (1903); F. H. Skrine, *The Expansion of Russia* (3d edition 1915); Bernard Pares, *A History of Russia* (1925); S. A. Korff, *The Foreign Relations of Russia* (1922); *Autocracy and Revolution in Russia* (1923).

CHAPTER XIX

THE UNIFICATION OF THE UNITED STATES

I. The Lack of National Unity

While the settlements of the Congress of Vienna were falling to pieces before the onslaughts of democracy and nationalism in Europe, the Republic of the United States was expanding across the American continent. By 1860, through purchase and conquest, the nation extended over an area about as large as all Europe, and included a population of 31,500,000. This vast region was being rapidly cemented together by a network of highways, railroads, and canals. With the opening of mines and the building of factories the exploitation of the matchless natural resources of the country began. The establishment of schools and colleges was quite as marked as the raising of cotton and the creation of steamboats. Social reforms kept pace with the most progressive nations of the Old World. For the white race political democracy was farther advanced than anywhere else on earth. Excepting for the evil of Negro slavery, there were no privileged classes and no feudal system. Autocratic government was unknown, and the people as a whole were happy, prosperous, and proud of their native or adopted land.

Progress of American expansion

But the problem of complete national unity remained unsolved. To be sure, there was one constitution and one flag, but state rights and sectionalism had not yet been outgrown. So strong were the local loyalties that men regarded their status as New Yorkers or Virginians as of more consequence than that of Americans, while New Englanders, southerners, and westerners took more pride in their localities than in national citizenship. Washington foresaw the danger of sectionalism and warned the people against it. DeWitt Clinton resigned his seat in the Senate of the United States to be mayor of New York City. In the War of 1812 some of the states refused to permit their militia to fight outside of their territorial limits, and in 1814 the New England Federalists threatened to withdraw from the Union. The differences and jealousies between the North and the South became more and more accentuated as the years passed so that as new states were admitted, great care was taken to keep political power in Congress pretty evenly balanced between the states above, and those below, the "Mason Dixon line." For a time both sections were satisfied with the Missouri Compromise of 1820 — the "Dirty Bargain" — which made the line of 36° 30′ the division between free and slave territory in the Louisiana Purchase. When Congress passed a tariff in 1832, South Carolina voted the Ordinance of

Separatism in early nineteenth century

Nullification, and forced a modification of the tariff law. The same year Georgia set aside a decision of the national Supreme Court, and even repudiated a treaty made by the federal government. And so the dispute between state and national sovereignty went on until settled by a gigantic civil war.

2. The Civil War

The controversy over slavery further separated the North and the South. The doctrine of liberty as set forth during the American Revolution resulted in the abolition of slavery in many of the northern states, where it was of little economic value. The federal constitution provided that after a period of twenty years (1808) the importation of Negro slaves to the United States should cease. After the Missouri Compromise in 1820, the slave states became more aggressive in defending slavery as an economic necessity and as a moral good for both the slave and the master. The reaction on the North was the rise of the abolition movement. Lundy and Garrison, through their newspapers; Wendell Phillips, the orator; Whittier, the Quaker poet; Parker, the preacher; and Lowell, the essayist, all took up the cause of the freedom of the blacks. Reviled and even mobbed in the north, these advocates of human justice and democracy soon spoke to multitudes, and aroused public opinion until among the Northerners Negro servitude became a burning issue. The Liberty party was formed in 1840 to limit slavery by all constitutional means.

Meanwhile the free discussion of the slavery problem vanished in the south. In 1845 Texas was annexed as a slave state, and the Mexican War afforded further opportunity for sectional strife in Congress. The uproar over the admission of California as a "free state" ended in the Compromise of 1850, which, however, satisfied neither the North nor the South. The Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854 permitted the question of slavery in those two territories to be settled on the principle of "squatter sovereignty." Both sections rushed settlers into the region to control the vote and local warfare resulted. Out of that controversy was born the Republican party, which in 1856 polled 1,314,264 votes. When in 1857, in the Dred Scott decision, the Supreme Court decided that the national government could not prevent the introduction of slavery into a territory of the United States, the Republicans assailed it as "unconstitutional." Men like Lowell said that the question could be settled by war alone. Lincoln became the champion of a new nationalism in the north, while John Brown's fanatical raid convinced the South that slavery, to live, must be nationalized. Many thousands among the Northerners were won over to the abolitionists' views. The presidential election of 1860 was a crisis in the history of the Republic.

Slavery and secession

Four days after the election of Lincoln as President, the South Carolina legislature called a secession convention, which on December 20, 1860, declared that the state was no longer a member of the

Union. By February 1, 1861, six more states seceded. These seven states then summoned a constitutional convention, formed a "provisional constitution," and elected Davis and Stephens as president and vice president of the "Confederate States of America." Further efforts at compromise failed. The North refused to accept the decision of the Supreme Court on the slavery question as final; the South insisted that the dictum of that august tribunal should not be questioned. On this issue neither section would yield. Thousands in the north believed that the South should be permitted to secede, and President Buchanan argued that there was no way by which the national government could "coerce a state." When a ship carrying the American flag, went to provision federal troops in Fort Sumter in Charleston Harbor, she was fired on by a South Carolinian battery, January 9, 1861, and the war between nationalism and sectionalism began.

Policy of Lincoln

In his inaugural address on March 4, 1861, Lincoln held that "the Union" was "perpetual," and promised that the laws of the nation would "be faithfully executed in all the states." When Fort Sumter was captured by South Carolinian soldiers on April 14, President Lincoln immediately called for 75,000 volunteer troops. Four more southern states at once seceded, and both sides prepared in grim earnestness for the gigantic conflict that was to decide the question of American nationalism. The North with 22,000,000 people, of whom 3,500,000 were foreign-born, raised 2,500,000 soldiers. The South with 9,000,000 inhabitants, of whom 3,500,000 were slaves, 150,000 free negroes, and 300,000 foreigners, recruited 1,230,000 men for war. The naval superiority of the North enabled her to cut off the South from outside supplies, and in her factories and war materials the North also had an advantage. Still the South held out through four long years of heroic struggle, and surrendered only when no longer able to raise men and means of warfare. The unity of the nation was won at a tremendous cost. The North lost 360,000 men; the South 258,000, or a total of 618,000 lives. The United States spent $3,660,000,000; the Confederacy, $1,500,000,000. The destruction of northern merchant vessels amounted to $20,000,000. The North suffered small loss in property; the South was almost ruined commercially, and estimated its loss in slaves alone at $2,000,000,000.

Abolition of slavery

This conflict, called the "War of the States" in the south and the "Great Rebellion" in the north was a triumph for the nationalists. The doctrine of state sovereignty received its death blow, and henceforth, after a controversy that had lasted since 1787, the full sovereignty of the federal government was recognized. In 1862 Congress freed 3,000 slaves in the District of Columbia and paid their masters $300 for each slave. Slavery was also abolished, but without compensation, in all the territories. The property of rebels was likewise confiscated, and this included slaves, who were set free. Public opinion in the north finally induced President Lincoln in 1863 to

issue the Emancipation Proclamation which affected the status of more than 3,000,000 slaves. Just two years before, Tsar Alexander II had broken the shackles of millions of serfs in Russia.

In Europe the humanitarian wave which accompanied the French Revolution had as one of its planks the abolition of human slavery. Many of the conservatives joined the liberals in support of this demand, at least in countries occupied by whites. During the first half of the nineteenth century, therefore, the more enlightened states of Europe regarded it as a world disgrace that the United States should still tolerate slavery. Logically such states as Great Britain and France should have rejoiced over the outbreak of the Civil War and should have given their moral support to the anti-slavery side. One of the reasons why this did not occur was because the progressive forces, which had caused the outbreak of a series of revolutions, were all hostile to slavery. Consequently the conservatives, in a natural reaction, upheld the slave-owners, and attempted to give material assistance to the southern states. Following the example of the British government's proclamation of neutrality, other European and the Latin-American states declared their neutrality during the Civil War. Gladstone said: "Jefferson Davis and other leaders of the south have made an army; they are making, it appears, a navy; and they have made, which is more important than either, a nation." Hence the southern Confederacy was recognized as a belligerent power. When the southern commissioners, Mason and Slidell, started for Great Britain on a British ship to obtain recognition of the Confederacy as an independent nation, a northern warship seized them. Great Britain threatened war, unless they were released, but Lincoln had taken a position which would justify the United States in freeing them without appearing to act under a threat from England. Great Britain, hard-hit by the blockade, which cut off her cotton supply, and Napoleon III, who was seeking the conquest of Mexico, were considering mediation to end the war, when Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation put the war on a higher moral plane. Prominent Englishmen like Bright and Forster, and even Queen Victoria, were friendly to the North. Palmerston and Gladstone, however, viewed the war as an attempt of the more powerful North to tyrannically coerce an unwilling community to obedience. Throughout the war Russia, Prussia, Denmark, and Italy were friendly to the North.

Reconstruction policies and problems

After four years of fighting, it took eight more years to restore the Union, disrupted by secession. The most prominent leaders of the south were excluded from national offices, but not one of them was tried for treason. It was thought that the Negro question was solved by three amendments to the national constitution: the thirteenth amendment abolishing slavery in 1865; the fourteenth making Negroes citizens in 1868; and the fifteenth giving them the right to vote in 1870. Not until 1870 were all the seceding states readmitted to the

Union. To care for the millions of freed but homeless black people, Congress created the Freedman's Bureau in 1865. The assassination of Lincoln in that year made the problem of reconstruction much more difficult. The Supreme Court by its decisions sought to create "an indestructible union of indestructible states." The military officers sent down to govern the southern states vetoed laws, removed civil officials, dismissed legislatures, and issued decrees like despots instead of acting like the representatives of a democratic government. Southern Republicans and northern "Carpet-baggers" controlled the Negro vote and inaugurated a régime of corruption and extravagance past all belief. In self-protection the southern men joined the Democratic party and formed the "solid South" in national politics. An Amnesty Act in 1872 restored all but approximately 300 Confederate leaders to full political rights, and special laws soon reinstated many of these to their former status as citizens. The Supreme Court in 1875 declared the Civil Rights Act unconstitutional, and thus permitted the southern states to discriminate against the Negro in hotels and on railway trains. The Ku-Klux-Klan sought to terrorize the blacks and thus restore and preserve white ascendancy. The dark-skinned Americans secured freedom, but as yet they enjoy neither full civil rights nor social democracy.

3. Social, Economic, and Educational Progress

The emancipation of several millions of black people from a state of servitude was the greatest social change that had ever occurred in the life of the nation. Hundreds of thousands of Negroes went north to form a section in nearly every village and city. Much was done to relieve their needs and to supply them with employment. Meantime the white population was spreading from the east into the middle and far west. The old towns were expanding into ugly, clumsy cities, and new cities were springing up to the westward. These cities were poorly-lighted, inadequately drained, badly policed, and most of them without paved streets. New York City in 1857 had the first uniformed and disciplined body of policemen. Washington was an unpaved bog in time of rains, and pigs and cows roamed through the streets. Adequate systems to supply fresh water were just being constructed. Village greens were common, but Central Park laid out in New York City in 1857 was the first large city park. After 1854 horse cars were rather widely used. From 1845 to 1855 more than a million Irish immigrants found homes in the New World, and the series of European wars from 1848 to 1871 resulted in the coming of hundreds of thousands from the continent to America. Even Chinese and Japanese began to cross the Pacific to labor in California and Oregon.

Social progress

The natural resources of the nation were opened up on a greater scale through the large supply of cheap labor. Lumbering developed into a paying industry. The first oil wells were sunk in 1859, and

soon methods of refining crude oil gave the world kerosene and other products. Natural gas was discovered and widely used for lighting, heating, and manufacturing. Mining was developed by leaps and bounds. Agriculture, horticulture, and stock raising spread across the continent. In 1860 the South exported cotton to the value of $191,000,000, and after the Civil War this lucrative business was revived. Express companies were organized, and in 1851 letter postage was reduced to three cents. Mills and factories multiplied in the north. The iron industry was revolutionized by the Bessemer process. The telegraph was supplemented by the first cable across the Atlantic in 1866. Free delivery of mail (1863), money orders, and mail cars (1864) expedited business. The enactment of a homestead law in 1862 and the completion of telegraph and railroad communication with the Pacific coast by 1869 facilitated the settlement of post-war problems and gave impetus to the settlement of the west. Hundreds of new inventions put the United States among the leading industrial countries of the world. New corporations, banks, and insurance companies appeared. Labor became better organized and through strikes and boycotts sought higher wages and shorter hours. In the economic life of the world, the United States, particularly for the period following the Civil War, began to occupy a more conspicuous place.

Industrial developments

The educational progress of the nation was seen in the general spread of education through the free public schools and the attention given to grading and supervision. About 1850 superintendents were appointed to oversee the grade schools in the cities. At the same time efforts were made to improve the secondary schools and colleges, while true universities were appearing here and there. The University of Iowa in 1856 admitted women to all departments. The press, library, platform, and pulpit spread knowledge among the people. The churches were becoming national until the Civil War created a schism in some of them. Whittier, Longfellow, Emerson, Hawthorne and other writers were creating a new national literature. Such journals as the *North American Review*, *Harper's*, and the *Atlantic Monthly*, made their appearance. Historians like Bancroft and Prescott were followed by Motley and Parkman. The South could point to Poe and Simms as literary stars.

Cultural changes

4. The Achievements of Nationalism to 1880

As one surveys the period of world history from 1820 to 1880 it stands out in strong relief as preëminently an age of nationalism. Most of the insurrections were nationalistic in character, and the doctrine of the mission of the national state, preached as fervently as a religious creed by all groups of people, was a decisive factor in moulding the course of human events. In Greece, Latin America and Belgium national states were created before 1848, while the spirit of nationalism led to needed reforms in Great Britain, France

and the United States. Everywhere, in the Old World and the New, this nationalistic awakening inspired peoples to new impulses and ambitions. Oppressed peoples, such as the Poles, Italians, Hungarians, Slavs, Germans, and Irish were dreaming and planning for the day of national emancipation. The thirty years from 1848 to 1878 was one of nationalistic realization. Three great world powers — Italy, Germany and Japan — were created; and three smaller states — Serbia, Rumania, Bulgaria and Montenegro — gained an independent status. Hungary secured all the rights of a self-governing state, as an equal ally of the Austrian Empire. The Poles, Czecho-Slovaks, and Jugo-Slavs were defeated in their aspirations for separate political organization. The national integrity of the United States was saved only by the Civil War. France was once more transformed into a republic, the Third, which has endured to the present time. By 1878 the political geography of Europe was simplified and clarified. The sore spots resulting from the failure of nationalism to attain its goal, consisting chiefly of Alsace-Lorraine, Poland, the groups in Austria-Hungary, Norway, *Italia irredenta*, the Balkans, and Ireland were to cause disturbances for the next forty years.

Natural independence and unification

For thirty years after 1820 there occurred in Europe and in Latin America a relatively large number of liberal insurrections and revolutions, mostly within existing political organizations, which had for their objectives the overthrow of autocratic rule and the attainment of a greater degree of self-government. For the thirty years following 1848, with the exception of the small outbreaks in Poland and Greece in 1863, the secession of the South in the United States, and the bloody frenzy of the Paris *Commune* in 1871, the states of the world were remarkably free from internal upheavals. With the attainment of nationalism, came a development of the institutions of self-government far more remarkable than during the epoch of liberal revolutions. By 1878 most of the European and American states possessed constitutions and systems of modernized governments, which were to prove fairly stable and enduring. After 1878, with the exception of the Balkans, there were in Europe comparatively few major political changes of much significance until the World War.

Decline of revolution

The development of nationalism was accompanied by the growth of political democracy and constitutional government. Among the different racial groups in Austria-Hungary the two forces, nationalism and democracy, continued to thwart each other. Elsewhere, national unity aided the establishment of popular government to a greater or lesser degree. In Germany and Italy the cause of the people was identified with the ambitions of the government, and hence hostility to the ruling powers tended to disappear as concessions of more liberal institutions were made. Reformers planned to advance progressive measures through parliamentary bodies chosen by an extended franchise rather than by revolution. Certainly a distinct gain

Development of democracy

was made for civilization when peaceable progress became the watchcry of the democratic national state.

Two forces, socialism and autocratic imperialism, were the enemies of nationalism. Socialism in one form or another sought to ignore national boundaries and institute a class-war against the capitalists in all countries. To accomplish their goal, they formed political parties and thus sought to gain control of the government. In 1868 the Social Democratic party, under Bebel's leadership in Germany, was organized to labor for the realization of the Marxian program. Had its ideals been realized fully, the socialist movement would have destroyed national unity everywhere. But it failed because the workingmen were largely loyal to the new national ideal, and because the national governments were sufficiently strong to prevent its triumph. Autocratic imperialism successfully thwarted the realization of nationalism in central and eastern Europe. In Germany the people of Alsace-Lorraine, Posen, and Schleswig were compelled to remain subject to Prussia. In Austria-Hungary, the Slavic and Italian groups were ruled by Austrians and Hungarians. In Russia, the Poles, Lithuanians, Letts, Esthonians and Finns were denied autonomy. In the Balkans, Turkey tyrannized over the subjected Christian nationalities. And in the United Kingdom, Ireland did not enjoy self-government.

Socialism and imperialism

The effects of the growth of nationalism on world civilization were both good and bad. On the whole it encouraged democracy and helped to extend the right of the people to participate in government. It tended to reduce the power of kings and emperors by establishing popular legislatures, and by creating systems of free, national education. It reduced the danger of disruption through internal revolution, and assured the triumph of law, liberty, private property, and orderly progress. On the other hand, nationalism tended to a narrowing of ideals and sympathies; to an intolerance of everything "foreign"; to a selfish and bigoted type of patriotism; to an undue praise of national history, art, literature, language, music, and institutions. Consequently it bred dangerous rivalries and animosities among nations, and led to alliances of one group of nations against another group. It brought the policies and "vital interests" of one nation into conflict with those of another. Each nation sought to become entirely self-supporting by securing new territory and the control of new markets. Distrust and hatred grew apace until, finally, to realize national ideals, the nation-state felt it imperative to build a formidable navy and to possess a powerful standing army. Europe became an armed camp in defense of nationalism, the result of which was the World War in 1914.

Nationalism, culture and civilization

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

J. S. Bassett, *A Short History of the United States* (2d edition 1921); J. F. Rhodes, *History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850*, 7 vols. (1892–1906); *The Civil War*

(1918); W. E. Dodd, *Expansion and Conflict* (1915); *The Cotton Kingdom* (1921); W. M. Meigs, *Life of Calhoun*, 2 vols. (1917); A. B. Hart, *Slavery and Abolition* (1906); G. P. Garrison, *Westward Extension* (1906); T. C. Smith, *Parties and Slavery* (1906); A. Johnson, *Stephen A. Douglas* (1908); J. G. Nicolay and John Hay, *Abraham Lincoln, a History*, 10 vols. (1890); I. M. Tarbell, *Life of Abraham Lincoln*, 2 vols. (1900); Lord Charnwood, *Abraham Lincoln* (1915); E. D. Fite, *Social and Industrial Conditions in the North during the Civil War* (1910); C. F. Adams, *Charles Francis Adams* (1900); F. Bancroft, *Life of Seward*, 2 vols. (1900); N. W. Stephenson, *The Day of the Confederacy* (1920); W. E. Dodd, *Life of Jefferson Davis* (1907); H. U. Faulkner, *American Economic History* (1924); W. A. Dunning, *Reconstruction, Political and Economic* (1908); P. L. Haworth, *The United States in Our Own Times, 1865–1920* (1920); J. R. Commons et al., *History of Labour in the United States*, 2 vols. (1920); C. R. Lingley, *Since the Civil War* (1920); F. L. Paxson, *Recent History of the United States* (1921); E. L. Bogart, *Economic History of the United States* (1913); I. Lippincott, *The Economic Development of the United States* (1920); Bliss Perry, *The American Spirit in Literature* (1921); E. E. Slosson, *The American Spirit in Education* (1921); C. F. Thwing, *History of Higher Education in America* (1906); E. G. Dexter, *History of Education in the United States* (1904); A. M. Schlesinger, *A Political and Social History of the United States, 1829–1925* (1925); L. B. Shippee, *Recent American History* (1924); D. S. Muzzey, *The United States of America*, 2 vols. (1924).

PART VI

NATIONAL CONSOLIDATION
INDUSTRIAL AND WORLD POWERS

CHAPTER XX

GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

1. Neutrality and Foreign Relations

After the elimination of Napoleon from the public life of Europe in 1815, Great Britain enjoyed a long interval of peace, until, about the middle of the nineteenth century, her imperial interests led to a series of foreign wars: (1) She joined in the Crimean War against Russia to preserve the integrity of Turkey. (2) In 1857 all northern India rose in the Sepoy revolt against British rule. With the aid of loyal native troops from other sections, and fresh soldiers from home, the British were able to put down the insurrection. The mutinous native troops were punished and all who were suspected of instigating the massacre were sent to death, oftimes with the greatest cruelty. (3) Three wars occurred with China — the Opium War of 1839–40, the war of 1857–60, and that of 1860 — which secured for the British valuable trading rights. (4) In 1862 there was a short war with Japan. (5) Similar petty conflicts took place in Ashantee, Abyssinia, Burma, Can Reb (1837), Tasmania (1830), Afghanistan (1839, 1842), New Zealand, and with the Kaffirs (1819, 1834, 1846, 1850), Boers (1848), Basutos (1851), Zulus and Kaffirs in South Africa. As a result the British Empire was extended and British commerce considerably increased.

Foreign war

The Civil War in the United States won friends for the South among the conservative upper classes, and champions for the North among the common people. The blockade of southern ports shut out British goods and closed the textile mills by cutting off the supply of cotton. Idle workers, the high cost of living, and anger at the seizure of Mason and Slidell from a British ship, caused the English government to send troops to Canada preparatory to a declaration of war on the North. But Lincoln's apology for the capture of the two Confederate commissioners averted a conflict. Great Britain declared neutrality, but secretly favored the South by permitting cruisers to be built in British shipyards. In the case of the "Alabama" and several other cruisers, the guilt of Great Britain was so evident that the Geneva Tribunal, ten years later, awarded $15,000,000 in damages to the United States. On the whole, however, the British government preserved its neutrality faithfully in the face of much pressure at home and provocation abroad.

Great Britain and the United States

2. Political Reforms

Since 1832 there had been no extension of the franchise and no change in the distribution of seats in the House of Commons. Agita-

tion for the granting of the right to vote to all Englishmen culminated in the Chartist movement, which, however, accomplished nothing directly. When Gladstone in 1866 led the movement for the extension of suffrage, only one man in six in Great Britain had a vote. To win the support of the people, Disraeli secured the passage of the Reform Bill of 1867, which reduced the number of parliamentary seats in 46 towns and gave them to the larger cities and more populous counties. At the same time the right to vote was extended to all men who paid a small sum in taxes or rent, so that now at least two thirds of the men voted for members of the House of Commons. Only the poor farm laborers and the poorest workingmen in the cities remained disfranchised. The elections of 1868 swept the Liberals into power with Gladstone as prime minister. The Ballot Act of 1872 introduced the practice of secret voting in British elections. When the farm laborers struck for better wages and demanded the right to vote, Gladstone became their champion and, against much opposition, secured the passage of the Reform Bill of 1884, which increased the voters from 3,000,000 to over 5,000,000. The next year more than a hundred of the smaller towns were made parts of the counties in which they lay, and their representatives were given to the larger cities and thickly settled counties. At the same time the electoral districts were equalized all over the kingdom. Gladstone now boasted that the people were arrayed in "one solid, compacted mass around the ancient throne, which it had loved so well, and around a constitution now to be more than ever powerful, and more than ever free."

Extension of the suffrage

The middle class was enfranchised in 1832; the workingmen in the towns and cities in 1867; and the poorer people in the rural districts in 1884. The next year representation was adjusted to the population, and the members of the House of Commons increased from 658 to 670, with 72 for Scotland, 103 for Ireland, and 495 for England and Wales. These conditions continued unchanged until 1918. Since a man voted, not as a natural right but as an owner or user of property, some 2,000,000 men were still deprived of the right to vote for members of Parliament. Further, since a man voted in every district where he met the property qualifications, nearly 525,000 men were plural voters, some having as many as twenty votes. Consequently the cry, "one man, one vote," arose, and complaints were made that, since the population had again shifted to the industrial centers, the earlier apportionment of seats was no longer equitable. For instance, in 1912 an English borough with 56,000 voters and an Irish borough with only 1,700 voters had the same number of members in the House of Commons. Finally, women taxpayers who in 1869 were given the right to vote in municipal elections, began to demand the right to vote for members of Parliament. Their claim to this privilege was greatly strengthened by the demonstration during the World War of their ability to share in the

Woman suffrage

difficult tasks confronting the nation. To meet these new conditions, the People's Act of 1918 was passed (1) giving a vote to all males without regard to taxes or property; (2) limiting the number of votes that an elector could cast to two; (3) permitting absent soldiers and sailors to vote by mail, and lowering their age limit to nineteen years; and (4) granting to every woman over thirty the right to vote. Thus the franchise was further extended to 2,000,000 men and to 8,000,000 women, making Great Britain one of the most complete democracies on earth.

Another important political reform occurred in connection with local government, when in 1882 the right to vote for city officers was extended to all inhabitants, whether property holders or not. The acts of 1888 and 1894 created representative councils in the counties and parishes chosen by both men and women. To these bodies was given authority over such matters as education, health, and the poor. In this way the British people have come to rule themselves by the will of the majority in both local and national affairs.

Local government reforms

While local government, the House of Commons, and the cabinet were now democratic, the House of Lords remained as the bulwark of class privilege. For a century the "mending or ending" of the Lords was a burning issue in British politics. When in 1909 Lloyd George proposed a heavy income tax and other burdens on the rich, the Lords, by a vote of 350 to 75, rejected his budget. Since for a long time it was assumed that the Lords had no control over money matters, the House of Commons voted that this rejection by the Lords was a "breach of the constitution and a usurpation of the rights of the House of Commons." Supported by the nation, the House of Commons passed the Parliament Act of 1911 and the angry Lords were obliged to sanction it. This measure provided that any law dealing with the financial matters of the nation, passed by the Commons and refused by the Lords, should after one month be sent to the king and, with his signature, become law. Other bills rejected by the Lords, if passed by the Commons in three successive sessions, also became law. Provision was made, however, that two years must elapse between the second reading of the bill in the first session and its third passage. As a result of the curtailment of the authority of the House of Lords, it has less power today than the Senate of the United States. The legal term of Parliament was lowered from seven to five years in order to insure more frequent national elections. With the Lords' loss of all veto power over money bills and the retention of only a suspensive veto over other laws, the House of Commons is now the unquestioned sovereign power of the nation.

Decline of House of Lords

3. The Government of Great Britain

The British government differs from that of the United States in six important ways: (1) It has a flexible and only partly written rather than a rigid, written constitution. (2) It places much more

Government of England and United States

power in the lower house of the national legislature. (3) It is centralized and not federalized. (4) It uses the cabinet as the real executive, which reflects the will of the majority in the Commons. (5) The governmental powers are united and not separated, and are continually changing. The constitution is made up of many documents, legal precedents, written laws, and unwritten practices — the product of fifteen centuries of political growth — and it has not yet reached a final form. Parliament has the power to alter the constitution at will, and by the common processes of law making. (6) There is no supreme court to decide on the constitutionality of legislation. To an American, the British political system seems at once "royal, aristocratic, and democratic." Prior to 1832 the aristocracy were in control; then the middle class came into power; and with more recent extensions of the franchise and the abolition of the veto power of the Lords, the government is on a truly democratic basis. Yet both the king and the Lords remain and perform valuable services in the British system.

To an onlooker the king seems to play an important role. He lives in splendid palaces, owns large estates, enjoys personal immunity, and cannot be arrested or called to account for his private conduct in any court of law. On his accession, George V was voted an annual income of $2,300,000. He sets the example in all social circles, occupies the center of the stage in all official ceremonies, and reigns "by the grace of God." Viewed more closely, however, he is

The king

little more than a national guide-post with the "right to encourage and the right to warn." Like the Union Jack, he stands symbolically for the unity and permanency of the Empire, and for the majesty of the law. "The king reigns, but does not rule," and the "crown" is no longer the king, but merley "a convenient working hypothesis." Laws are passed and enforced, and court decisions made, in the name of the "crown," yet the real executive, or "crown," is not the monarch but the ministry, which is directly responsible to the majority in the House of Commons.

The ministry is composed of about sixty of the highest executive heads, nominally appointed by the king, but in reality selected by the prime minister, who reflects the will of the party in power. In theory custom obligates these ministers to resign at once, if the House of Commons expresses a decided disapproval of their policy.

The ministry

About twenty of these ministers, who fill the most important positions, form an inner circle known as the cabinet, which shapes the policy of the government. Although the most powerful factor in the British system, the cabinet until recently was wholly unknown to law. In 1906 this office for the first time was recognized by law. The head of the cabinet is the prime minister, who is always the acknowledged leader of the majority party. The prime minister chooses his own associates, and serves as the connecting link between the king and Parliament; with other cabinet members he sits

in the House of Commons to explain all important acts and bills. The cabinet exercises administrative powers, directs legislation, and continues in office as long as it enjoys the confidence of the House of Commons. When an adverse vote is passed by the Commons, one of three things may occur — either the cabinet immediately resigns, or it may bow to the will of the majority as the Ramsay MacDonald cabinet did on half a dozen occasions, or else the House may be dissolved and a new election held. Should the new House support the cabinet's policy, it remains in office; if it does not, then the leader of the "opposition" is asked to form a cabinet. In the British government the cabinet is the "keystone of the arch," and has so notably proved its success as an agency of the people's will that it has been generally copied over the world.

The strain of the World War forced some significant changes in the cabinet system. Many new departments were created to meet the abnormal situation. In 1915 a "coalition" cabinet was formed of representatives of all parties, but it soon proved too cumbersome to conduct business for the efficient direction of the war. Hence the next year a "war cabinet" of five members, with Lloyd George as prime minister, was formed, to which a sixth member was added later. This "war cabinet" continued in power after peace was made, until the election of 1922 returned the conservative Unionists to power with sufficient strength to restore the pre-war cabinet system. In 1917 and again in 1918 the prime ministers of the self-governing British colonies were asked to attend a series of special meetings of the cabinet in order to secure more effective coöperation in waging the war. It is one of the peculiarities of British political procedure that these variations occurred without any formal authorization by Parliament.

Imperial coöperation

The British Parliament, constitutionally, is made up of two houses: the Lords and Commons. The House of Lords is composed of hereditary peers, bishops, and peers created by the king. The Commons by the act of 1918 included 707 members elected by the people for a term of five years, unless Parliament is dissolved sooner. Any British voter is eligible for a seat. As the prime organ of the people's will, the House is virtually Parliament, and is commonly so designated as the source of sovereignty. In the United States elections occur at fixed periods; in Great Britain they may take place at any time the prime minister wishes to appeal to the people, and must be held at least every five years. The law of 1918 fixed the amount any candidate may spend on elections at about fourteen cents for each voter in the county electoral district and ten cents for each voter in the borough district. The House elects its own presiding officer, called the "speaker," who is supplied with a home and a stipend of $25,000 pearly. Such officers as the clerk and sergeant-at-arms are named for life by the king. This powerful body, without a written constitution to limit its actions, without a su-

Parliament

preme court to declare its acts unconstitutional, and without a veto by the Lords or king to nullify its measures, governs the country with wisdom and sanity. Through a long historical process the Commons has acquired powers that once belonged to the king and the Lords. Since 1919 there has been much discussion of the "devolution" of the government of Great Britain, which would give England, Scotland, and Wales subordinate legislatures, called crown councils, to relieve Parliament of a multitude of purely local problems with which it is at present swamped. There has also been considerable discussion of the further reform of the House of Lords.

4. Political Parties

England was the first modern country to develop the system of political parties, which today prevails in all democratic nations. After the seventeenth century the two-party organization emerged and became an integral part of the government. The political arena witnessed a clash between the Whigs and Tories, or the Liberals and Conservatives as they were called after 1850. The Tories were in power prior to 1830, after which, with the exception of a few brief periods, the Whigs or Liberals controlled the government until 1874.

British political parties

The Liberals stood for individual liberty, stressed free trade, sought to break down the rule of the landed aristocracy and hereditary privilege, wished to curtail the power of the state church, urged equality before the law, and championed Irish home rule, the extension of suffrage, the betterment of the lot of the workingmen, and democratic ideals. From 1874 to 1905, except for nine years of Liberal rule, the Conservatives were in power. Their earlier slogan for "the Crown, the Church, and the Constitution" was considerably altered by the irresistible march of events. They accepted certain democratic reforms, which were well safeguarded against excesses, and showed an eagerness to redress grievances growing out of competition in industry. Their imperialistic policy culminated in the South African War (1899–1902). They stood before the nation as the guarantors of law, order, and property. In 1886 Gladstone's first bill for home rule in Ireland led a large section of the Liberals under Chamberlain to secede to the Conservatives, who thereupon adopted the name of Unionists. In 1905 the Liberals returned to power and governed Great Britain until 1915, when the coalition cabinet was formed for the better prosecution of the World War.

Each of these two great parties was strong enough to restrain the other, and yet one of them always ruled in the House of Commons. "His Majesty's Government" is the victorious party; "His Majesty's Opposition" is the defeated party. Both parties are so broadly national in their policies that notwithstanding heated debates and apparent differences, many broad-minded men find it easy to change from one to the other. In general the Unionists opposed Irish home rule, and favored an aggressive foreign policy, tariff reform in the

direction of protection, moderate social legislation, and reasonable land reform. To check the supremacy of the House of Commons, they urged a popular referendum on all important laws about which the two houses disagreed. They represented the landlords, farmers, the clergy of the state church and many men of wealth in industry. The Liberals championed Irish self-government, free trade, radical social legislation, restriction of the liquor traffic, the abolition of plural voting, and the supremacy of the House of Commons. Prior to the World War their leader was Lloyd George, who advocated a sweeping program of social democracy. Their strength came from the middle class and the laboring classes in the industrial centers, where human welfare was bound up with coal, iron, and commerce. Two minor political parties appeared in recent years. The Irish Nationalists, localized in Ireland before a self-governing status was obtained by the Irish, sought either home rule or complete independence, and often held the balance of power in the House of Commons. The Laborites, organized about the end of the last century by the trade-unions, and composed of workers and sympathetic intellectuals, desired in general to promote the welfare of the laboring masses. Before the World War neither of these two parties was strong enough to play any important role alone. After 1906, however, by uniting with the Liberals, they exercised a profound influence on legislation. The Labor party in that year had 29 seats in the House of Commons, and by 1914 the number had been increased to 42. Early in 1918 the Labor party adopted a national democratic organization and appealed for support to all who worked "by hand or brain." Since the World War the Laborites have increased their membership greatly, and have set forth a comprehensive program of social and economic reconstruction in British industries. In the elections of 1922 they won 142 seats, and in the elections of December, 1923, succeeded in winning control of Parliament with 191 seats. It remains to be seen whether the Labor party will become one of the great parties, by absorbing the Liberals, or whether it will be swallowed up by the Liberals.

Party programs

5. Social Reforms

In recent years it has been felt that the two most pressing social problems are: (1) the unequal distribution of wealth; and (2) the ownership of land by a few persons. Industries, mines, railways, and ships are in the possession of capitalists, who have the means to enjoy life, while their hired workers, who constitute a vast majority of the men and women and children of the nation, have neither sufficient leisure for recreation, nor adequate pay for food and clothing, nor comfortable homes in which to rear their families. Crime, disease, overwork, ignorance, and deprivation continually confront the working people. The workers in the congested industrial centers early in the nineteenth century formed "labor unions" through

Labor unionism

which by collective bargaining they hoped to obtain higher wages and shorter hours. When Parliament forbade these organizations and sent men to jail for violating the law, the workers formed secret unions. Public opinion became so strong in support of the labor unions that in 1824 the prohibition was partly removed, and a decade later under Robert Owen a "Grand Consolidated Trades Union" came into existence. The "strike" as a weapon to secure reforms was regarded by the government as a conspiracy against legal business, and punishable by the criminal code. Not until 1871 were labor unions fully legalized, strikes permitted, and collective bargaining freely allowed. British labor unions now increased rapidly and set an example for skilled wage-earners in other countries. After the successful dockers' strike in 1889, the unionization of unskilled labor made much headway. The railway men of the Taff Vale Railway in Wales struck and "picketed" the road to prevent the company from using non-union men. The railroad company then brought action in court against the union and in 1901 it was found guilty by the House of Lords and sentenced to make good the losses to the railway company. As a result the labor unions in the nation were so aroused that they joined the Liberals in enacting the Trades Dispute Act of 1906, which permitted "picketing," and forbade suits against trade-unions for compensation on the ground of violation of agreement.

The workers now advanced their interests through both the union and the Labor party. In each election new victories were won. The Lords in 1909 decided that the funds of unions could not be spent for political purposes. The House, however, in 1911 voted to pay each of its members a salary of $2,000 a year, which enabled the Labor members to devote all their time to their duties, and afterwards enacted a law permitting unions to use their money for party needs, if approved by a majority vote of their members. Serious labor troubles and strikes from 1911 to 1914 caused general alarm. Meanwhile labor unions were uniting in larger and more powerful organizations until in 1914 the Miners' Federation, the National Union of Railwaymen, and the Transport Workers' Federation, included more than 1,500,000 members. In 1920 about 60 per cent. of the manual workers were in trade-unions, and they had 70 members in Parliament. Largely as a result of the idealism of the World War, the Labor party demanded the nationalization of the coal mines and the means of transportation, and the settlement of world problems on the basis of genuine democracy.

The British Labor Party

The bad conditions among the workers led to some salutary reforms. In 1878 the previous laws regulating labor in industry were united into a single code, and provisions were made for the inspection and sanitation of factories and mills. This code was revised in 1902, when the minimum age of child workers was raised to twelve years, and the general working conditions improved. In 1908 the Mines Code

extended these regulations to the mines. Two years later an eight-hour day for miners, and in 1912 a minimum wage, were created. The Workman's Compensation Act of 1906 required employers to pay their workers for accident or sickness. Pensions of $1.25 a week were provided in 1908 for poor workers over seventy. In 1914 over a million old people were drawing this pension. In London alone 100,000 tenants were housed in modern homes built by the government. An effort was made to give every laborer "a garden patch." Labor exchanges were established to find employment for the idle workers. Wage boards representing the workers, the employers, and the government were organized to adjust wages on a fair scale. Finally the government provided insurance against illness, injury and unemployment. These measures were based on the theory that all society should bear the burdens of the working classes for the general welfare of the nation.

Loud were the complaints in Great Britain because the land was in the possession of a few rich landlords. As in feudal days, less than 5,000 persons held the greater part of the soil of the nation. In England proper 27 noblemen had come into the ownership of about 10 per cent of all the fields and forests, while in Scotland 1,700 persons laid claim to 90 per cent of the territory. Further, quite a number of the largest estates in the nation were "entailed," that is, they went from the father to the eldest son and could not be sold or broken up. Thus it was that these landed aristocrats, without manual toil, collected from their tenants annually in rents millions of dollars.

Land problems in Great Britain

The land problem was so serious that statesmen became greatly alarmed over the situation. The tenant farmers and farm "hands" were dwindling, and farming declined until the crops fell far short of feeding the population. The landlords paid taxes only on that part of their lands directly used by themselves, while the tenants paid taxes on all the remainder. Before 1909 the lands reserved for game and gardens were also exempt from taxation, and the game wardens alone increased in half a century from 9,000 to 23,000. In that year Lloyd George cited the case of a Welsh tailor who was assessed $4,700 on 800 square yards of land, while a near-by marquis was assessed only $4,600 on 500,000 square yards. Vast sections were reserved for hunting instead of being cultivated to feed the people. Between 1889 and 1909 about 1,500,000 acres of tillable soil were withdrawn from cultivation. During the World War most of this idle land was plowed up and planted to crops, and it will never be given up again to idle users. Since the leases of tenants were for short periods, they took no pains either to enrich the soil or to make improvements. Increased rents caused much discontent, and the hard work, low pay and long hours induced thousands of farm laborers to flock to the cities or to leave for the colonies. More than half of the farm laborers were getting less than $4.50 a week for their toil.

The situation was serious, and it was felt that land reforms must

be made. To remedy the evils in the rural districts, over 56,000 farm cottages were declared unsuitable for families to live in, and a government commission was named to study the farm problems. In 1913–14 it recommended: (1) a living minimum wage for all farm hands; (2) the erection at public cost of modern homes for the farmers; (3) repayment for such improvements as the tenants made; (4) the prohibition of the "sporting tenant"; (5) radical changes in the game laws; (6) an increase in the number of small, independent farmers; and (7) the creation of a land court to settle all questions growing out of agricultural conditions. The outbreak of the World War prevented the immediate realization of these reforms, but they serve as an ideal towards which the government is working. Today in Great Britain only 6 per cent of the people are engaged in agriculture, while in Italy the number is 35 per cent, in France 40 per cent, in Russia 72 per cent, and in Jugo-Slavia 80 per cent.

Proposed agrarian reforms

6. Educational Changes and Religious Reforms

The education of the children in Great Britain was delayed by the hostility of the nobility and the clergy, who feared that knowledge for the common people would make them restless, atheistical revolutionists. Ignorance and order, they argued, were preferable to intelligence and disorder. The church, and not the state, they said, should supervise education. As a result of these ideas illiteracy in 1850 averaged about 40 per cent among adults. Prior to 1870 perhaps a majority of the children received no adequate training in schools, and such schools as did exist were under the control of the church or private organizations. But the conviction gradually prevailed that an enlightened democracy must replace an uneducated one. Men like Bentham, Blackstone, Owen, and Adam Smith were advocates of universal education, enforced attendance, and a national system of schools. The social changes under the Industrial Revolution began to favor better educational advantages. It is necessary "to induce our future masters to learn their letters," exclaimed Robert Lowe. The Liberals, particularly under the leadership of Gladstone, championed national education, and in 1870 passed the Forster Act, which began the first public school system. Its purpose was neither to replace the church schools, nor to deprive them of government grants, but only to "fill in the gaps." Hence wherever the need was felt, non-sectarian "board schools," paid for in greater part by local taxes, were set up. Parents still paid "fees" and the government made small appropriations to support these schools.

Backwardness of public education

The rivalry between the private "voluntary schools" and the public "board schools," especially over national funds, became very bitter. The former demanded more financial aid from the government. Laws requiring compulsory attendance were passed between 1876 and 1899 for all children up to twelve years, and in the latter

year a central Board of Education was created. In 1902 local school boards were replaced by county and borough boards to control the "board schools," while the "voluntary schools" were left under sectarian management, but both were permitted to receive support from local taxes. The various groups of Non-conformists, who had supported their own schools out of their own pockets, indignantly refused to pay the local school taxes. Some of them were put in jail and the property of others was confiscated. In 1906 the Liberals passed a law in the Commons asserting: (1) that only those schools controlled by the state should be considered as a part of the public school system; (2) that instruction in religion was not compulsory; and (3) that teachers should not be required to pass an examination on their religious beliefs. But the Lords vetoed this bill, and thus, for the time, prevented the creation of a system of public, secular, elementary schools. It remained for the Education Act of 1918 to inaugurate such a system. This law increased the pay of teachers, made school attendance compulsory for all children up to 14 years of age and provided continuation schools for children up to 18 years of age. The employment of children under 12 years of age was prohibited, and of children over 12 years of age only out of school hours. Fees in public, elementary and continuation schools were abolished. Provision was made also for nursery schools, for school camps and playgrounds, and for physical training and medical inspection. Special grants were made for secondary schools. At last England had a "national system of public education."

Private versus public schools

Education Act of 1918

The paltry sum of $100,000 voted by Parliament in 1833 to aid in building schoolhouses had increased by 1861 to $4,000,000 for general educational purposes. In 1913 the total sum of local and national funds raised was $150,000,000; and this budget was increased by 1922 to more than $350,000,000. Aroused at last to the need of governmental supervision of education, the Children's Welfare Act of 1908 sought to improve the lot of juveniles from the prevention of infant mortality, free meals for poor children, and industrial schools, to the salvation of youthful criminals.

The secondary schools, known in Great Britain as "Public Schools," established by private endowments from the sixteenth century on — such as St. Paul's, Eton, Westminster, and others — have continued down to the present time. During the nineteenth century the "nine Great Public Schools" were supplemented by others, and their course of study was gradually modernized. But until the present century England had no national system of secondary education, and the entrance to secondary schools from the elementary schools was narrowly restricted. The educational acts of 1902, 1907, and 1918, however, revolutionized secondary education. By 1911 there were 862 secondary schools with 141,000 pupils and a decade later these schools had increased to 1,021 with 282,000 pupils. In like manner, the old universities of Oxford and

Cambridge have seen rivals spring up in the half dozen or more city universities.

The middle of the last century was full of protests from Protestants, Catholics and Jews against the payment of taxes for the support of the Anglican Church to which they did not belong. As a result of the agitation, in 1868 the arrest of a Dissenter, because he objected to the payment of taxes to support the national church, was prohibited by law. In Ireland about one person out of every sixteen was an Episcopalian, and yet all had to pay the church tax. It is a matter of small wonder that "tithe wars" were common in the Emerald Isle until 1869 when the English Church was disestablished. The old law permitting Anglicans alone to receive academic degrees from Oxford and Cambridge remained until 1871 when it was rescinded. In 1880 Non-conformists were allowed to hold burial rites in the parish cemeteries. When in 1888 members of Parliament were given the privilege of making a declaration of loyalty instead of taking the old religious oath, the last religious test for public office was removed. George V in 1910 omitted from the coronation oath the characterization of Roman Catholics as "superstitious and idolatrous." In Wales in 1914 the Anglican Church was disestablished. In Scotland the Presbyterian Church is the state church. For some years there has been much agitation for the disestablishment of all the established churches in the United Kingdom, but thus far without complete success.

Religious liberty

7. The Irish Question

The dissatisfaction of the Irish under British rule was due to the following causes: (1) The Irish people regarded themselves as a "submerged nationality" with their own natural boundaries which gave the island a status more or less separate from Great Britain. (2) They have never been happy under the rule of their conquerors, and the racial hostility between the Celts and English has never died out. (3) The Irish are largely loyal Roman Catholics, while the English are strongly Protestant; hence efforts to Anglicize the Irish have been resented in repeated revolts, which have been put down with cruelty, and the planting of Protestants in North Ireland aggravated the discontent. (4) English landlordism in Ireland, with its many attendant evils, fomented a state of chronic rebellion, as did English legislation for Ireland, which had for its purpose the subjugation of the Irish people. Out of these conditions grew the Irish Question, which confronted the British government.

A brief survey of some of the most obnoxious laws will explain Irish resentment. For instance, Irish Catholics were forbidden to inherit, or even to purchase, land from a Protestant. Should the eldest son of a Catholic turn Protestant, he could take his father's property upon the latter's death. Indeed a distant Protestant relative of a Catholic might secure all his estate in spite of the claims of his

Conditions in Ireland

direct Catholic heirs. Catholics in business could not hire more than two helpers and had to pay a special tax. Although the Roman Catholics in Ireland were all enfranchised in 1793 yet the Irish Parliament, which was held at Dublin until 1800, was controlled by the few Protestants, who also had legal supervision of the scattered schools. The most exasperating laws restricted the freedom of the Catholic clergy. When the Irish took to raising stock, excessive export taxes ruined their business, and when they engaged in the wool industry, they met the similar obstacles. At the same time they were forbidden to send their farm produce abroad. The spirit in which these harsh laws were enacted was represented in the statement of an English Lord Chancellor: "The law does not recognize that any such person exists as an Irish Roman Catholic." Indeed the lenient execution of these laws was the only thing that saved Ireland from complete destruction.

Ireland and the American and French Revolutions

The successful issue of the American Revolution inspired the Irish to attempt a similar effort to throw off the British yoke. Secret organizations became so active that the English were forced to make numerous concessions. The French Revolution created another movement for independence in 1798, which gave the English a pretext for abolishing the Irish Parliament in 1800. Henceforth Ireland was given 100 representatives and 28 peers in the British Parliament. The Irish Question was now thrown into the national legislature, and for 120 years remained unsolved. Every revolt on the continent found an echo in Ireland, and the last explosion came with the World War. There were three steps in the solution of the Irish problem: (1) the establishment of religious freedom which was won between 1828 and 1869; (2) the return to the Irish of the lands held by English landlords; and (3) the granting of self-government. In seeking a solution of these issues, the Irish have been divided into two groups: one urging pacific efforts, the other advocating violence.

Distressing economic condition of Irish peasants

The economic conditions resulting from the unequal distribution of land were most distressing. A government commission reported in 1836 that Irish farm laborers received just a little over one fifth of the pay for similar work in England. The census of 1841 showed that nearly half of the peasants lived in one-room cottages, most of which were unfit for human beings. Yet English landlords were drawing millions in rent from the half-starved people, whom they never saw. Despotic agents of these absentee landlords in 1847 collected about $20,000,000. O'Connell estimated that between 1839 and 1843 about 150,000 peasants were evicted for failing to pay their rents. In the famine of 1847 some 80,000 died of starvation, and the British government was forced to feed a third of the entire population. Within fifty years it was said that 4,000,000 left the island for America and other countries. They carried their hatred of England with them, and in 1858 in the United States they plotted the Fenian rebellion against British rule in Ireland. By 1891 Ireland

had lost one half of its population, and between 1849 and 1883 the evicted peasant families numbered 363,000.

At last the British Parliament took up the land question. In 1860 tenancy was held to be a solemn contract, and a decade later an effort was made to compensate peasants for improvements. These feeble efforts only angered the peasants, who murdered the agents of the landlords, burned their houses, destroyed their cattle, and "boycotted" them. The Irish Land League of 1875 took for its cry, "free sale, fixity of tenure, and fair rent," and raised large sums of money to end landlordism. The Land Act of 1881 permitted "free sale," guaranteed "fair rent" for fifteen years, and authorized payment for improvements. Parnell and the Land League denounced the law as a mixture of "force, fraud, and folly" and a reign of terror followed. The Land Acts of 1891 and 1896 proposed to loan the peasants $150,000,000 with which to buy their farms from the landlords on easy terms, and by 1908 over 160,000 purchases had been made. The land question seemed to be on the way toward satisfactory settlement.

Irish land question

To the Irish for 150 years self-government was the fundamental issue. The Liberals under Gladstone in 1886 made the first effort to solve the problem of home rule in a sensible manner. The First Home Rule Bill provided: (1) for an Irish Parliament to control local matters; (2) for the surrender of Irish representation in the British Parliament; and (3) for the control of military and foreign affairs by the British crown. This bill was defeated in the House of Commons. The Second Home Rule Bill of 1893, again proposed by Gladstone, differed from the first only in permitting the Irish, in addition to having their own Parliament, to retain 80 representatives in the British Parliament. It passed the House of Commons but was defeated by the Lords. The Conservatives created county and district councils in Ireland elected by the people, but they fell far short of satisfying the Irish. Finally the Liberals in 1912 introduced the Third Home Rule Bill providing: (1) for an Irish Parliament of two houses; (2) for the control of military, foreign, monetary, and commercial questions by the British Parliament; and (3) for 42 Irish representatives in the House of Commons. Ulster in north Ireland, fearing domination by the Catholics of south Ireland, threatened to rebel and began to arm, while hostility also appeared in Great Britain. But at length in 1914 the bill was passed the third time by the House of Commons, the king signed it in 1915, and it became law. Meanwhile, however, the World War had begun, so the House voted to suspend the bill from operation until the close of the war.

Movement for "Home Rule"

When Great Britain entered the World War in 1914, Sir Edward Carson offered the services of the "Ulster Volunteers," who were formed to oppose home rule, and John Redmond pledged the loyalty of the Catholic Irish. But the Sinn Fein, a secret society organized in 1904, led a movement for complete Irish independence, and sent

agents in 1915 to Germany and the United States to secure aid. Sir Roger Casement, while attempting to smuggle German arms into Ireland, was arrested, condemned for treason, and shot. In 1916 the Sinn Feiners raised the standard of revolt in Dublin, proclaimed a republic, and flung out the new flag of green and gold. After some fighting the rebellion was crushed by British troops. The next year Lloyd George permitted the Irish to elect a convention of their own to settle the question of home rule, but when it could reach no agreement, he said that the British government would settle the problem.

Irish independence and the Irish Free State

In the general elections of 1918 the Sinn Feiners elected 76 members to the British Parliament, but instead of going to London, they met in Dublin in their own Dail Eireann, drafted a constitution, chose Eamon de Valera as president, sent delegates to the Paris Peace Conference, and refused to obey the British government. A state of ruthless terror prevailed for three years between the Irish Republicans and the British aided by the Ulster Unionists. The proposal in 1920 to set up two governments — one for Ulster, and another for the rest of Ireland, with a "Joint Council," was satisfactory to neither faction. At last in 1921 Lloyd George invited the republicans to London, where a treaty was signed, which created the "Irish Free State" with the same status as Canada, or Australia, and gave Ulster the privilege of joining it or not as she pleased. A majority of the Dail Eireann accepted the new arrangement, and in 1922 a government was instituted with Michael Collins as president. Two groups in Ireland refused, however, to recognize the "Free State": (1) the Ulsterites, who have their own "Government of Northern Ireland," according to the Government of Ireland Act of 1920; and (2) the Republicans led by de Valera, who through violence hope to secure complete independence. In 1925 Ireland was still in a state of turmoil — she has won self-government but not national unity!

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

A. L. Cross, *History of England and Greater Britain* (1914); *Shorter History of England and Greater Britain* (1920); A. D. Innes, *History of England and the British Empire*, 4 vols. (1916); J. A. R. Marriott, *England since Waterloo* (1913); S. Walpole, *History of England since 1815*, 6 vols. new edition (1905); *History of Twenty-five Years, 1856–1880*, 4 vols. (1904–1908); S. Low and C. Sanders, *Political History of England, 1837–1901* (1907); H. W. Paul, *A History of Modern England*, 5 vols. (1904–1906), J. F. Bright, *History of England*, 5 vols. (1884–1904); R. H. Gretton, *A Modern History of the English People*, 2 vols. (1913); G. M. Trevelyan, *British History in the Nineteenth Century, 1782–1901* (1922); *The Life of John Bright* (1913); R. Muir, *A Short History of the British Commonwealth*, 2 vols. (1920–1923); C. Seymour, *Electoral Reform in England and Wales* (1915); M. Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, 2 vols. (1902); L. T. Hobhouse, *Liberalism* (1911); *Democracy and Reaction* (1905); W. L. Blease, *A Short History of English Liberalism* (1913); W. S. Churchill, *Liberalism and the Social Problem* (1909); H. Cecil, *Conservatism* (1912); L. T. Hobhouse, *The Labor Movement* (1906); L. M. Larson, *A History of England and the British Empire* (1924); M. Lloyd, *Trade Unionism* (1915); S. and B. Webb, *The History of Trade Unionism* (edition 1920); *Industrial Democracy* (1911); A. W. Humphrey, *A History of Labour Representation* (1912); E. Guyot, *Le socialisme et l'évolution de l'Angleterre contemporaine, 1880–1911* (1911), R. E.

PROTHERO, *English Farming, Past and Present* (1912); C. TURNER, *Land Problems and National Welfare* (1911); H. HARBEN, *The Rural Problem* (1914); B. S. ROWNTREE and B. LASKER, *Unemployment: a Social Study* (1911); W. L. BLEASE, *The Emancipation of English Women* (edition 1913); C. J. H. HAYES, *British Social Politics* (1913); S. LEE, *Queen Victoria: a Biography* (1903); L. STRACHEY, *Queen Victoria* (1921); *Eminent Victorians* (1919); J. MORLEY, *The Life of William Ewart Gladstone*, 3 vols. (1903); *Recollections*, 2 vols. (1917); W. F. MONYPENNY and G. E. BUCKLE, *Life of Benjamin Disraeli, Earl of Beaconsfield*, 6 vols. (1910–1920); A. MACKINTOSH, *Joseph Chamberlain, an Honest Biography* (1914); H. SPENDER, *The Prime Minister* (Lloyd George) (1920); *Life of Henry Campbell-Bannerman*, 2 vols. (1924); G. CECIL, *Life of Robert, Marquis of Salisbury*, 2 vols. (1921); E. R. TURNER, *Ireland and England, Past and Present* (1919); M. HAYDEN and G. A. MOONAN, *A Short History of the Irish People from the Earliest Times to 1920* (1921); L. PAUL-DUBOIS, *Contemporary Ireland*, English translation (1908); E. BARKER, *Ireland in the Last Fifty Years (1866–1916)* (1917); S. G. HOBSON, *Irish Home Rule* (1912); S. ROSENBAUM, *Against Home Rule: the Case for the Union* (1912); G. E. RUSSELL, *Coöperation and Nationality* (1913); J. CONNOLLY, *Labour in Ireland* (1917); W. B. WELLS and N. MARLOWE, *A History of the Irish Rebellion of 1916* (1917); R. M. HENRY, *The Evolution of Sinn Fein* (1919); R. B. O'BRIEN, *Life of Charles Stewart Parnell*, 3 vols. (1898); S. GWYNN, *The Last Days of John Redmond* (1919); G. BALFOUR, *The Educational System of Great Britain and Ireland*, 2d edition (1903); A. L. LOWELL, *The Government of England* (edition 1912); W. BAGEHOT, *The English Constitution* (edition 1911); C. ILBERT, *Parliament, its History, Constitution and Practice* (1911); A. V. DICEY, *Introduction to the Study of the Constitution* (1915); C. F. G. MASTERMAN, *How England is Governed* (1922); E. M. HULME, *A History of England* (1924).

CHAPTER XXI

FRANCE UNDER THE THIRD REPUBLIC

1. The Provisional Republic

The proclamation of a "Republic" was made by the Parisians on September 4, 1870, upon hearing that Napoleon III and his army had been captured at Sedan. Republicans, Liberal Monarchists, and Socialists all joined in this provisional arrangement, but each group interpreted the "Republic" differently. The Republicans wanted a bourgeois republic like that of 1848. The Liberal Monarchists planned to convert it into a constitutional monarchy. The Socialists advocated a state founded on the ideas of Karl Marx or of Proudhon. But the German peril for the time united these three parties in support of the temporary "Government of National Defense" under the leadership of Gambetta and Thiers. Even when Paris surrendered, Gambetta's Republicans were determined to continue the conflict, while their monarchist opponents thought the struggle hopeless. To settle the question, a National Assembly was elected by universal manhood suffrage. Out of the 750 members, the Monarchists had 500, not because France clearly wanted a monarchy, but because the peasants earnestly desired peace. Without a formal recognition of the "Republic," the Assembly selected Thiers as "head of the executive power" and then, after removing from Bordeaux to Versailles, ratified the harsh Peace of Frankfort, which conciliated Germany but plunged France into civil war.

Overthrow of the second empire

The radicals among the middle class and the wage-earners, who formed the Paris *Commune*, distrusted the rural "clodhoppers" of the monarchial Assembly. When the Versailles government ordered the payment of all rents and debts, which had been temporarily suspended during the war, there resulted many evictions of the poor people and failures among the little tradesmen. The situation was made more dangerous by the dissolution of the National Guard in Paris, because it left the guards penniless, desperate, and with guns in their hands. The troops sent to Paris to take away the cannon were pounced upon and disarmed. The *Commune* raised the red flag, revolted against the Assembly, and declared Paris free and sovereign. The people outside of Paris were urged to imitate the capital, and to join it in forming a confederate republic of free communes in order to put an end to "the old political and clerical world of militarism, bureaucracy, exploitation, stock-jobbery, and special privileges." Instead of supporting the "Communards" however,

The Communard movement

the country people aided Thiers in crushing them. After a siege of Paris for six weeks, followed by another week of merciless street-fighting, the national forces triumphed. Bands of Communards burned some of the most historic buildings and destroyed many of the finest monuments in Paris. Never had a foreign foe committed so many acts of vandalism on the beautiful city. The retaliation of the Assembly surpassed the cruelty of the Communards. Those seized with weapons in their possession were shot down and buried in nameless tombs. Thousands were court-martialed, and put to death or exiled. Other thousands fled from France in terror. It has been estimated that probably 17,000 Communists fell as victims. Not for two decades did socialism again raise its voice in France.

Recovery of France from defeat

So quickly did France recover from the effects of the war with Germany and the civil conflict, that it astonished the whole world. For five years the National Assembly ruled the nation, enacted laws, and built up a constitution. To appease the Republicans, Thiers was given the title of "President of the French Republic," but he was subject to the will of the monarchial Assembly. So slightly was French credit impaired and so well were the national finances managed that by the end of 1873 the last franc of the unprecedented war indemnity of $1,000,000,000 was paid and the last German soldier had left French territory. The people of France, and foreigners also, proved their faith in the provisional government by subscribing seven times over the huge national loans. Army reforms were introduced and, in imitation of the Prussian system, universal military service for five years was adopted. The forts around Paris were strengthened and a line of fortresses was built against the Germans along the eastern border. Prominent Frenchmen began to talk about a "War of Revenge" to recover Alsace-Lorraine, and in Paris the statue of the lost city of Strassburg was draped with mourning until the day of deliverance should come.

2. Republic or Monarchy?

The most important question confronting France was: Should the new government be a republic or a monarchy? The various monarchial groups understood that the proclamation of the "Republic" was merely provisional until they could agree upon a suitable candidate for the throne. At first "President" Thiers favored the Orleans claimant, but in the end he put his country above party politics and by constructive statesmanship brought France safely through a perilous period. Trusted by the people and seeing the dangerous bargainings of the Monarchists, he now came out as the champion of a conservative republic. The Monarchists, angered at his betrayal of their cause, forced his resignation in 1873. He left office, convinced that the sentiment of the majority of the French people was with him, and rewarded with the popular title, "Liberator of the territory." The National Assembly then elected as president, Marshal Mac-

Mahon, an outspoken royalist, ready to step aside as soon as a king should be selected. The Republicans, led by Gambetta and others, forthwith instituted "the republican education" of the people chiefly through speaking tours and mass meetings, for the press was not yet freed from government control. The wave of republicanism which commenced to flood France, forced the Monarchists to reach an agreement: (1) that the Bourbon heir, the count de Chambord, should be crowned as Henry V; and (2) that since he was childless, he should proclaim the succession of the Orleans claimant. But the stubborn Bourbon candidate refused to accept the crown unless the principle of divine-right and the white flag of his house went with it. As the Orleanists could not abandon the tricolor his obstinacy gave the victory to the Republicans in 1875, when, after a deadlock of two years, a law was passed by a majority of one providing for the election of future presidents of the "Republic" for a term of seven years by the "plurality of the votes of the Senate and the Chamber of Deputies met in National Assembly." Three "constitutional laws" passed the same year gave France the basis of a new constitution, that of a parliamentary republic organized like the constitutional monarchy of Belgium.

Struggle for Monarchy

In the election of the first legislature, President MacMahon and his royalist friends secured a monarchial Senate owing to the dominance of the rural communes in the electoral colleges, but the Chamber of Deputies, chosen directly by the people, had 360 Republicans against 170 Monarchists. President MacMahon and the Monarchists sought to win the wealthier middle class, the peasants, the soldiers, and the clergy, through offices and favors. Ignoring the republican Chamber of Deputies as far as possible, he attempted to rule France as an autocrat, and identified his government with the restoration of the temporal power of the Papacy in order to hold the support of the Church. This was the period of "the republic without republicans." Gambetta still led the true, uncompromising Republicans, who drew their support from the lower middle class of the cities, the intellectuals, and the workingmen, and who vehemently declared that France should never again be governed by any monarch or emperor. "Clericalism, that is our enemy!", they said in combatting the Catholic Church, which, recalling the experiences of the French Revolution, naturally opposed the Republic. They insisted upon a responsible ministry, and denounced the personal rule of President MacMahon, who, in 1877, dissolved the Chamber of Deputies and appealed to the nation to support his policies. In the new election, which was hot and furious, each party used every means to win. Gambetta conducted a whirlwind campaign throughout the country appealing to the people to overthrow autocratic government. Just before the election, he said of President MacMahon: "When the country has spoken, he will have to submit or resign." The Republicans won a majority of 137 seats in the new Chamber, and the next

Victory of the Republicanism

year secured a majority in the Senate also. They now insisted upon the dismissal of some officers who were Monarchists, and President MacMahon in 1879, perceiving that his cause was lost, resigned.

3. The Republic under Republicans

Strengthening of Republicanism

The Third French Republic, proclaimed in 1870, was permanently established in 1879 with the election of Jules Grévy, a firmly convinced Republican. The same year the capital was removed from Versailles to Paris, and July 14, the anniversary of the fall of the Bastille, was celebrated as the nation's birthday. Gambetta was rewarded with the presidency of the Chamber, and finally the premiership. The Republic under the Republicans soon became strong and vigorous. The political leadership was not in the hands of nobles and bishops, but of lawyers, physicians, scholars, and industrial captains — members of the *bourgeoisie*, well-informed, progressive, able, and socially equal — who cared for both the material prosperity of the nation, and the intellectual and educational welfare of the people. After the defeat of monarchism, the Republic kept a sharp eye on its two remaining foes: clericalism and militarism.

Liberty and education

One of the first concerns of the Third Republic was to guarantee individual liberties. The law of 1881 established free speech and the right of assembly, and a year later the press was emancipated. The system of local government, inherited from the French Revolution, was perpetuated giving the national government general control but at the same time allowing considerable communal autonomy. The next problem taken up was education, which had been sadly neglected. Attention was called to the contrast between the excellent German schools, and the poorly-equipped, badly-taught schools of France. It was said that the German schoolmaster had "triumphed at Sedan." Not only was illiteracy high in the country districts of France, but the schools were in the hands of the clergy, who used them to undermine the Republic. Hence the demand arose for national public schools free from sectarian teaching. Of course the clergy denounced such "neutral" schools as both immoral and "godless," but the Republicans insisted that to endure, the Republic must educate its own citizens. Finally in 1881–2 the Ferry Laws established a system of free public education and made attendance for children under thirteen years of age compulsory. Private church schools were not entirely abolished, but in 1880 the Jesuits were expelled, and many other religious orders were forbidden to teach.

French school system

Higher and lower normal schools were organized to prepare lay teachers, who alone were authorized to teach. The local authorities assumed supervision over the schools, but state support increased from $5,000,000 in 1870 to over $173,000,000 in 1920. The secondary schools or *lycées* were given a broadened course of study; and by 1886, in spite of the bishops, 36 of them had been

established for girls. The universities under state patronage were increased in number and thrown open to foreigners on very favorable terms. The whole educational system was highly centralized. The Third Republic had won its greatest triumph — a victory over ignorance. The illiteracy of citizens above ten years of age in 1906 was 14 per cent, but in 1912 for army recruits it had dropped to 4 per cent. This triumph, however, at the expense of the clericals, made them still more uncompromising foes of the Republic.

To end the attacks on the Republic, the constitutional amendment of 1884 was passed forbidding all proposals for the revision of the republican form of government. This was followed by another amendment, which democratized the Senate by abolishing the life-senators and by excluding from seats in the Senate all members of families of pretenders to the French throne. At the same time the larger municipalities were given a greater share in electing senators although the procedure still favored the rural *communes*. This fine record of educational and democratic progress was somewhat obscured by the instability of successive ministries due to factional fights, as well as by corruption in high places. A scandal arising out of his son-in-law's traffic in decorations of the Legion of Honor caused President Grévy to resign in 1887 and Sadi-Carnot was chosen to succeed him. The Monarchists adroitly raised the cry of inefficiency and dishonesty against the republican régime. At this crisis the ambitious, popular soldier, General Boulanger, appeared on his black war horse. Posing as a patriotic Republican, he had been appointed minister of war in 1886. By preaching a "War of Revenge" against Germany, he became the idol of the army and one of the most widely acclaimed public men. Forced out of the cabinet, he entered politics as the stalking-horse of the Monarchists, who plotted to make him a military dictator in order to restore the monarchy. His program announced a revision of the constitution such as would make the president the real executive of the nation. Had he acted with firmness in 1889, he might have overthrown the Republic; instead, he talked and threatened until the Republicans discharged him from the army and summoned him to trial for treason. Then he fled from the country and in 1891 blew out his brains. His failure strengthened the Republic both at home and abroad, and the elections of 1889 gave the real Republicans three fifths of the Chamber of Deputies.

Storm and stress in the Republic

A greater blow to Republican prestige was the notorious "Panama Scandal" worked up by the conservative press before the elections of 1893. A former minister of public works was found guilty of accepting a bribe from the Panama Company; the financial honor of the great engineers de Lesseps and Eiffel was compromised; Clemenceau and other Radical leaders whose devotion to the Republic had made them strive to smother the scandal, were obliged to withdraw for some years from public life; and, although the conservatives

failed to win the elections, they did gain in influence in succeeding governments.

The Dreyfus case

The next disaster, which threatened the Republic, was the Dreyfus affair. For a decade it shook France to the foundations, and attracted wide comment. In the midst of the excitement over the assassination of President Sadi-Carnot, the resignation of President Casmir-Perier, and the election of President Félix-Faure in 1894, came the arrest of Alfred Dreyfus, a Jewish captain of artillery serving on the General Staff. He was charged with selling valuable military secrets to Germany. After trial before a secret court martial, he was publicly deprived of his stripes and sword, expelled from the army, and imprisoned for life. Although denying his guilt and affirming his love of France, he was sent to Devil's Island off the northern coast of South America. The French people, incited by an anti-Jewish crusade, approved his punishment as a traitor. The Monarchists denounced the Republic as "bourgeois and Jewish" and sought to capitalize the Dreyfus case for their own advantage. The Catholics blamed the Jews for the growth of atheism and socialism in France. Meantime Colonel Picquart, an honest republican officer in charge of military secrets, by examining the documents in question, was convinced that it was not Dreyfus but a disreputable and boastful monarchist major, named Esterhazy, who was guilty. But when he reported his discovery to the minister of war, he was ordered to be silent, and was soon replaced by Colonel Henry.

The Monarchists, militarists, and clericals, with a large following among the masses, now formed a new party called the Nationalists. They began an open attack on the Socialists, the anti-militarists, the anti-clericals, the Jews, and the Republic. At first the pro-Dreyfus party was composed of literary men, teachers, and artists, but soon the Socialists and Syndicalist (or Laborites) under the leadership of Jean Jaurès took up the cause of the condemned Jewish captain, and finally the Republicans demanded a fair trial. Of course the Jews also left no stone unturned to vindicate the innocence of a member of their race. Colonel Picquart, believing that Dreyfus was the scapegoat of a conspiracy of Monarchists in the army, worked with all his might for a new trial. Émile Zola, the great novelist, wrote to President Félix Faure his famous open letter, "I Accuse," which was read around the globe. The government announced that the case was "closed." At length Colonel Henry confessed that he had forged one of the documents in the case, and committed suicide. Major Esterhazy also admitted that he had forged another of the documents on the evidence of which Dreyfus had been convicted, and fled to London. President Loubet ordered the supreme court of France to review the case. But it was not until 1906 that Dreyfus was completely exonerated, promoted in the army, and decorated with the Legion of Honor. Colonel Picquart later became minister of war, and the remains of Zola were buried with great pomp and pride in the

Triumph of Dreyfus and the Republic

Panthéon. The Monarchists and militarists suffered a crushing defeat. All types of Republicans were united, and the Third Republic emerged more triumphant than ever. The threatened disaster had proved a blessing in disguise.

4. Separation of Church and State

As a Catholic country, France had numerous powerful religious orders or "congregations" which had greatly increased in numbers and wealth since 1870. For instance, there were 14,000 nuns in 1870 and 75,000 in 1900, while the monks in the latter year numbered 190,000. The wealth of these orders multiplied from $2,000,000 in 1850 to $200,000,000 in 1900. Premier Waldeck-Rousseau pointed out that these monastic societies, because of their hostility to republican institutions, were a national peril. Hence in 1901 there was enacted a law which abolished all religious "congregations" except those authorized by the government, and forbade the members of the few authorized orders to teach in the public schools. As a result many orders were exiled from France and some 10,000 church schools were closed. Another law in 1904 was intended to deprive monks and nuns of the right to teach in private as well as state schools during the next ten years. By 1913 over 4,500,000 children were being taught republican ideals in the public schools, while only 500,000 were attending church schools.

French Catholicism in 1900

In 1905 the Concordat of 1801 was abrogated, and the complete separation of church and state decreed. The state neither appointed the clergy to office nor paid their salaries. Pensions to the older clergy, however, were continued, and grants to others were extended during the period of readjustment. The members of all religious sects were treated alike and authorized to form societies of laymen to manage their affairs. To these societies were to be turned over all buildings used for worship and for housing the clergy, but other church property was to be retained by the Republic. Gifts and legacies to the churches were restricted. In case the lay associations did not act within a given time, even the church buildings were to pass to the state. The clergy and pious Catholic laymen denounced these measures as acts of spite and spoliation. Nevertheless the French bishops had finally decided to accept the situation and organize the lay associations when Pope Pius X proclaimed the whole Separation Law invalid, and called on French Catholics to disregard it. Two years of turmoil followed; riots broke out, and some men prophesied civil war. However in 1907, thanks to the skill of Aristide Briand, a working compromise was reached by which (1) the clergy could make arrangements with the local mayors for the use and maintenance of the churches for worship; and (2) they could manage their church affairs as they pleased. Much ecclesiastical property was turned over to charitable organizations. In this manner, through its opposition to the Third Republic, the Catholic

Separation of Church and State

Effects of religious reforms

Church in France lost most of its property, financial support from the state, the control of education, and even exemption from military service and taxation. This new status forced the clergy to become champions of the very principles they had fought, namely, freedom of worship, assembly, speech, and the press. The separation of church and state was a reality, and both powers have slowly adapted themselves to the changed relation. The church has full independence in religion; the state in government, and both have prospered. Victory, however, was with the Republic. In 1921 diplomatic relations were resumed with the Papacy.

5. The New Imperialism

While firmly establishing the Republic on the ruins of monarchism, militarism, and clericalism, French statesmen were also turning their attention to imperialism. They remembered the great French empire of the earlier centuries, which after 1815 had shrunk to a few islands and coast towns in India, Africa, and South America. The rebuilding of a new colonial empire had begun with the conquest of Algeria. Under Napoleon III the Senegal valley in Africa, and Cochin China in Asia, were acquired, together with some islands in Oceania and a protectorate over Cambodia. Thus by 1870 France had staked out a large colonial empire, which was to serve as a beginning of greater overseas expansion.

Origins of French colonial empire

Imperialism under the Third Republic

Under the Third Republic, this colonial empire was extended ann consolidated until it became the second largest in the world. More than three fourths of this empire was secured between 1878 and 1914. Tunis, coveted by Italy, was made a French protectorate in 1881 to safeguard the eastern border of Algeria. This led to ill-feeling between France and Italy for a generation. Agreement with Great Britain in 1904, and later adjustments with Germany and Spain, gave France a free hand in Morocco. Thus French authority was extended over nearly all of northwestern Africa from Algiers to the Congo — a solid block eight times the size of France with almost a third of her population. In this vast region railroads have been built, auto-routes constructed, air-services established and many other modern changes effected. In Asia, Annam in 1883 and Tonkin in 1884, were secured, and later united with Cochin China under the name Indo-China. In 1907 parts of Siam were added to this new colonial unit. Madagascar in 1905 became a French protectorate. The defeat of Germany in the World War added a portion of her African possessions to France. Through all these overseas acquisitions, France owned in 1923 a colonial empire twenty times her own size with a native population of 60,000,000. The annual trade with her colonies increased from $70,000,000 in 1879 to $400,000,000 in 1914 and to about $600,000,000 in 1924. French capitalists invested millions in colonial enterprises. The Catholics approved of imperialism because it gave them new fields for missionary work. Patriots took pride in seeing

the French flag floating around the globe. Republicans saw no inconsistency in imposing their civilization on "inferior" peoples in other parts of the earth. In spite of initial failures and discouragements, the French have accomplished wonders in steadily transforming their African and Asiatic colonies agriculturally and economically into wealth-producing regions and finally creating lucrative markets for home products.

6. Socialism

For two decades after the suppression of the Paris Commune in 1870, socialism did not noticeably reappear in France. A party of "reformist" Socialists was organized in 1893 by Jaurès and Millerand, who, contrary to the teachings of Karl Marx, held that the instruments of production could be taken gradually and legally out of the hands of individuals by society. Jules Guesde organized the Marxian Social-Democrats to combat the *bourgeois* Republic. These two parties in 1893 polled 500,000 votes and elected 40 deputies. In 1905 all the socialist factions except a few "Independents" united to form the Unified Socialist party, whose strength increased until in 1914 they polled 1,500,000 votes and elected 102 deputies. In 1919, as a result of the introduction of a modified form of proportional representation, their parliamentary contingent dropped to 68; but in May, 1924, with the "Leftward" swing of the pendulum, it rose to 101 in a Chamber whose total membership was now reduced to 584. More or less akin to the Unified Socialists were the 39 Independents and the 29 Communists. All the Socialists had stood staunchly for the separation of church and state, and advocated progressive social legislation. One of their former "comrades," Aristide Briand, was premier in 1909–10 and, when the World War broke out, Viviani, an Independent Socialist, was premier, while the Unified Socialists, Guesde and Sembat, entered the war cabinet.

French socialism

However, France had been outdistanced by both Germany and Great Britain in passing social legislation. Fewer people were engaged in industry in France, and hence the problem of the workers was not so pressing. Further, republican statesmen were so absorbed in the conflicts with the Monarchists and the Catholic Church that they overlooked the needs of the laboring classes. The lot of the factory hands and miners was far from ideal. The legal right to strike had been recognized as early as 1864, and industrial workers were permitted to form unions in 1868, but most of the labor unions were suppressed after 1870. Not until 1884 did the "charter of liberties" restore these rights, after which the unions or "syndicats" increased until in 1894 they numbered over two thousand. In 1914 there were more than 12,000 unions with 2,000,000 members. In 1895 the General Confederation of Labor was organized to lead the struggle for greater economic freedom. Local chambers of labor were formed in the industrial centers, and in 1902 these bodies joined the

Social legislation

General Confederation. To secure an eight-hour day and other concessions, the Confederation declared a series of general strikes. The government forbade public employees to join the Confederation or to strike, and the independent-socialist premier, Briand, broke up a general railroad strike in 1910 by calling the strikers "to the colors" as soldiers and then forcing them to act as strike-breakers.

Fear of socialism and organized labor compelled republican statesmen to seek to content the workers with social legislation. Their votes were needed also to protect the Republic from its internal foes. The Great Act of 1892 raised the legal age at which children could be employed to thirteen years; established a ten-hour working day as the maximum; forbade unnecessary work on Sunday; and regulated work in the mines. The next year laws provided for the health and safety of workers, and gave free medical care to workmen and their families. In 1907 the working day for miners was reduced to eight hours. All workers were guaranteed one day of rest each week. The government set up machinery for the voluntary arbitration of labor disputes (1892). Compensation for accidents in industry (1898), compulsory insurance (1910), and old age pensions (1911) were provided. In 1918 nearly 10,500,000 persons were registered under the old age pension law. The criminal law was made more humane. Better ethical instruction in the schools was provided for children. The power of the father over his family was reduced, and divorce, which had been legalized by the Revolution, regulated by the Code Napoléon, and suppressed by the restoration, was reëstablished by the law of 1884.

Railroads

The railroads in France were built by private companies, but the government guaranteed a 4 per cent interest on the capital invested. As early as 1878 the government spent $100,000,000 in extending some of the smaller and less remunerative lines. The Western Railroad with 3,700 miles was taken over by the government in 1909 to protect its loan to the company. The railroads of the six great lines of France would girdle the globe one and a quarter times.

7. Foreign Affairs

Military policies

To regain her prestige among the European powers after the Franco-Prussian War, France adopted compulsory military service. In 1905 it was reduced to two years. The increase of the German army in 1913 alarmed France, because her population was so much smaller than that of Germany. The birth-rate after 1870 had fallen so low that in 43 years there was a gain of only 4,000,000 inhabitants — and over a million of these were foreigners, chiefly Italians, Spaniards and Belgians. "Every year we win a battle against France," boasted General von Moltke. Hence France, in 1913, restored the three-year term of military service, and thus added 170,000 men and officers to her standing army of 607,000. The French military bill was actually introduced in the Chamber of Deputies before the German army bill.

had been presented to the German parliament. Both grew chiefly out of the anxiety produced by the Balkan troubles. The Socialists protested and Jaurès proposed a popular militia as a substitute. But now that the army had been republicanized, the Republicans devotedly defended it. Great activity was displayed during this year (1913) in equipping the army, and in strengthening the forts along the German border. At the same time the navy was brought up to fourth place among the navies of the world. When the World War broke out France, although inadequately prepared, was not taken completely by surprise. Her active army was slightly larger than that of Germany. After the War, military service was reduced to eighteen months. The law of 1922 provided for a standing army of 520,000 Frenchmen and 205,000 natives of the French colonies. Further reductions were promised as soon as the general European situation would permit.

Alsace-Lorraine and revenge for 1871

The army was closely associated in the mind of French Nationalists and Conservatives with the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine. From 1870 until the Boulanger crisis, the "War of Revenge" had been dinned into the ears of the people through oratory, poetry, music, and the press, until it became an obsession. The old statue of the lost city of Strassburg in the great Place de la Concorde in Paris was kept covered with flowers and trimmed in mourning by noisy, patriotic demonstrations. During the next two decades pacifism, socialism and anticlericalism were the dominant movements in France, but the Agadir affair of 1911 aroused national feeling again. Almost alone the Socialists thought that the provinces might be recovered by negotiation. As late as May, 1913, French and German Socialists arranged a conference at Berne to discuss problems of mutual interest. The 150 French Socialists and Socialist-Radicals expected to meet a like number from Germany, but found only about 55 present. One of the German Social-Democrats said: "Every German, from the highest to the lowest, considers that the Alsace-Lorraine question can be opened only on the battlefield. Let the French have no delusions on that head." Every stupid blunder made by Germany in Alsace-Lorraine, such as the suppression of the pro-French newspapers and the violence of the military leaders in the town of Zabern, awakened patriotic resentment in France.

The first international problem to which French statesmen gave their attention after 1870 was how to gain friends in Europe against their enemy. It was hoped to form an alliance with Austria-Hungary, or, that failing, with Russia. But Bismarck shrewdly checked that move by creating the Three Emperors' League, and thus kept France isolated, irritated, and thirsting for revenge. No French statesman, who did not include the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine in his program, could long remain in office. At the time there seemed little likelihood of a close friendship with Great Britain; and in 1882 France withdrew from their joint occupation of Egypt and left Great Britain in control.

In the previous year she had been given a free hand by Bismarck and Britain to create a protectorate over Tunis. This act, however, offended Italy by thwarting her own ambitions, and led her to enter the Triple Alliance with Germany and Austria-Hungary. For some years, on the other hand, Franco-Russian relations had been growing more cordial. Russia attributed her defeat in the Congress of Berlin in 1878 to the support given to Great Britain by Germany and Austria-Hungary, and consequently turned a more friendly face towards an alliance with France. The Dual Alliance of 1891 to offset the Triple Alliance was the result. The Russian loan in France was over-subscribed eight times. The navies exchanged visits, and Tsar Nicholas II and the tsarina were the first royal personages to set foot on French soil since the departure of William I of Germany. Their visit to Paris brought a welcome sense of support and security to the majority of Frenchmen. In 1897 the French president returned the visit. The Socialists and many other extreme democrats in France denounced this ("Mezentian union") alliance with an autocracy. However, with the backing of Russia, official France became more aggressive in world affairs. There was some talk about making the Mediterranean a "French lake," while serious plans were laid for expansion in Africa and elsewhere.

Dual Alliance with Russia

The Dual Alliance was not pleasing to Great Britain, since it united France with Russia, now regarded as her greatest foe. Both the British and the French were eager to control the Upper Nile region. In 1896 the British government sent General Kitchener to Khartoum. Meanwhile the French government had ordered Captain Marchand to march across Africa to take possession of that territory. In 1898 these two imperial agents met at Fashoda. Both nations were excited and many persons thought that war was inevitable. But, thanks largely to Delcassé, the eminent foreign minister, wiser counsel prevailed and satisfactory boundary lines were fixed. Unfortunately the offensive attitude of the British press during the Panama scandal and the Dreyfus affair was now imitated by the French press in criticizing the Boer War. Not until 1903, when King Edward VII and President Loubet exchanged visits, did both countries begin to express a friendlier attitude. The next year a convention was signed, which settled all outstanding conflicts. France recognized British rights in Egypt and surrendered certain fishing privileges in Newfoundland; and in return Great Britain acknowledged French claims in Morocco and made further adjustments in Africa. The momentous Entente Cordiale had come into being. Already (Dec., 1900), acknowledgement of Italy's rights in Tripoli had secured her recognition of French claims in Morocco. All these arrangements strengthened the prestige of France in Europe.

Origins of the Triple Entente

To further offset the dangers of the Triple Alliance, Delcassé began the task of bringing France, Russia and Great Britain together in a wider Entente Cordiale. A common fear and suspicion of Germany

made this step an easy one, and the Anglo-French understanding of 1904 was followed in 1907 by the Anglo-Russian agreement. These two arrangements, together with the Dual Alliance, paved the way for the Triple Entente as a counter-coalition against the Triple Alliance. No formal treaty was signed, but since all disagreements were eliminated, these powers — with Japan as a possible fourth member — were ready to consolidate their interests into an actual alliance at the first threat of common danger. The first test of these friendly understandings came in 1911, in the Agadir incident arising out of French rights in Morocco. Germany felt obliged to recognize a French protectorate over Morocco in exchange for a promise of the open door policy in trade and the cession of part of the French Congo. But a clash had been averted only through the conciliatory statesmanship of Caillaux. New national antipathies had been stirred up which had hardly subsided before the second test came in the World War, when the Triple Entente formed a solid block against the Central Powers.

8. The French Government and Political Institutions

The French government, in form, is republican like the United States; in operation, it is parliamentary like Great Britain. Supreme authority is located in a Senate and a Chamber of Deputies which make laws, direct their execution, and amend the constitution. There is no such division of governmental powers as in America. France is a highly centralized, and not a federal Republic. The cabinet system is in use. The constitution consists of several fundamental laws enacted by the Chamber and Senate, has no "Declaration of Rights," says nothing about the "sovereignty of the people," and does not even make provision for annual budgets or a judiciary. These omissions have been remedied by subsequent legislation and ministerial decrees.

Centralization

The president is chosen for seven years by the two houses meeting together at Versailles as a National Assembly. Accordingly there are no great presidential campaigns as in the United States. Members of the old royal families are excluded from the office. The president receives a salary of $240,000 a year and is supplied with two official residences. For treasonable acts he may be impeached or even put to death. He sees that laws are enforced, appoints certain officials, receives foreign representatives, makes treaties with the consent of parliament, acts as the nominal head of the army and navy, and has the power of pardon. He cannot legally declare war without the vote of both chambers. He neither reigns like a king nor governs like the president of the United States. His acts must all be countersigned by a member of the ministry. His veto may be set aside by a bare majority in parliament. Not since 1877 has he dissolved the Chamber of Deputies. There is no vice-president. In case of the

President

president's death or resignation, the National Assembly meets immediately to elect his successor.

Ministry

As in Great Britain the ministry is the real executive and responsible to parliament. The ministry, not the president, really makes decisions, formulates policies, appoints officials, enforces law, concludes treaties, and manages the army and navy. The president presides over formal meetings of the cabinet, which consists of twelve departments. In forming a new ministry, the president first selects a premier, who in turn chooses associates having the confidence of a majority in the Chamber of Deputies. The premier then takes the portfolio he desires, and assigns the others. The ministers, whether deputies or senators, have a right to attend all sessions in either chamber and to take part in debates. When defeated by the Deputies on an important measure, the ministry resigns in a body. Owing to the large number of groups in the Chamber, changes are frequent, as is shown by the fact that in Great Britain from 1873 to 1914 there were 8 ministries, whereas in France there were 50. But while the ministries are unstable, government is stable, and policy is reasonably steady. Although the surface often looks stormy, France has made commendable progress in its political life.

Parliament

The controlling political power in France is the parliament, which changes slowly. The Senate, whose 300 members are chosen indirectly for nine years, one-third retiring every three years, somewhat resembles that of the United States before 1913. It is a dignified body containing many of the ablest men in the nation. Although it may initiate legislation other than money bills, its main work consists in serving as a check on the popular house in revising and occasionally defeating its bills. The Chamber of Deputies consists since 1924 of 584 members elected for four years by manhood suffrage according to population. Fourteen of these deputies are from the colonies. In 1919 a bill to extend the right to vote to women passed the lower house but was defeated in the Senate. The chief reason was the fear of republican anti-clericals that the church might regain authority through the women voters. The lower house lives out its full term of office, as in the United States. Both deputies and senators receive $3,000 a year. The committee system is widely used. The French parliament has three functions: (1) to elect a president; (2) to make laws; and (3) to amend the constitution. Money bills must originate in the popular chamber.

Until 1876 the French were divided into two great political groups, each with several factions: (1) the Monarchists, composed of Bonapartists, Orleanists, and Bourbons; and (2) the Republicans, divided into moderates and radicals. Since 1876 these parties have undergone many changes. The voters in France rally around some inspiring leader, who represents some political policy. Parties are organized in parliament after elections rather than before, and hence are continually altering, although certain policies endure. The

Political parties and the group system

party groups, omitting the 14 colonial deputies in the Chamber of Deputies elected in 1924, stood thus: (1) 11 Conservative Royalists who were anti-republican and represented the old noblesse and reactionary clergy; (2) the Republican Entente (137) composed of the Liberal Action party (Republicans, who wished to protect the Catholic Church), as well as of Progressives (moderate Republicans who represented the rich *bourgeoisie* and opposed too rapid social changes); (3) 126 National Radicals and Republicans, who placed the security of the Republic above every other consideration but who had formed part of the National *bloc* led by Poincaré and Millerand; (4) the 127 Socialist-Radicals and 39 Independent Socialists following Herriot and holding to a program of international peace and domestic reform; and (5) the 130 Communists and Socialists who represented the working classes and strove for social and economic transformation. These last three groups were anti-clerical.

9. Material Prosperity

Economic conditions

During the period from the Franco-Prussian War to the World War a sum greater than the indemnity paid to Germany was spent on works of peace. A net-work of highways, about 2,000 miles of canals, and over 32,000 miles of railways aided transportation. Tolls were abolished, the rivers were made navigable, old harbors were improved and new ones built. The merchant marine made commendable progress, although it was still far behind that of Great Britain. Of the 23,000 vessels entering French ports in 1921 only 8,000 were French. With an area equal to Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Kentucky, and Tennessee, France is an agricultural state; and in spite of the exodus to the cities of the hired laborers, 44 per cent of the 40,000,000 were still living in the country in 1911. It is a nation of small farmers, although large estates are numerous around Paris and in the west. To prevent the revival of a landed aristocracy, the Revolutionary and Napoleonic law of inheritance requires the almost equal distribution of a man's property among his children. This tends to break up great estates, and the number of small proprietors has slowly risen to nearly 2,500,000. The peasants are hard-working, thrifty, and economical. The old implements of agriculture are disappearing, especially since the World War, and are being replaced by labor-saving machinery, often bought coöperatively. The soil is fertile and tilled with care. The government supervises and encourages wine-growing, and the production of silk, flax, hemp, and horses. Coöperative stores, insurance companies, markets, and land-banks are managed by the farmers. Agricultural schools keep steadily introducing improvements. Grains and beet sugar are protected by tariffs. As a result of these aids, agricultural products doubled in value between 1860 and 1913; and France remains one of the most famous countries in the world for the production of raw silk and the cultivation of the vine.

Agriculture

Remarkable industrial progress has also been made under the Third Republic. The loss of Alsace-Lorraine robbed France of valuable deposits of iron ore. Although her production of coal and lignite increased more than threefold from 1871 to 1912, still this was not enough to meet her needs, and a third of her coal supply had to be imported. With the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine, and the acquisition of the Saar Valley, for at least 15 years, from Germany at the close of the World War, France will be able ultimately to export vast quantities of iron. In 1914 France ranked fourth among the powers in the production of iron and steel; today she is the greatest metallurgical nation in Europe. Even before the War the huge steel mills at Le Creusot were a powerful rival of the Krupps in Germany. Between 1870 and 1914 French factories increased threefold, and the horsepower nearly tenfold. A surplus of about 25 per cent of the factory products was exported in 1914, but, largely owing to her income from foreign investments, the value of imports slightly exceeded the exports. The French banking system was one of the finest in the world in 1914, and played an important role in international finance. Before the World War, in proportion to her population, France was looked upon as one of the richest nations in the world. In 1922 as a result of the World War her public debt was given as nearly 317,000,000,000 francs.

Manufacturing, commerce, banking

Just before the French Revolution broke out in 1789, Arthur Young, an English country squire, made three tours through France and left his impressions in his book on *Travels in France*. Exactly a century later, Miss Betham-Edwards made a similar journey and recorded the changes she saw in her book, *France of Today*. The transformation in that hundred years is almost unbelievable. The advance in material prosperity is striking, but the changes in the soul and brain of her people are still more conspicuous. France has passed from one of the most autocratic to one of the most democratic countries in Europe. Not nobles and bishops, but farmers, small shop-keepers, artisans, scholars, and capitalists are the rulers. Political problems are usually discussed from the standpoint of national welfare. The press claims to reflect the interests of the common citizen, although unhappily some papers with a great circulation are controlled by the counting-house and privileged interests. The government is very sensitive to public opinion; hence it is trusted by the mass of the people. When an effort was made in 1906 to select, by a newspaper plebiscite, the greatest Frenchman of the past century, the people chose not a statesman, not a general, not a churchman, but a scientist, Louis Pasteur, because he had performed the greatest service for the people. Napoleon Bonaparte stood fourth in the list. Yet when the World War came, it found France united to wage the greatest and most costly struggle in her national existence.

French progress since 1789

Since 1792 the Republicans have seized the government four times — three times by revolutions. The first three republics were

followed by monarchial restorations. Throughout all these changes France has developed politically towards democratic government and socially towards equality. France stands today as the joint product of republicanism and imperialism. The centralized administration, the judicial system, the Legion of Honor, the University of France, and the revenue system are bequests of the Empire. The city government, the military system, the public schools, the right of the workers to organize, and the separation of the church and state, were established under the republics. Hence, France is governed on a democratic basis, but is administered under a bureaucracy.

Republicanism and bureaucracy

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

E. Bourgeois, *Modern France*, 2 vols. (1919); W. S. Davis, *History of France* (1919); G. Hanotaux, *Contemporary France*, English translation by J. C. Tarver, 4 vols. (1903–1909); P. de Coubertin, *The Evolution of France under the Third Republic*, English translation by I. F. Hapgood (1897); J. Jaurès, editor, *Histoire Socialiste*, Vol. XII by J. Labusquiere, *La troisième république, 1870–1900* (1909); C. H. C. Wright, *The History of the Third French Republic* (1916); J. C. Bracq, *France under the Republic* (1910); W. C. Brownell, *French Traits* (edition 1902); B. Wendell, *The France of Today* (1907); A. Tilley, *Modern France* (1915); A. L. Guerard, *French Civilization in the Nineteenth Century* (1914); E. Lavisse, editor, *Histoire de France Contemporaine*, 4 vols. (1920–1921); E. Lepelletier, *Histoire de la commune de 1871*, 2 vols. (1911–1912); J. Simon, *Le gouvernement de M. Thiers, 7 février 1871–24 mai 1873*, 2 vols. (1879); A. Bertrand, *Les origines de la troisième république, 1871–1876* (1911); J. Reinach, *Histoire de l'affaire Dreyfus*, 7 vols. (1898–1911); A. Debidour, *L'église catholique et l'état sous la troisième république*, 2 vols. (1909); A. Briand, *La séparation des églises de l'état* (1905); P. Sabatier, *Disestablishment in France* (1906); L. Levine, *Syndicalism in France* (1912); M. Dubois and A. Terrier, *Un siècle d'expansion coloniale, 1800–1900* (edition 1902), E. Dimnet, *France Herself Again* (1913); E. Thery, *Les progrès économiques de la France* (1909); E. Levasseur, *Questions ouvrières et industrielles en France sous la troisième république* (1907); W. M. Sloane, *Greater France in Africa* (1924); G. Weill, *Histoire du mouvement social en France, 1852–1910* (1911); R. Fighiera, *La protection legale des travailleurs en France* (1913); P. T. Moon, *The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France* (1920); L. Levine, *The Labor Movement in France* (1912); A. Bourson, *Le socialisme en France depuis 1871* (1908); *Le syndicalisme contemporain* (1911); P. Louis, *Histoire du mouvement syndical en France* (2d edition 1911); A. Tardieu, *La France et les Alliances* (1904, English trans. 1908); R. Pinon, *France et Allemagne, 1870–1913* (1913); G. H. Stewart, *French Foreign Policies* (1921); R. Poincaré, *How France Is Governed*, English trans. (1914); E. M. Sait, *Government and Politics of France* (1918); Noell, *L'administration de la France* (1911); L. Jacques, *Les parties politiques sous la troisième république* (1913); A. Rambaud, *Jules Ferry* (1903); C. Dawbarn, *Makers of New France* (1915), P. Deschanel, *Gambetta* (1919); H. M. Hyndman, *Clemenceau* (1919); S. Huddleston, *Poincaré* (1924); A. Fabre-Luce, *La Victoire* (1925).

CHAPTER XXII

THE GERMAN EMPIRE AFTER 1871

1. The Government

After the defeat of France in 1871, the North German Confederation, joined by the four southern states of Baden, Bavaria, Hesse, and Würtemberg, was changed into the German Empire. The constitution of 1867 was continued, with minor alterations, as the fundamental law of the new state, which was a federal union of twenty-five states resembling somewhat the United States. The individual states were given large powers, but the imperial government had jurisdiction over industrial combinations, railways, social welfare, the civil and criminal codes and foreign affairs. The officials of the individual states, supervised by the central government, enforced the federal laws. Thus the German Empire was limited, representative, and federal — partly democratic and partly monarchic; partly elective and partly hereditary.

Constitution of the German Empire

The constitution made the hereditary king of Prussia, who was president of the Federation, emperor with power to preserve his independence of the legislature. Any act that menaced his authority he might declare to be an amendment to the constitution, and then defeat it by his control over the Prussian votes in the Federal Council (Bundesrat). Although he had no veto over laws passed by parliament, yet through Prussia's control of military affairs and federal taxes, he could exercise that right to a limited degree. He called and dissolved the national legislature, and held the balance of political power in his own hands. The chancellor was his servant, and assumed all responsibility for all official acts of the emperor, who was personally inviolable and officially irresponsible.

The Emperor

The imperial legislature consisted of the Bundesrat and the Reichstag. The Bundesrat, clothed with more power than any body in the Empire, helped to make laws, and acted as a supreme court. Its members were appointed by the rulers of the 25 different states with an unequal distribution of the 61 members. Thus Prussia had 17 members; Bavaria 6; Saxony and Würtemberg 4 each; and the other states from 1 to 3 each. The delegates voted as state groups under instructions from their governments. The Bundesrat could not only initiate laws, but could even pass ordinances with the force of law. It could approve or reject many federal officers. In inter-state quarrels, it acted as a final court. Although amendments to the constitution had to originate in the lower house, yet only 14 votes in

Parliament

the Bundesrat could defeat them. Hence one state, Prussia, with 17 votes, could prevent any changes in the fundamental law. Like the old Diet of Frankfort, the Bundesrat was undemocratic, the bulwark of monarchy and privilege, and the most powerful factor in the government.

The Reichstag, with 397 members elected for five years by universal male franchise, was the most democratic part of the national government. It did not often use its right to initiate laws — that was left to the Bundesrat — but contented itself with discussing, amending, and accepting or rejecting them. Since its chief function was to give advice and to criticize, the government used it as a thermometer of the feelings of the nation. It exercised far less power in shaping legislation than the lower houses in the United States, Great Britain, and France. Since the apportionment of seats was not changed after 1870, in later years it did not truly represent the German people. For example, Berlin with a population of 600,000 in 1870 had six members and that number was not increased when the inhabitants grew to over 2,000,000. On the other hand, East Prussia, with a rural population equal to that of Berlin had seventeen representatives. In 1912 about 2,000,000 voters elected 74 conservative members, while 4,250,000 Social Democrats chose only 110 members. All clamors for a change were denied because the old system of apportionment gave the advantage to the advocates of conservatism. Thus while progressive countries throughout the world were becoming more and more democratic, Germany remained strongly monarchical until the Empire was overthrown in the Revolution of 1918.

The reasons for the persistence of political conservatism in Germany may be briefly summarized:

1. The overtowering power of Prussia, covering two thirds of the Empire and having 40,000,000 out of the 67,000,000 people in 1914, prevented liberal changes in the motley union of monarchies and city republics of unequal size and with constitutions and legislatures more or less democratic. In both branches of the imperial parliament, Prussia had a controlling voice, and her king was the German emperor. In the Bundesrat, Prussian delegates were chairmen of all standing committees except that on foreign affairs. Indeed the Empire was formed, it might be said, by the extension of Prussian authority over the smaller states. In the aristocratic government of Prussia, the House of Lords was composed of 300 landed nobles, and the lower house consisted of 443 members elected by the famous, indirect, three-class system of voting. In each electoral district the voters were divided into (1) the few wealthy men, about 3 per cent, who paid a third of the direct taxes; (2) a larger group of the moderately rich, about 10 per cent, who paid another third; and (3) the common people, about 87 per cent, who paid the last third. Each of these three classes chose a third of the delegates to the district electoral college, which then selected the representatives. This device,

Persistence of conservatism in the German Empire

which permitted property, not men, to vote, was invented to prevent government by the people.

2. The autocratic emperor was in nowise subject to legislative control, as was the case in the progressive states of Europe. There was no cabinet system, and the chancellor, as the arm of the Emperor, no matter how often his measures were voted down by the parliament, continued in office as the emperor's spokesman until removed by him. Since the chancellor was usually also the prime minister of Prussia and acted as chairman of the Bundesrat, he initiated most of the imperial legislation, and moulded the policy of Germany both at home and abroad. "The king governs; the ministers do not," said Bismarck, the "Iron Chancellor." The emperor employed the machinery of the chancellorship to entrench autocratic rule throughout the nation.

3. Militarism was a third factor in promoting and perpetuating absolute power. The Empire was created by "blood and iron," and the military class made that policy the bedrock of German power. An uprising to force liberal concessions would have been crushed by the Prussian military machine that had defeated Austria and France. The schools, the pulpit, and the press were used to teach the people the duty of obedience, and to make them believe that the safety and prosperity of the fatherland depended upon a strong army and navy. Consequently, the large majority of the people patriotically supported the military autocracy under the delusion that it was "enlightened, economical, and efficient."

4. The middle class and the workingmen, although they formed an overwhelming majority of the nation, refused to unite, as in France and Great Britain, to overthrow autocracy and privilege which were perpetuated by the ruling minority of militarists and landed aristocracy, called the "Junkers." The middle class feared that the workers, who were largely socialistic, would establish a socialistic republic. The wage-earners, on the other hand, refused to permit political power to pass into the hands of the capitalists. With its opponents divided into two hostile camps, the conservative minority ruled Germany from 1871 to 1918, when defeat in the World War caused their power to crumble before a popular revolution.

5. There were no true political parties, as in Great Britain and the United States, because the government was above parties. In the Reichstag, usually following elections, certain groups were organized, not on broadly national lines, but on race, section, religion, class and economic interest. At the outbreak of the World War there were five major divisions: (1) The Conservatives, centering in Prussia, were champions of strong government, militarism and an aggressive foreign policy. (2) The Roman Catholic or "Center" party included all classes, defended its church interests, combatted socialism, and as a rule voted with the Conservatives but favored many social reform projects. (3) The National Liberals represented the middle class,

supported protectionism, militarism, and a colonial empire; and yet advocated governmental reforms in opposition to the "Junkers." (4) The Progressives were another middle-class party of more radical inclinations which favored a revision of national representation, a responsible ministry, the curtailment of militarism, the separation of church and state, and free trade. (5) The Social Democrats alone were organized both nationally and locally, held nominating conventions, and had a regular platform. Their strength came from the industrial centers. They stood for the abolition of class government and of the exploitation of labor, the destruction of capitalism, and a socialistic state. By playing off one party against another, and by relying upon the pretty consistent support of the "Blue-Black" *bloc*, the autocratic government was able to perpetuate its power.

Political parties

2. The Chancellorship of Bismarck 1871–1890

After creating the German Empire with the sword, there remained the no less difficult problem of unifying and nationalizing it. Bismarck, as architect and master-builder, set about this task with his characteristic boldness and keen understanding. His powerful friend and ally was Emperor William I, who at his coronation as king of Prussia took the crown from the communion table and placed it on his own head saying: "The crown comes only from God, and I have received it from His hands." Later he reminded all imperial officers that their oath also included "supporting the policy of the government at the elections." Bismarck relied principally upon the National Liberals and later the Conservatives and the army to carry out his policy. Other parties had to coöperate or be crushed. He threw consistency to the winds and shaped his plans to the needs of the hour, but always the supreme goal he had in mind was a fatherland *united, strong, and great.*

Bismarck's methods

Germany's success on the battle field had left one half of Europe uneasy, the other half hostile. The war-maker must remove all suspicions by becoming the peace-maker. Bismarck, "satisfied" with the commanding position Germany had won by 1871, set about to insure the permanency of his nation's place in European affairs. To placate France for the loss of Alsace-Lorraine, he suggested that she should seek compensation in northern Africa, and to prevent united action by the French, he encouraged the Republicans and in this way kept alive the constitutional conflict. To isolate her and thus avoid war, he formed the Three Emperors' League with Russia and Austria, and induced Italy to enter the German group in 1882 in the historic Triple Alliance. In a speech in the Reichstag in 1888 Bismarck explained the reasons for his foreign policy thus: "God has placed us where we are prevented, thanks to our neighbors, from growing lazy and dull." The French, "the most warlike and restless of all nations" are on one side, and Russia, with "military inclinations," on the other. "The Franco-Russian vise within which we are

Foreign policy

squeezed compels us to hold together" and to form a close alliance with Austria. "We are situated in the heart of Europe, and have at least three fronts open to attack." Hence the secret treaty of alliance with Austria in 1879 provided for "reciprocal aid" in case of attack by Russia or by another power supported by Russia.

To foster national unity at home, Bismarck combatted the dangers of state rights by increasing the power of the central government. The various state banks were unified under an imperial bank for financial stability. New coins, decorated with the Emperor's image, and the imperial arms, spread the new German nationalism. The diverse commercial, civil, and criminal laws were unified into a new national code with national law courts. An imperial bureau took charge of the state railroads, the telephone and the telegraph lines. These acts, and many others, were intended to create national patriotism and solidarity.

Centralization

The *Kulturkampf*, a contest between the Empire and the Roman Catholic Church, was viewed by Bismarck as a phase of the struggle for German unity. In the elections of 1871 the German Catholics, most of them resident in non-Prussian territory or in the Polish provinces, sent 63 members to the Reichstag, as champions of (1) Pius IX's *Syllabus of Modern Errors* (1864), which denied religious freedom to other creeds, denounced modern civilization, and asserted the complete independence of the church from the state; (2) the dogmas of papal universality and infallibility decreed in 1870 by the Vatican Council; and (3) the restoration of the pope's temporal power. German Protestants and even some German Catholics, who called themselves "Old Catholics," opposed these claims. As a result the Old Catholics were driven from the Catholic schools, dismissed from ecclesiastical offices, and excommunicated. Then the orthodox Catholic bishops demanded that the government dismiss the Old Catholics from the state universities and public schools. Prussia and other states refused to do so. This led the orthodox Catholic clergy to attack the German government, and a bitter religious war resulted.

Kulturkampf

The first imperial parliament made it a penal offense for the Catholic clergy to assail the government, and forbade religious orders to engage in teaching. The Jesuits were next expelled from Germany. Then Prussia passed the May Laws in 1873–5, which required civil marriage, cut off all appropriations for the Catholic Church, and forced young priests to be educated in the state schools. Bismarck approved these measures on the ground that the Catholics were threatening the unity of the Empire. The pope, on the other hand, pronounced them illegal, and ordered the clergy to disregard them. Germany was soon in an uproar. Bismarck, backed by the Protestants and the 50,000 Old Catholics, sought to enforce the laws by fines, imprisonment, and dismissals. "We shall not go to Canossa," defiantly boasted the Iron Chancellor, who proceeded to close Cath-

Surrender of Bismarck

olic churches and seize their property. "The Diocletian persecution" united the Catholics, who in 1877 returned 92 members to the Reichstag. By this time even non-Catholics began to denounce the harsh laws as a violation of religious liberty. Bismarck was wise enough to see his mistake, and began to retreat. He was further impelled towards peace with the Catholics because he desired Catholic support for the program of social legislation designed to weaken the Social Democrats. With the election of Pope Leo XIII, a prelate of conciliatory nature, in 1878 Bismarck deemed it wise to make peace — to go to Canossa after all — and the most objectionable laws were repealed. As a reward for his surrender, he had the support of the Catholic party in solving the grave social and economic questions confronting him.

The Industrial Revolution in Germany

In 1870 Germany was a country of 40,000,000 people employed chiefly in handicrafts and farming. This comparatively poor nation of "poets and philosophers" had made little progress in manufacturing and mining. The imports greatly exceeded the exports, and free trade prevailed down to 1879. More than 100,000 emigrants left Germany each year. About two thirds of the people lived in the country, and only eight cities had more than 100,000 inhabitants. Within five years after the creation of the Empire, with governmental financial support, a surprising change began to occur in industry. Factories sprang up by the hundreds, millions of peasants moved from the villages to the manufacturing towns, mines were opened, railroads were built, and ships were sent over the world laden with German goods. The whole country was "booming" with a new industrial spirit. But soon hard times struck Germany: business failures occurred, factories and mills closed, the construction of railroads and ships stopped, and both capitalists and wage-earners suffered in consequence. Then Bismarck turned to a protective tariff for relief: "to preserve the German market for German industry." With the aid of the Conservatives and Catholics, in 1879 he put a duty on farm products and manufactures, restricted German coastwise trade to German ships, and improved docking facilities. The laws of 1881–5 put a high tariff on practically all imports except raw materials. Commercial treaties with foreign countries opened new markets for German goods. This new policy brought such an unprecedented expansion to German industries that foreign trade in 1880 amounted to three times what it had been in 1850.

The next problem attacked by Bismarck was socialism, or "red internationalism," which he regarded as a greater danger than "black internationalism," as Catholicism was designated. The Socialists had opposed the Franco-Prussian War and the conquest of Alsace-Lorraine. They denounced the autocratic Empire, and openly championed a popular government, together with an improved social and economic system. Bismarck hated their type of democracy, feared their influence among the workers, and denounced them

as ungrateful traitors to law, order, and the Empire. When radicals twice tried to assassinate the popular old Emperor William I, Bismarck found an excuse for a series of laws that forbade all organizations, assemblies, and newspapers for the purpose of overthrowing "the social order" or of spreading "socialistic tendencies." The police were empowered to arrest Socialists, and expel them from the country without recourse to the ordinary courts. These measures, passed in 1878, remained in force twelve years. Over a thousand publications were suppressed, 1,500 persons imprisoned, and 900 banished. One is reminded of the steps taken half a century earlier by Metternich to keep people from thinking. These persecutions had the usual result of spreading instead of curbing socialistic propagandism. The Socialists evaded the police by gathering under the disguise of singing societies, athletic associations, bowling unions, and social clubs. Their newspapers were printed in Switzerland and smuggled into Germany, and their conventions were held in Holland and elsewhere. So steadily did the party grow that in 1890 it polled 1,500,000 votes and sent 35 members to the Reichstag. In that year Bismarck was dismissed and the new emperor, conscious of defeat, allowed most of the obnoxious laws to lapse.

The struggle against Socialism

Socialist gains

Realizing that force and repression were insufficient, Bismarck had decided to win the workers away from socialism by social reforms enacted by the state. This, he thought, would convince them that the Empire was their real benefactor. He saw clearly that in an industrial society the working classes must be kept contented if social peace and national power were to be assured. Hence he announced that a Christian state must give heed to the "rights" of the unprotected masses. "A few drops of social oil" by autocratic paternalism would safeguard both capital and labor. He dwelt a good deal on "the duty of humanity and Christianity," and the necessity of bringing the "non-propertied class" to regard the state as a friend and not an enemy. To the Reichstag he said: let the workingman have work when well, care for him when sick, and insure him against poverty when old. Then he will not rush to join the Socialists, but will trust the government. When the middle class complained that this was sheer socialism, Bismarck replied: "If you believe that you can frighten anyone, or call up specters with the word socialism, you take an attitude which I have abandoned." Social legislation would give the state better soldiers, better citizens, and better workers. Hence Bismarck became a pioneer in state socialism by providing: (1) insurance against sickness and accident; (2) protection for children and females; and (3) old age and invalid pension for the poor workers.

Social legislation

It is worth while to look at the effects of the laws of this "greatest scientific social reformer." Laborers, who earned under $500 a year, were compelled to carry sickness insurance. Employers bore two thirds, and the workers one-third, of the cost. In the event of illness, a

workingman received half his pay for 26 weeks, and free medical care. If he died, the funeral expenses were supplied from the same fund. No fewer than 14,500,000 persons were insured and $107,000,000 paid in claims in 1913. Those engaged in industry were forced to carry accident insurance, the cost of which was paid by the employers. In case of death from accident, the family of the insured worker received 20 per cent of his annual wage. By 1913 about 26,000,000 were insured under this law and $51,000,000 in benefits had been paid. Old age insurance was required of all workers who received annually in wages less than $400 and the fund was contributed to by the employers, laborers, and the nation. At the age of 65 the insured was given a pension varying from $30 to $60 a year according to his own payments to the fund. In 1913 some 16,500,000 persons were insured and $52,000,000 had been paid in pensions. The loud complaints of employers about these measures ceased after they saw the efficiency of the employees improved and the industrial output multiplied. But Bismarck's prophesy that social insurance would kill socialism was not fulfilled, for in 1914 the Socialists were stronger than ever. However, it was a far different sort of socialism from that of Karl Marx.

Results of Bismarckian social reform

Not until the close of his political career did Bismarck become actively interested in the beginnings of a colonial empire. Some German commercial cities in 1859 made a treaty with the sultan of Zanzibar, but in 1871 Germany, never a colonizing power, refused to accept French colonies instead of Alsace-Lorraine. While unifying the Empire, Bismarck had no thought of risking fresh conflicts with European powers over worthless colonies. In fact the Prussian conception of rule was ill-fitted to govern distant lands. But the remarkable transformation of Germany from an agricultural to an industrial state, the increase in population and the general scramble for colonies converted Bismarck from an opponent to an advocate of a moderate colonial policy. His memoirs clearly show, however, that he launched out in this new enterprise with hesitation and misgivings. The Samoan Islands were ruled jointly with Great Britain and the United States from 1889 until they were divided in 1900. Enterprising German merchants had already established trading posts in Africa, Asia, and the islands of the Pacific, where they exchanged their goods for cocoa, coffee, rubber, and spices. They organized a Colonial Society, and began to agitate for an overseas imperial policy. Heeding the call of the capitalists, the missionaries, and the patriots, Bismarck, with characteristic vigor, in 1884–5 proclaimed protectorates over 60 trading posts and 100 missionary stations along the coast of Africa, which laid the foundations for Togoland, the Cameroons, German Southwest Africa, and German East Africa. New Guinea was divided between Germany, Great Britain, and Holland in 1886. Imperial funds were granted to establish steamship lines between these distant regions and the fatherland. The dominions of the sultan of Zanzibar were divided among Germany, Italy and

The rise of the German colonial empire

Great Britain until the British government in 1890 established a protectorate over the island and appeased Germany by ceding to her Heligoland. Before Bismarck's resignation in that year a definite policy of colonial expansion was under way.

Bismarck not only founded the German Empire, but established it on a firm basis. By the end of his career, in 1890, the Empire had become a reality, and particularism had largely died out. To be sure, this end had been reached at the expense of democracy, but the German people as a whole were well-satisfied with the existing strong government and regarded the military machine as an indispensable guarantee of security. In the economic sphere Bismarck had established industry and commerce on a sound foundation and had laid the basis for Germany's colonial empire. In Europe, Germany had become the dominating power, protected by a far-flung system of alliances which appeared impregnable, and above it all, directing everything, Bismarck stood as a powerful personality, recognized generally as the greatest statesman since Napoleon.

3. The Reign of Emperor William II 1888–1918

Emperor William I died in 1888, at the age of 91, and was succeeded by his son Frederick III, who was married to a daughter of Queen Victoria and was well-known for his liberal inclinations. But the new emperor was mortally ill when he ascended the throne, and lived only three months more. Upon his death William II assumed the imperial crown. He was a young man of 29, and proved to be one of the most extraordinary personalities who have wielded royal power in modern times. His youth had been very unhappy, and his training, despite a university career, had been largely of a military nature. An eager, receptive, versatile type, he had fallen under the influence of his officer companions, who instilled in his mind the traditions of aristocratic conservatism. No man had a loftier idea of his mission, greater confidence in himself and deeper faith in the glorious future awaiting his fatherland. And yet William II, with the best intentions, proved anything but a blessing to his country. Though well-informed he was superficial, showy and arrogant, a man of spasmodic temperament and quickly changing moods. To the world he appeared as a poseur, an incarnation of the spirit of militarism, and an independable neurotic whose never-ending travels and visits and whose high-sounding, ill-considered speeches and theatrical actions were an element of uncertainty and danger. No man did more to cultivate an exaggerated sense of Germany's importance among his own people and to bring his fatherland into ill-repute abroad. He was, as Edward VII once put it, "the most brilliant failure in history."

Character of William II

It was inevitable that a young man of such pronounced personality would soon come into conflict with Bismarck, who had grown more and more autocratic and uncompromising with advancing age.

Dismissal of Bismarck

Bismarck had predicted that when Crown Prince William became emperor, he would be his own chancellor. A conflict of wills soon appeared, and in 1890 the Iron Chancellor, who had guided the ship of state through stormy waters, was dismissed. He died in 1898 requesting that these words be carved on his tomb: "Here lies Prince Bismarck, a faithful servant of William I." After "dropping the pilot," the young emperor said: "The course remains unchanged. Full steam ahead."

Economic progress under William II

The growth of German industries and commerce under William II was without parallel in recent world history. With rapid strides Germany became a dangerous trade rival of Great Britain and the United States. By 1914 she was the third coal-producing country on earth; and in pig-iron surpassed the British and ranked next to the United States. Her steel output was double that of Great Britain, and her exports of machinery in twenty-five years increased twelve-fold. In 1888 German ships were built in British shipyards; when the World War broke out she had a merchant marine of 5,000,000 tonnage nearly all of which was constructed at home. Her largest steamship lines such as the Hamburg American and the North German Lloyd, had the finest passenger and freight ships afloat. German electrical and chemical industries held a commanding place; German exports of dye-stuffs amounted to about 80 per cent of the world's supply; and German artificial perfumery, indigo, extracts, and medicinal products like camphor, were sold abroad in large quantities. At the same time agriculture and forestry were scientifically developed. Foreign trade was cultivated so persistently that it increased from one to five billion dollars betwen 1870 and 1914, although it fell far short of that of Great Britain.

William II and social legislation

William II accepted Bismarck's theory of state socialism, and hoped to conciliate the Socialists by social and economic reforms. He declared that it was the duty of the state "to protect the weaker classes of society and to aid them to a higher economic and moral development." With the increase of the number of the Socialists, he became alarmed and began to denounce them as "vermin which gnaw at the roots of the imperial oak" and "foes unworthy of the name of Germans." Without success he tried to have a harsher law than Bismarck's enacted, and to have the Socialists in the Reichstag tried for treason because they refused to stand and cheer him. He told the army that he might call upon them to shoot down their brothers and fathers. But in the face of this imperial hostility, the Socialists continued to grow until in 1912 they had more representatives in the Reichstag than any other party. Gradually most of the liberal elements rallied to their banner, and the party itself became more and more moderate in its program. The platform called for universal franchise; the initiative and referendum; equal electoral districts; the payment of members of the Reichstag; a responsible ministry; guarantees for free speech, assembly, and press; a militia instead of a

Socialist strength

standing army; the right of labor unions to organize; and social and economic reforms. They opposed the law of 1913, which raised the standing army from 656,000 to 878,000 at a cost of $250,000,000 until the government consented to raise the money in direct taxes on the incomes and estates of the rich. When the World War broke out, with the exception of a small group, they supported it on the plea that they saw in the triumph of Russia a victory of barbarism over a higher civilization. On August 4 all the Social Democrats voted for the first war credit.

Municipal socialism

The German cities were not merely political units, but intelligent agencies for scientific social welfare. The large industrial cities were free from slums, sanitary, and beautified with fine streets, parks, and squares, while adequate sewer and water systems were built. Special sections were set aside for homes, hospitals, museums, schools, public baths, and factories. Public utilities such as gas and electric plants, street cars, theaters, loan societies, and even dairies, slaughterhouses, breweries and bakeries were owned and operated by some of the city governments. With dishonesty and local politics largely eliminated, German municipal government was held up as a model in other states. Just as France a century earlier hoped to capture the world through "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," so Germany sought to dominate with "Science, Organization and Skill." Everything was carefully worked out in advance, and nothing was left to the blind goddess of luck. Experts were set to work to improve old methods, to eliminate waste, to anticipate trouble, and to systematize methods of production and distribution. Farming, manufacturing, commerce, the national budget and public debt, transportation, communication, education, philanthropy, public health, recreation, and military and naval preparedness were all subjected to scientific study by imperial commissions.

The Army system

The Prussian system of universal military service, extended to the entire Empire by Bismarck, reached its height under William II. Every young man at the age of seventeen was subject to call to military duty for three years, which were reduced to two years in 1893 for the infantry. After this initial service, a soldier went into various grades of the reserve until the completion of his forty-fifth year. Men with a certain standard of education escaped with one year of service and supplied the officers for the reserve forces. In 1914 Germany had 4,000,000 trained soldiers subject to call to duty. The emperor, as head of the army, appointed the General Staff to provide for all contingencies in the event of war. The officers formed a wealthy, noble caste of great power and high social standing, with its own code of ethics and manners. So thorough was the military drill in discipline, courage, and obedience that the common soldiers did not dare to murmur. Military service formed the basis for civic virtue, and the position of the soldier was exalted above other callings.

Militarism became the blighting curse of the German Empire, as of continental Europe in general. It bred paternalism and fed on autocracy. It made the profession of arms the highest national ideal. William II boasted that he was first a soldier and then a citizen; that his "most important heritage" was the army and navy; that they and not the parliament were the "foundation of the state"; and that "blind obedience" was the highest form of patriotism. When the emperor was seen in "six different uniforms on the same day, but never once in civilian uniform," militarism was exalted above civil life. Eminent statesmen like Bismarck and von Bülow were raised to the rank of general as the highest mark of honor. The soldier was everything; the civilian nothing. Scholars, judges, manufacturers, and civil officials were prouder of their uniforms in the reserve army than of their university degrees and their achievements in civil life. Soldiers were seen everywhere — on the streets, in the cafés, in church, and at the universities. Every occasion was taken to point out that the German Empire was created by the army and the future of Germany's greatness depended upon it. Officers suspected of liberal ideas lost their commissions. Any officer, who "wishes to follow his own conscience," said the minister of war, "must take his discharge." The barracks were schools of despotism, grossness, and cruelty, but the outcries against the barbarities were silenced with court-martials and penal servitude.

Abuses of militarism

The Zabern incident in 1913 was characteristic of the brutal and swaggering German military régime. In the little Alsatian town of Zabern the officers had so irritated the people that they were hooted in the streets. As a result, martial law was proclaimed, and a number of persons were arrested. The civil authorities protested. During the disturbance, a fiery young lieutenant struck with his sword a lame shoemaker, who had laughed at him. A wave of indignation swept over the nation. The major in command of the garrison was tried in court but acquitted on the ground that he "did not know that he had acted illegally." The Reichstag by a vote of 293 to 54 censured the government for permitting the affair to occur, and the chancellor had to admit that the officer had "transgressed the limits of the law." The crown prince telegraphed his congratulations to the colonel, who received the Prussian Order, while the governor of Alsace-Lorraine was recalled. The incident showed, nevertheless, that the country at large was decidedly out of sympathy with the attitude of the ruling class.

Zabern Incident

As the foremost military state in the world, the military officers, capitalists, advocates of a colonial empire, and Pan-Germanists began to clamor for a more powerful navy. The construction of railway lines to the eastern and western frontiers for military defense was followed by the completion in 1896 of the Kaiser Wilhelm Canal 61 miles long connecting the North Sea with the Baltic, and the projection of a gigantic inland water-way system. The German Navy

The rise of German navalism

League now aroused patriotic popular support for a huge naval project. Emperor William II never tired of telling his subjects that "the ocean is essential to Germany's greatness" and was convinced that Germany's extensive commerce required a formidable navy to protect it. Heligoland, obtained from Great Britain in 1890, gave Germany an island naval base at the mouth of the river Elbe. The Naval Acts of 1898 and 1900 began a big program of shipbuilding, which soon ranked Germany as a naval power next to Great Britain, and caused the latter to make desperate efforts to keep her naval strength at twice that of Germany.

Germany's wealth, population, industrial interests, and powerful army and navy, enabled her to pursue a vigorous foreign policy. Chancellor von Bülow, a Prussian landlord of wide diplomatic experience, came to the front as the champion of the new German imperialism. He reflected the views of the emperor and of those classes, who wanted to see Germany become a great world power. Under his leadership Germany made herself economically the dominating power in Turkey. German officers reorganized the Turkish army and young Turkish officers were sent to the German military schools. Emperor William II made two visits to the sultan and proclaimed himself the mighty friend of all Mohammedans. German statesmen replaced the British in directing the foreign policies of the porte. Austro-Hungarian expansion in the Balkans was supported, while Russian designs were blocked. German scientists studied the

Foreign policy and imperialism

economic possibilities of the Balkans and more especially of Turkey. German capitalists secured concessions to build the Constantinople-Bagdad railroad, which some of the more imaginative expansionists said would be the spinal column of a powerful German Empire embracing "Middle Europe" and the Turkish Empire and extending from the North Sea to the Persian Gulf. Talk of this sort aroused the hostility of France, Russia, and Great Britain.

In 1904 Great Britain secretly recognized the "special" interests of France in Morocco in exchange for French recognition of England's position in Egypt. Each nation promised to defend the rights of the other diplomatically. Suspecting this arrangement, William II in 1905 suddenly appeared at Tangier, saluted the sultan's representative as the spokesman of an independent power, and praised the German business pioneers, who "in a free land" were keeping alive "the interests of the fatherland." The French and British both interpreted this visit as a German challenge for a share in the trade and political control of Morocco, as indeed it was intended to be. To adjust the problem without war, the conference of Algeciras was held in 1906, and attended by representatives of the chief European powers, the United States, and Morocco. Germany stood for an independent Morocco and an open door for trade as laid down by the Madrid Convention of 1880. France and Spain insisted upon the recognition of their special treaty rights, and in the end they secured control of the

Morocco crises

police force in the country, though the Moroccan bank was to be an international enterprise. This settlement, however, soon proved unsatisfactory to all parties concerned.

Another crisis was precipitated in 1908 by an incident at Casablanca in Morocco. Six soldiers, three of whom were Germans, fled from the French Foreign Legion, an armed force policing the country, to the German consulate, where they were protected and given passports to embark on a German ship. While going to the ship with German agents, they were arrested by French officers. Germany demanded their release but France refused and proposed to refer the case to the Hague Tribunal. The decision of that body was accepted. Three years later came the Agadir affair. With her soldiers in Morocco, France was in complete control. Realizing this, Germany demanded "compensations" from France in exchange for a "free hand" but met with a rebuff. To protect German interests and the open door in trade, the *Panther*, a German gun-boat, was sent to Agadir.

For some weeks war threatened. Lloyd George made it clear that his country would support France but disclaimed any threat of war. In the end it was agreed: (1) that France should establish a protectorate over Morocco; (2) that Germany should be given a part of the French Congo as compensation; and (3) that the open door policy should be continued. This settlement likewise satisfied no one. The French felt that Germany by political blackmail had taken a portion of her African territory, and, certain of English backing, felt that a stronger attitude should have been taken. The Germans were alarmed at the firmness of France and the attitude of England, and there was a distinct feeling that Germany had not received her due. Germany's answer to these diplomatic defeats was the increase of the imperial army in 1913. By this time Africa was so completely divided up among the European powers that no country could extend its possessions except at the expense of some other power. That Germany was planning to expand in the Dark Continent at the expense of France seems to be indicated by the fact that at the outbreak of the World War the German government declined to give Great Britain any assurance of the integrity of the French colonies in the event of war.

Pan-German League

The Pan-German League, organized in 1894, soon became a noisy though small group preaching an enlarged Germany. The term "German" was interpreted to include Holland, the Flemish part of Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Austria, and parts of Russia and Switzerland. The most patriotic Pan-Germans openly asserted that sooner or later, by war or peace, these portions of Europe would form a part of "Greater Germany." By 1908 this League carried on an extensive agitation through its newspapers, a large fund, and able speakers. Though it never exerted any great political influence it coöperated with the Navy League, the Defense Association, and other patriotic

societies. By 1911 its original purpose was merged with the larger ambition to make Germany "a dominant power in the history of the whole world." Fortunately the League had little influence on the government. Carefully planned propaganda was set on foot to hold the loyalty of Germans in all parts of the earth. In 1913, the centenary of the War of Liberation, the League joined twenty other patriotic organizations in a great "drive" to strengthen "national feeling" in support of the increase of the army. Even Bebel said the Socialists would "fight to the last gasp in defense of the fatherland." Though not actually so intended, the enthusiasm aroused in that year had much to do with the general support of the war in 1914.

Improvement of Anglo-German relations 1905–14

In the years preceding 1914 Germany felt more and more keenly that the world was turning against her, and she was struggling to maintain her interests and her position. German-Austrian influence in the Balkans and Turkey had aroused the Russians, on the one hand; and interference in Morocco had angered the French, on the other. The British by controlling the sheik of Koweit had checked the construction of the Bagdad railway to the Persian Gulf; and through their influence in Persia had prevented the extension of the road farther into Asia. Blocked in this manner, Germany in 1913 reached a preliminary agreement with Great Britain, which (1) recognized German railway and economic rights as far as Bagdad; (2) planned for the extension of the line as far as Bassora under international control; and (3) reserved to the British the right to build the road the remaining 85 miles to Koweit. Negotiations for a triple treaty with Turkey and Great Britain were proceeding satisfactorily, when the European crisis of 1914 arose. Friendly notes were likewise exchanged between Germany and Great Britain over increases in the navy program, when stopped by the threat of war.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

W. H. Dawson, *The Evolution of Modern Germany* (1907, 1919); *The German Empire, 1867–1914*, 2 vols. (1919); *Bismarck and State Socialism* (1891); *Protection in Germany* (1904); *The German Workman* (1906); *Social Insurance in Germany, 1883–1911* (1912); *Municipal Life and Government in Germany* (1914); A. Ward, *Germany* (1919); H. Ichtenberger, *Germany and its Evolution in Modern Times* (1913); K. Lamprecht, *Deutsche Geschichte der jüngsten Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, 2 vols. (1912–1913); O. Bismarck, *Gedanken und Erinnerungen* (2 vols., 1898, Vol. III, 1919), English translation of I and II (1899); G. Goyau, *Bismarck et l'église: le Culturkampf, 1870–1887*, 4 vols. (1911–1913); B. von Bülow, *Imperial Germany* (1914); J. E. Barker, *Modern Germany* (1905, 1919); B. E. Howard, *The German Empire* (1906); P. Laband, *Deutsches Reichstaatsrecht* (6th edition 1912); F. K. Krueger, *Government and Politics of the German Empire* (1915); O. Stillich, *Die politischen Parteien in Deutschland*, 2 vols. (1908–1911); H. G. James, *Principles of Prussian Administration* (1913); C. de Lestrade, *Les monarchies de l'empire allemand* (1914); O. Hammann, *Der Missverstandene Bismarck* (1921); W. Sombart, *Deutsche Volkswirtschaft im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (1903); F. C. Howe, *Socialized Germany* (1915); T. B. Veblen, *Imperial Germany and the Industrial Revolution* (1915); K. Helfferich, *Germany's Economic Progress and National Wealth, 1888–1913* (1913); W. P. Paterson, *German Culture: the Contribution of the Germans to Knowledge, Literature, Art, and Life* (1915); A. Guilland, *Modern Germany and her Historians* (1915); P. Rohrbach,

German World Policies, English translation by E. von Mach (1915); A. Hurd and H. Castle, *German Sea Power, its Rise, Progress, and Economic Basis* (1913); A. Zimmermann, *Geschichte der Deutschen Kolonialpolitik* (1914); E. Lewin, *The Germans and Africa* (1915); R. H. Fife, *The German Empire between Two Wars* (1917); F. Hartung, *Deutschland unter Wilhelm II* (1918); W. F. Massow, *Deutschlands Innere Geschichte unter Wilhelm II* (1920); E. Reventlow, *Deutschlands Auswärtige Politik* (1911); E. Brandenburg, *Von Bismarck zum Weltkrieg* (1922); W. Valentin, *Deutschlands Aussenpolitik, 1890–1918* (1921); M. E. Townsend, *Origins of Modern German Colonialism, 1871–1885* (1921); M. Wertheimer, *The Pan-German League* (1925).

CHAPTER XXIII

THE DUAL MONARCHY OF AUSTRIA-HUNGARY

I. The Dual Government

The Austro-Hungarian Empire was unique among the states of Europe. The political machinery set up in 1867 by the Compromise (*Ausgleich*), endured until the disastrous defeat in the World War dissolved the unnatural union of nationalities. In the throne room of the Hapsburgs at Vienna were the gilt letters AEIOU, meaning "Austria rules the world," (*Austriae est imperare in orbe universo*), adopted by Emperor Frederick in 1443 as the emblem of the invincibility of Austrian rule. But in 1918 the proud Hapsburg house, like the Hohenzollerns and Romanovs, crumbled to dust.

Dual government

The Compromise lasted half a century. It created, not national unity, but a dual imperial rule under a monarch who commanded the army and navy, appointed joint ministers, promulgated the laws, and had a veto over the acts of the delegations as well as of the two parliaments. The delegations, chosen annually, sat in separate national chambers to settle common problems for ten-year periods and to vote the budget for the army and foreign service. In case of disagreement, they met together and voted as one body. This system caused delays, confusion, and national jealousies. Hence it was predicted quite generally that the first serious shock would dissolve this political patchwork.

This polyglot Empire in 1914 contained about 50,000,000 people representing a dozen different races and four religions, and was regarded as one of the "danger zones" of Europe. (1) The Germans, numbering about 12,000,000 or a quarter of the total population, represented the wealthiest, best-educated, and ruling element. In the past they had hoped to "Germanize" the whole Empire but in the last 25 years they were struggling merely to maintain their position. They were centered in Austria, but were also scattered throughout the rest of the Empire. (2) The Hungarians formed a solid block of nearly 10,000,000 surrounded by Germans, Slavs and Rumanians. For a thousand years they had preserved their national existence and had kept their weaker Slavic neighbors under an iron heel. (3) The Slavs, including 25,000,000 or half the entire population, constituted the largest group, but were divided by dialects, customs, and location. In the north were 8,500,000 Czecho-Slovaks in Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, and Hungary; 5,000,000 Poles in Silesia and Galicia; and

Ethnic situation

4,000,000 Ruthenians in Galicia and Bukowina. In the south were 1,250,000 Slovenes in Styria and Carniola; 5,500,000 Serbo-Croats in Croatia, Slavonia, Bosnia, and Dalmatia. Excepting the Czechs and the Croats, the Slavs were backward in education and in economic progress. (4) The Latins numbered 4,000,000 and were divided between the 1,000,000 Italians north of Italy and around the Adriatic, and the 3,000,000 Rumanians in Transylvania and Bukowina. Confronted by this complex racial situation, the Hapsburg rulers were forced to follow one of two courses — either to federalize the Empire, or to crush national autonomy and assert their control over all the non-German nationalities. Unfortunately the latter alternative was chosen, and the Dual Monarchy was regarded as only a temporary arrangement until complete Austrian domination could be established.

2. The Austrian Empire

The Austrian constitution of the year 1867 contained a modern bill of rights, and provided for a fairly liberal parliamentary government. The emperor, who was "sacred, inviolable, and irresponsible," retained all powers not expressly taken away from him. The cabinet as in Germany was practically subject to his will. The Reichsrat was divided into two houses — an aristocratic House of Lords, and a House of Representatives elected every six years. The electoral law of 1907 abolished class voting and in its place established direct manhood suffrage. The large number of political factions interfered greatly with smoothly-running political machinery and made it impossible for the parliament to assert its control over the ministers; to this difficulty were added serious racial and religious differences. *Austrian government*

Out of a total population of 30,000,000 under Austrian rule, only about 40 per cent was German. Half of the population was Slavic, eager for an independent status like that of Hungary. In Bohemia the Germans and Czechs were engaged in a bitter feud. The Poles, enjoying self-government, were disposed to support the Hapsburg régime, especially since the Ruthenian peasants were left pretty much to the mercies of their polish landlords.

The southern Slavs were treated with less consideration. To counteract the desire of the Italians for annexation to Italy, Slavs were encouraged to settle in their regions. Thus one group was played off against another until fear forced them to accept protection from imperial hands. But this settlement was no settlement at all, and only stored up trouble for the future. These national groups became more insistent upon the recognition of their own languages, schools, and local political institutions, in a federalized state. Only the necessity of standing together for defense, affection for the old ruler, Franz Joseph, and common economic interests held the discordant groups together. Riots were common, but were put down by force. The extension of the right to vote to the Slavs allayed the *Problems of nationality*

controversy, but did not settle it. In 1913 the Bohemian diet was suspended and Bohemia was ruled from Vienna. The final settlement came in 1918 with the collapse of Austria-Hungary in the World War.

Social legislation

Austria passed some laws to improve the lot of the common people. In 1884–5 there were established a ten-hour day for workers in the mines and an eleven-hour day for the factories. Sunday labor was prohibited, and the use of women and children in industry was restricted. The insurance of laborers against sickness or accident was made obligatory in 1888. Trade-unions were given a legal status. State ownership of railways was begun. The Industrial Revolution was slowly transforming the country, but Austria was still predominantly an agricultural state.

3. The Kingdom of Hungary

Hungarian government

When Hungary became an independent Kingdom in 1867, the constitution of 1848 was patched up to meet her needs. Although the emperor of Austria was recognized as the king of Hungary, his power was greatly restricted. The parliament consisted of two houses — the Table of Magnates representing the privileged classes, and the Chamber of Deputies chosen by a complicated and narrow franchise, which enabled the Magyar gentry to retain complete control. In 1914 out of a population of 21,000,000 there were only 1,100,000 voters. The numerous political factions and racial groups enabled the ministers to evade their responsibility to the people with the result that the parliamentary government system worked little better than in Austria.

Magyarization

The Magyars constituted scarcely half of the total population, yet they dominated the social, economic, and political life of the country. They occupied the best portions of the kingdom and pursued a ruthless "Magyarization" of the 5,500,000 Slavs, the 3,000,000 Rumanians, and the 2,000,000 Germans. The 1,000,000 Jews readily adopted the Magyar speech. Of the subject peoples, the inhabitants of Croatia-Slavonia alone had their own local government and used their own language. Elsewhere every effort was made to prevent the non-Magyars from electing their own nationals to office. In 1910 only ten members of the Chamber were not Magyars. Under this oppression, the Slavs looked to union with Serbia or Rumania for the realization of their national freedom. Between 1896 and 1910 more than a million people emigrated to other lands, chiefly to the United States. The poorer people suffered not only from the autocratic government, but also from the aristocratic system of landholding. By 1914 some attention was paid to popular education and to the improvement of agriculture, but Hungary was commonly regarded as one of the most feudal countries in Europe. Its industries were chiefly agriculture and flour-milling. To the 76 per cent of the disfranchised men the extension of the right to vote was a burning question.

Many of the Magyars loyally supported the Dual Monarchy only because they thought that it gave them protection in the event of war. The nationalists, however, desired to see the tie weakened, or broken altogether. Strong men like Count Tisza and Deak were champions of dualism, but others like Francis Kossuth, the son of the earlier revolutionist, led a party for complete separation. Every ten years, when the joint agreements were renewed, the country was in an uproar. Franz Joseph evaded difficulties by threatening to proclaim universal franchise in Hungary and thus turn the rule over to the non-Magyars and lower classes. The conflict was an irrepressible one, and would have led to separation sooner or later, had not the World War settled the problem. When that storm broke out, the party of independence, through fear of Russia, heartily supported Vienna, until the collapse came.

Hungarian aspirations for independence

4. Foreign Relations

It was dread of Russia that threw Austria-Hungary into the arms of Bismarck in 1879, when the Dual Alliance was formed. The tension between Russia and Austria-Hungary was somewhat relaxed in 1881, when in a secret treaty the latter power agreed to the union of Bulgaria and Rumelia in exchange for permission to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina. At the same time a friendly understanding was reached with Serbia that she should not make any foreign treaty without the consent of Austria-Hungary. Looking for support for her Mediterranean policy against France, Italy asked to be taken into the Triple Alliance in 1882. Austria-Hungary thought that this arrangement would stop the cry for *Italia irredenta*, and relieve her of an enemy in the rear.

Triple alliance

For years it was the ambition of Austria-Hungary to become the dominant power in the Balkans, which lay just to the southeast of her, either as conqueror or as dictator over a "sphere of influence," although it was well-known that this meant the implacable hostility of Russia and of other European powers. The Congress of Berlin in 1878 authorized her to "administer" Bosnia and Herzegovina, with the general understanding that in due time these provinces would be annexed. Meanwhile little Serbia began an intense propaganda to secure them, and thus open for herself a way to the sea. In 1908 the Dual Monarchy, at the suggestion of Russia, and to forestall the demands of the Young Turks for their restoration, annexed them. This act precipitated a crisis in European diplomacy. But, befriended by Germany, Austria-Hungary weathered the storm of protest, and in 1909 the Turkish parliament recognized the annexation in return for an indemnity of $12,500,000. The crisis passed without war, but it left the seeds of bitterness, which bore fruit in 1914. Serbia felt herself frustrated and disgraced; Russia was chagrined, because she did not receive the Straits as compensation for annexation of Slavic states; and France and Great Britain were balked in their effort to uphold

The Balkan issue

the treaty of Berlin. Austria-Hungary, aided by her powerful ally, Germany, emerged with heightened prestige and increased territory. Indirectly the murder of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand and his wife in 1914 at Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia, the immediate occasion for the outbreak of the World War, was caused by this annexation.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

H. W. Steed, W. A. Phillips, and D. A. Hannay, *Short History of Austria-Hungary and Poland* (1914); *The Hapsburg Monarchy* (2d edition 1914); B. Auerbach, *Les races et les nationalités en Autriche-Hongrie* (1898); A. R. and E. M. C. Colquhon, *The Whirlpool of Europe, Austria-Hungary and the Hapsburgs* (1907), G. Dragr, *Austria-Hungary* (1909); R. W. Seton-Watson, *Racial Problems in Hungary* (1908); *Corruption and Reform in Hungary* (1911); *The Southern Slav Question and the Hapsburg Monarchy* (1911); D. S. Kovitch, *L'annexation de la Bosnie-Herzegovine et le droit international* (1912); F. Schmid, *Bosnien und die Herzegovina unter der Verwaltung Oesterreich-Ungarns* (1914); P. Teleki, *The Evolution of Hungary and its Place in European History* (1921); V. Gayda, *Modern Austria: her Racial and Social Problems* (1915); A. Hevesy, *Nationalities in Hungary* (1919); A. F. Pribram, *The Secret Treaties of Austria-Hungary* (1922).

CHAPTER XXIV

THE EXPANSION OF THE RUSSIAN EMPIRE

1. Expansion in Asia

Thwarted in her drive for Constantinople by the Crimean War Russia then turned her attention to the Far East. Fifty years before the reign of Peter the Great, restless bands of Russians had crossed Siberia and reached the Pacific. From that time onward for three hundred years, Russia had had an eye on Asia. After the middle of the nineteenth century, the conquest of Siberia became a fixed policy, although it must be said that Russia had no need to find free soil for a surplus population. Into that vast region went adventurers, merchants, brave men in search of gold, trappers, political exiles, and runaway serfs. By 1860 the Amur valley and the seacoast south to Valadivostock were secured from China. Alaska was sold to the United States in 1867 and Sakhalin island was acquired in 1875 from Japan. From the point of view of world history, Russia greatly extended European rule into Asia and also demonstrated that Asiatic empires could not resist the invasion of European powers unless they adopted the technical improvements of the western world. Important commercial privileges were secured from China. To open up the rich resources of Siberia and to connect European Russia with the Pacific, the Trans-Siberian railroad was begun in 1891 with funds borrowed from France. It was completed about ten years later and was the longest railroad on earth running over five thousand miles eastward from Moscow. The consent of China was secured to run the line more than a thousand miles across Manchuria, and to build a branch line southward from Harbin to Port Arthur, which was leased to Russia in 1898 for a period of twenty-five years. Russian troops were poured into Manchuria to protect Russian interests, and Port Arthur, an ice-free port — "a window on the Pacific" — was strongly fortified. Siberia now began to fill up with immigrants, and the products of the mines, farms and forests, as well as the silks and tea of China, could be transported cheaply to the markets of Europe.

Russian movement eastward

The largest territorial gains made by Russia in Asia were not in Siberia, but in central Asia and the Caucasus, where a drive was made for an opening on the Indian Ocean. Gradually the tribes of Turkestan were conquered and the whole territory from the Caspian Sea to China was annexed. Russian agents were sent into Afghanistan and Baluchistan to the southward. Three important railroads were built across Turkestan, and one of these extended to Herat in Afghanistan. Russian expansion towards the Indian Ocean was stopped by

the Anglo-Russian agreement of 1907, which made Afghanistan a buffer state under British control. At the same time Persia was divided into (1) a Russian zone in the north; (2) a neutral zone in the middle; and (3) a British zone in the south. The reform of Persian finances was undertaken by the two countries jointly. When the Persians revolted against this interference, deposed the Shah, and called in an American financial adviser, Russia and Great Britain forced his dismissal, and continued their "peaceful penetration." By 1914 Russia had won an empire in Asia almost twice as large as all Europe, with which regions a lucrative trade was carried on.

2. Maintenance of Autocracy under Alexander III

Reactionary and absolutistic methods

At the time of his father's death in 1881, Alexander III was thirty-six years old, a physical giant, a soldier like his grandfather, Nicholas I, strong-willed, and intensely patriotic. He told his subjects that the "Voice of God" bade him preserve "the autocratic power" for the "good of the people." The revolutionists advised him to abandon absolutism as a national menace and said that the harshest punishments would not thwart their efforts for a free, modern Russia. They boldly told the tsar that he must either call a national assembly or face a bloody revolution. In reply to these threats, Alexander III called upon his loyal subjects to crush this "heinous agitation." He had no thought of imitating the more advanced states of Europe by giving his people education and civil liberty.

Pobiedonostsev

As confidential adviser, Alexander III selected Pobiedonostsev, his old teacher, a man who despised democracy as a trick of the wealthy middle class to fool the poor; who said that an unfettered press only spread falsehoods; who declared that freedom of worship led to insurrection against the church and state; and who contended that representative parliaments were sources of corruption and selfishness. All liberals and radicals were pitilessly hunted down, their organizations broken up, and their leaders jailed, or exiled. Thousands were sent to the wilderness of Siberia; and thousands of others fled to western Europe and America. Secret police and spies terrorized the country. The peasants, so far as possible, were subjected to the control of the lords. In 1886 a breach of contract by a workingman was made a crime. Local magistrates were superseded in 1889 by "land captains" named by the governors, and they were given judicial and administrative control over the peasants. The *zemstvos* and the city *dumas* were placed in the hands of the upper classes. By force all subject racial groups were to be "Russified" under the motto, "One Russia, one creed, one tsar." The Jews, particularly, were persecuted and driven to flight.

A small but influential group of Russians urged the isolation of the Slavs from the contaminating influences of western civilization. They said that the unique mission of the Russians was to preserve "benevolent autocracy," the Orthodox Church, and the *mir* in com-

munal life. It was Russia's duty, they held, to extend the helping hand of a "big brother" to other Slavic peoples in Germany, Austria-Hungary, and the Balkans, and perhaps eventually to unite them all in one great Slavic empire. At the same time they sought to improve the lot of the poor peasant, as the true and typical Russian, by extending to him government aid through the remission of taxes, a peasant's bank, and instruction in agriculture. To curtail the sale of liquor to the peasants, in 1894 it was made a state monopoly. The government, naturally, gave its hearty support to the Pan-Slavic movement.

Pan-Slavism

While the Industrial Revolution was transforming western Europe, Russia with its rich natural resources and abundance of cheap labor, was untouched. This was due to the lack of capital and business initiative, and to the reactionary government. The change came under Alexander III. The father of the Russian Industrial Revolution was Serge J. Witte (1849–1915). After graduating from college, he became first a newspaper man and later an expert railroad official. In 1892 he was made minister of communications, and the next year minister of finance, which post he held for a decade. In 1905 he went to the United States to negotiate peace with Japan. To develop Russian industries, by a magic touch he secured foreign capital, and by 1900 there were many thousands of factories employing several millions of workers. Soon the output of iron exceeded that of France or Austria-Hungary. Telegraph lines and railroads were extended in every direction over the Empire. The gold standard was adopted, and the exports doubled in ten years. The same effects appeared in Russia as in other industrial countries. A wave of prosperity swept over the Empire, and a well-to-do middle class began to emerge. The factories, mines, and oil fields drew a stream of peasants from the farms. The standard of living improved, prices increased, and the burden fell upon the workers. The wage-earners organized unions and instituted strikes for better conditions. The government declared these unions illegal and suppressed the strikers by force. Witte, however, was wise enough to secure laws to regulate factory conditions. His dismissal from office unfortunately put an end to these efforts to avert impending disaster.

Witte and industrialization

Upon taking the throne Alexander III said: "The foreign policy of the tsar will be entirely pacific." Hence he sought to remain on friendly terms with all European countries, but in 1889 he complained that Russia, among the powers, had "only one true and sincere friend — little Montenegro." He distrusted the Triple Alliance, which cut Russia off from the rest of Europe. Asia was full of conflicts with Great Britain. Consequently the friendly advances of France in 1891 were cordially received. The two countries had nothing in common except their fear of Great Britain and Germany. France needed an ally; Russia needed credit. The Dual Alliance was the result. Upon the death of Alexander III, France sent 5,000

Foreign policy and the alliance with France

wreaths and 19,000 bunches of artificial flowers tied with crepe and the tricolor, and ticketed with portraits of the tsar and President Carnot bearing the words: "United in sentiment and death."

3. Nicholas II — The Last Tsar

Nicholas II, the last tsar, succeeded his father in 1894. He was only 26 years of age, well-educated, and in his tastes more like his Danish mother than his giant father. He took his turn in the army and was acquainted with state affairs. He had travelled rather widely over the world, and liberals hoped that he would democratize Russia. In his first proclamation from the throne, he vowed to make his "sole aim the peaceful development of the power and glory of our beloved Russia and the happiness of all our faithful subjects." A little later he said: "I shall preserve the principles of autocracy." This meant peace abroad, but "Russification," Pan-Slavism, and repression at home. When a committee of *zemstvos* urged him to grant a constitution and a parliament, he scolded them for such "senseless dreams."

If Nicholas II inherited autocracy from his iron-willed father, he also inherited a wide-spread hostility to it. The middle and professional classes, and workingmen were determined to secure sweeping reforms and kept up an incessant agitation. Thinking the discontent was due to the intellectual classes, a bitter attack was made on the teachers, literary men, and students. College professors were dismissed, and spies were sent into the classrooms and libraries to spot the dangerous liberals. The police were set on the tracks of students and writers, and all who were suspected of revolutionary ideas were hurried off to Siberia without a fair trial. Books on democracy and progress were forbidden to be read. The notorious Plehve devoted all his energy to crushing the revolutionary party. His dragnet of spies and secret police was drawn across Russia to gather in the suspects from the factories, universities, banks, shops, clubs, public bureaus, army, and church. Many thousands were arrested, hanged, imprisoned, or exiled. Racial and religious hatreds were stirred up to turn the people's minds away from reforms. "Leagues of True Russians" were formed against the Jews, Poles, Finns, and others. At last Plehve, the author of all this savagery, himself fell a victim of a bomb thrown by a student.

Plehve and repression

This wanton persecution resulted in the formation of groups hostile to autocratic rule: (1) The landed classes, both peasants and large landowners, resented the encouragement of business to the neglect of their interests. Although watched and hampered by the police, over 400 of the 700 *zemstvos*, or local governments, demanded agricultural reforms, a national parliament, a free press, and civil and political liberty. (2) The wage-earners were bitterly opposed to autocratic institutions, and took up as a panacea Marxian socialism. In 1898 a "Workmen's Social Democratic Party" was formed, which

Increase of opposition to tsardom

fomented strikes, and spread socialistic teachings among hundreds of thousands. The intellectual groups in touch with the peasants organized the "Socialist Revolutionary Party," which demanded the division of large estates, advocated violence, and grew more rapidly after 1904 than the Social Democrats in the cities. (3) The middle class, who represented the brains, wealth, and ability of Russia, resented their exclusion from the imperial government. Many of them had visited the more enlightened countries and believed that the parliamentary system would better protect their rights. In 1904 they organized a party called the "Union of Liberation."

The hostility of these class groups was supplemented by the opposition of the submerged nationalities, which resented "Russification" and religious intolerance: (1) The Poles, Slavic in blood and Roman Catholic in faith, numbering about 8,000,000, remembered how after 1863 Poland became the "Department of the Vistula." Their language was forbidden, their church ruled from St. Petersburg, and their nobles robbed of their estates. Intensely nationalistic, they resisted "Russification," religious oppression, and the loss of their freedom, and joined the various revolutionary parties to obtain a constitutional régime. (2) The Baltic provinces of Esthonia, Livonia, and Courland, where the peasants were mostly Esths and Letts and the upper classes Germans, opposed the efforts to make the Russian tongue official, to deprive them of their local rights, and to "Russify" the German university at Dorpat. (3) The Finns, consisting of 3,000,000 under a ruling Swedish upper class, were furious over the loss of their independence in 1899, when their diet was put under the jurisdiction of the imperial government, their army incorporated in the Russian army, and the Russian language forced upon them as official. They proclaimed a day of mourning, petitioned the tsar to restore their liberties, organized patriotic clubs to resist autocracy, and in 1904 assassinated the Russian governor-general. (4) The 5,000,000 Jews, living mostly in western Russia, with their own religion and language, were forced to live within the "Pale," were barred from all professions except that of army physician, could not own land, and could not gain control of business corporations. Only a small percentage of Jews were allowed to attend the high schools and universities. They had no vote in the local governments, and yet had to pay taxes and serve in the army. Outlawed by the government, they evaded the laws, welcomed any sign of revolution, and opened their ears to the promises of socialism. Pobiedonostsev proposed a simple solution of the Jewish problem — let one-third emigrate from Russia; let another third die of hunger ; and convert the remaining third to the Orthodox Church. Plehve encouraged the "Black Hundreds" to plunder and massacre them in the "pogroms," which aroused the indignation of the whole world.

The minority peoples in Russia

4. The Russo-Japanese War and the Revolution of 1905

The Russo-Japanese War was a product of Russian imperialism, which collided with the aspirations of Japan. The lease of Port Arthur and its conversion into a strongly fortified naval base was intended to keep Japan out of Korea and Manchuria and indeed to cut off all her connections with China. But Japan, in close alliance with Great Britain and as thoroughly militarized as any western nation, demanded that Russia should evacuate both Korea and Manchuria. Russia returned evasive answers, and Japan, without a formal declaration of war, in February, 1904, began the eighteen months conflict with a naval attack at Port Arthur. Nicholas II issued a stirring appeal to his subjects entreating them to save the Empire from foes within and the enemy without. The militarists, imperialists, and Orthodox priests, heartily supported the war. But the masses of the people cared more for internal reforms than they did for the addition of territory in the Far East.

War with Japan

The war, from the Russian side, was poorly managed. The highest officials, including some members of the imperial family, made fortunes out of war contracts, and even Red Cross funds were stolen. The complete defeat of Russia by a non-European power weakened the prestige of the nation both at home and abroad. Russia surrendered to Japan Port Arthur, the southern half of the island of Sakhalin, and a protectorate over Korea; and agreed to give Manchuria back to China. Taking advantage of this military collapse, all classes and parties and nationalities hostile to autocracy renewed their attacks, and merged into a powerful revolutionary party. Mobs of patriots paraded the streets of Warsaw, Moscow, Kiev, and St. Petersburg yelling, "Overthrow absolutism!", "End the war!", and "Reforms or revolution!" After Plehve was assassinated, a few sops had been thrown out to the people. Whipping peasants was forbidden, their back taxes were remitted, partial freedom of the press and speech was permitted, and further reforms were promised. An informal congress of the leading men of the *zemstvos* and the local councils met in St. Petersburg in 1904 and asked the tsar to establish modern representative government. Similar petitions poured in from all over Russia. As a result the tsar agreed to make further changes but said that he would not permit the lessening of his imperial authority. To deal with the threatened outbreak, he appointed General Trepoff, the champion of despotism, as head of the police.

Defeat of the Russians

The various revolutionary groups now urged rebellion and assassination to force the government to yield. Among the victims was Grand Duke Sergius, who said that the people should be given a "stick" and not a ballot. The professional classes held banquets and heard revolutionary speeches. The peasants attacked the nobles, burned their castles, and stole their property. The Poles, Lithuanians, Germans, Finns, and even tribes on the frontiers of the Empire

rose in rebellion. Workingmen in the cities went on strike. With a foreign war on her hands, Russia was also confronted with a revolution at home. General Trepoff used his power to arbitrarily crush these outbreaks. The universities were closed; the railroads were put under martial law; and thousands of men and women were beaten, imprisoned, tortured, exiled, and executed without even the pretense of a legal trial. Cossacks in wanton carnage cut down the peasants. But all in vain — conditions grew worse from day to day. The workers organized the National Council of Workingmen's Delegates in 1905. When, unarmed and led by Father Gapon, they paraded through the streets of St. Petersburg, to petition the "Little Father" for a redressing of their grievances they were shot down in their tracks. This was the "Red Sunday," which shocked the world, and changed the peaceful movement into revolution. Wild with rage, the people built barricades in the streets of the capital. A mob of 200,000 excited patriots marched through the streets of Warsaw with Polish flags demanding independence. Finland declared a general strike for freedom. The peasants of the Baltic provinces robbed the homes of their German landlords and proclaimed a Baltic republic at Riga. The Armenians and Georgians took up arms. The Jews organized to combat the "Black Hundreds." The middle class and liberal nobles used their influence to force autocracy to bend to the people's will. The workers tied up the country by a railway strike.

The reaction of foreign defeat on home policies and problems

At last the tsar to save his tottering throne, granted concessions. He proclaimed religious freedom; permitted the use of national languages; cancelled the back taxes of the peasants; and ordered a civil trial for political crimes. Pobiedonostsev, Trepoff, and other tyrannical ministers, were dismissed, and Witte was asked to form a new reform cabinet. The unpopular war was ended by a treaty with Japan. These concessions were followed on October 30, 1905, by the famous Manifesto of Nicholas II, which marked the transition of Russia from an autocracy to a limited, constitutional monarchy. It promised (1) that all laws must have the consent of the national Dûma; (2) that acts of officials should reflect the popular will; (3) that freedom of speech and assembly were guaranteed; and (4) that the national Duma should be elected by popular franchise. Another decree, a few months later, changed the Council of State into an upper house representing the privileged classes. With these victories, the revolution subsided, and the nation turned its attention to the reconstruction of Russia.

Constitutional government promised

5. Russia under the National Dumas

The elections to the first national Duma brought into existence the following political groups, or parties: (1) The "Octobrists," representing the progressive nobles and the *zemstvos*, wanted a government similar to that of Prussia, in which the Duma should have

Parties in the Revolution of 1905

power to modify autocratic rule but not to displace it. (2) The "Constitutional Democrats," or "Cadets," made up of the middle and professional classes, regarded Great Britain as a more suitable model for government than Prussia. They wanted a constitutional, federal empire based on popular sovereignty, with a responsible ministry, and urged the division of the large estates among the peasants. (3) The Social Democrats, composed of the intellectuals and the workers in the cities, accepted the revolution as merely the first step in establishing an ideal socialistic state in the hands of the *proletariat.* They believed it to be their mission to instruct and to organize the masses for the work ahead. (4) The Social Revolutionists, wanted to overthrow the tsar at once and proclaim a socialistic state. They looked to the peasants for support, and hence urged the confiscation of all private lands. The *mir*, as the unit of the new democracy, was to be preserved. Terrorism of all sorts was advocated to accomplish their aims. (5) The "Peasants' Union"-was a wide-spread organization of farmers, whose platform consisted of the cry: "The whole land for all the people." They were closely allied with the Social Revolutionists. (6) The autocratic party, loosely organized, included the nobles, the army officers, the higher clergy, the bureaucrats, and conservative men of the middle class. They stood for all the policies of the old régime, and fought all the changes of the revolution. They formed the "Union of the Russian People," and plotted for a counter-revolution.

The first Duma

Shortly before the meeting of the first Duma, the government to forestall the Duma from becoming a constitutional convention published a fundamental law or constitution. The first Russian Duma, which met May 19, 1906, included among its 524 members, 40 Octobrists, 185 Cadets, 100 Social Democrats, 14 Social Revolutionists, and 85 representatives of various religious groups. The tsar opened this historic Duma by urging it to strive for the improvement of Russia's "moral outlook and for the reincarnation of her best powers." The Duma, inexperienced and visionary, soon discovered that liberty proclaimed was not liberty gained. It demanded amnesty for all political prisoners, but only a few were released. Commissions were named to investigate reports of corruption in the war with Japan, and the "pogroms" against the Jews. When the ministry was criticized, it refused to resign. When the Duma insisted upon a responsible ministry and proceeded to frame a radical agrarian law, the tsar dissolved it, and ordered a new election. Over 200 members protested, but were disfranchised and prosecuted for conspiracy. Out of this first session of the Duma, which lasted just a little more than two months, one noteworthy reform resulted by way of a counter-reformation by the government: the peasants were permitted to own their own farms as private property.

The second Duma, which convened March 5, 1907 and lasted over four months, was more hostile to autocracy than the first body. The

revolutionary parties which had boycotted the election to the first Duma, now were heavily represented. On the other hand, there was also an important reactionary faction, which represented the country rather than the cities, for St. Petersburg had only 6 and Moscow 5 members. This Duma demanded the confiscation of all large estates, *Second Duma* the abolition of courts martial, and a responsible ministry. When it refused to surrender the inflammatory Social Democratic members to be tried for treason, the tsar dissolved it, resumed his autocratic power to make laws, and put the right to vote on a class and property basis. The members of the Duma were reduced to 442 and the seats were so distributed as to insure the election of a majority friendly to the government.

The third Duma, which began its sessions on November 14, 1907 and endured over five years, had a vast majority of conservative landholders and merchants with only a few Cadets and Socialists. Docile and subservient, it sat idly by while Stolypin who has been prime minister since the dissolution of the first Duma, attempted to crush every trace of revolution. The schools and universities were placed under police surveillance. Deprived of their right to work for reforms through a representative assembly, the Terrorists had recourse to violence. They killed or wounded 4,131 officials and members of *Third Duma* the police force in 1907 and 1,009 in 1908. Stolypin retaliated with the execution of 1,800 "traitors" in 1907, and 800 in 1908, while 14,000 were exiled. The "Black Hundreds" were once more turned loose against the Jews. Finland lost its independence, and was put under the stringent control of the Empire. The hated Stolypin was assassinated in 1911 at Kiev. The voiceless Duma lived out its term of five years, and all that can be said to its credit is that it sanctioned the abolition of the joint land ownership of the *mirs;* passed a law to inaugurate insurance for the laborers; reformed local justice; extended common school education under the supervision of the Orthodox Church; and kept alive the idea of constitutional government.

The fourth Duma, which met November 28, 1912 and also sat for five years, was still more conservative than its predecessor. The group hostile to autocracy was reduced to 80 members. This Duma helped to reorganize the army and navy; favored a stricter control of the liquor traffic; approved of "Russification" and Pan-Slavism; *Fourth Duma* and aided the government to stifle the voice of the people. The last days of its history will be told in connection with the Revolution of 1917.

The Revolution of 1905 failed to secure genuine constitutional, democratic government. The autocratic throne of the tsar was still upheld by a huge standing army, the clergy, the bureaucrats, and the nobility. Foreign bankers, mostly French, supported the tsar's government. The German government had extended its moral aid in crushing Revolution. The vastness of the Empire made it difficult

Successes and failures of Revolution of 1905

for the foes of autocracy to organize effective, united resistance. Besides racial and religious differences separated them, and enabled the government to use one against the other. And finally, their leaders were either killed off or driven to exile. When the World War broke out in 1914, the spirit of revolution seemed to be reviving. For the first time in seven years the capital was in the grip of a mass strike, but the war enthusiasm infected even the strikers. Within three years, all anti-autocratic forces were to unite to overthrow the Romanov house.

Certain positive reforms had been gained by the Revolution of 1905. About 1,500,000 peasant householders became private landowners — an economic and social revolution that was to bear fruit later. The cities were full of wage-earners clamoring for their rights. The Duma, though stripped of all its power, was still the emblem and hope of popular government in the minds of the people. Finally, the Revolution brought about the moral overthrow of the "Little Father." The people saw that he was a tyrant, and that government by divine right was fundamentally cruel and predominantly selfish. Autocracy might be victorious for a time, but it had lost its power to perpetuate itself through the love and the support of the people. This, the World War was to prove.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

A. Rambaud, *Histoire de la Russie*, completed to 1913 by E. Haumant (1914); J. Mavor, *An Economic History of Russia*, 2 vols. (1914); A. Kornilov, *Modern Russian History*, 2 vols. (1917) (new edition 1924); R. Beazley, N. Forbes, G. A. Birkett, *Russia* (1918); G. Drage, *Russian Affairs* (1904); D. M. Wallace, *Russia* (new edition 1908); M. Baring, *The Russian People* (2d edition 1911); G. Alexinsky, *Modern Russia* (1913); H. W. Williams, *Russia of the Russians* (1914); J. D. Duff, editor, *Russian Realities and Problems* (1917); G. Kennan, *Siberia and the Exile System*, 2 vols. (4th edition 1897); H. G. S. von Himmelstjerna, *Russia under Alexander III and in the Preceding Period*, English translation by J. Morrison (1893); C. Lowe, *Alexander III* (1895); K. P. Pobiedonostsev, *Reflections of a Russian Statesman* (1898); S. J. Witte, *Memoirs* (1921); V. Berard, *The Russian Empire and Czarism* (1905), English translation; J. R. Fisher, *Finland and the Tsars, 1809–1899* (1899); W. A. Phillips, *Poland* (1915); I. Friedländer, *The Jews of Russia and Poland* (1915); N. Hill, *Poland and the Polish Question* (1915); P. Miliukov, *Russia and its Crisis* (1905); M. Kovalevsky, *Russian Political Institutions* (1902); *La crise russe: notes et impressions d'un temoin* (1906); B. Pares, *Russia and Reform* (1907); S. N. Harper, *The New Electoral Law for the Russian Duma* (1908); M. J. Olgin, *The Soul of the Russian Revolution* (1918); F. H. Skrine, *The Expansion of Russia* (3d edition 1915); A. J. Beveridge, *The Russian Advance* (1903); G. F. Wright, *Asiatic Russia*, 2 vols. (1903); M. M. Shoemaker, *The Great Siberian Railway* (1903); K. Asakawa, *The Russo-Japanese Conflict* (1904); A. N. Kuropatkin, *The Russian Army and the Japanese War*, 2 vols. partly translated by A. B. Lindsay (1909); A. Hedenström, *Geschichte Russlands, 1878–1918* (1922); S. A. Korff, *Autocracy and Revolution in Russia* (1923); A. L. P. Dennis, *The Foreign Relations of Soviet Russia* (1924); S. F. Platonov, *History of Russia* (rev. ed. 1925).

CHAPTER XXV

GROWTH OF THE KINGDOM OF ITALY AND THE MINOR POWERS OF WESTERN EUROPE

1. Political Institutions of Italy

From eight separate states Cavour and Victor Emmanuel II created a unified, hereditary monarchy like Great Britain rather than a federalized monarchy like Germany. The *Statuto*, granted to his subjects by the king of Piedmont in 1848, with only slight modifications, was continued as the constitution of Italy. It contained a bill of rights guaranteeing equality, a free press, taxation only by parliamentary consent, and right of assembly. The first king was Victor Emmanuel II, who was succeeded by his son, Humbert, in 1878. After King Humbert's assassination in 1900, Victor Emmanuel III mounted the throne. As in France and Great Britain, the ministry formed the working executive, was responsible to the lower house, and thus left the monarch only ornamental functions. Parliament consisted of the Senate with 385 senators appointed for life by the king from eminent Italians, and the Chamber of 508 deputies chosen by the people for a period of five years. So frequently was the Chamber dissolved that it seldom lived out its term. After 1912 the deputies were paid $1,200 yearly. The real government of Italy was in the hands of the Chamber, which was increased by the electoral law of 1919 to 535 members.

Italian government

The position of the Papacy in Italy was unique. Down to 1870 the pope was an Italian sovereign as well as the head of the Roman Catholic Church. The states over which he ruled lay in central Italy between Rome and Venice. Victor Emmanuel II by conquest seized the Papal States, and made Rome his capital. The church was not divorced from the state, for the Italian government still paid the salaries of the clergy, approved the nomination of bishops, and had religion taught in the public schools. The pope was recognized as a sovereign and assured personal inviolability, and granted the privilege of receiving and sending foreign ambassadors. His own flag floated over the Lateran, the "Leonine City," and the castle Gandolfo near Rome. To repay him for the loss of his territory, he was given the free use of the Italian telegraph lines, railroads, and post offices, and an annual grant of $645,000 from the national treasury. Pius IX and his successors refused either to accept this settlement or to recognize the legality of the Italian Kingdom. The subsidies continue to accumulate in the national treasury untouched. The popes have secluded themselves in the Vatican as "prisoners" and called upon the faithful Catholic rulers to restore their temporal authority and pos-

Problem of the Papacy

sessions. Until recently the pope advised the Italian Catholics to refuse to vote or to accept public offices. In the later elections, however, the clerical party showed great activity.

Progress towards democracy

Before 1882 voting was restricted by property and educational tests so that only 2½ per cent of the population elected the deputies. In that year, however, by lowering the property qualification and by extending the suffrage to all males who could read and write, the number of voters was increased from 628,000 to over 2,000,000, chiefly in the cities. Agitation for universal male franchise continued until in 1912 all property qualifications were removed for males over twenty years of age, and all literacy tests for males over thirty. This raised the voters to about 9,000,000 out of a population of 35,000,000. The electoral law of 1920 provided for universal suffrage of all men and women 21 years of age.

Until 1876 conservative groups from northern and central Italy were in control of the Chamber of Deputies and were disposed to show a distrust of democracy. Then for twenty years the liberal groups from southern Italy predominated with a bolder foreign policy and more democratic ideals. Since 1896 party groups, based on strong personalities rather than on great political issues, have become numerous. Towards 1914 stable national groups began to form, and in 1921 the Constitutionalists elected 275 members, the Socialists 122, the Catholics 107, the Communists 16, the Republicans 7, Germans 4, and Slavs 4.

2. Problems Confronting Italy after Unification

"Italy is made. Now let us make Italians," said D'Azeglio, an Italian patriot. For so many years had the people regarded themselves as Tuscans, Romans, Venetians, Neapolitans, and Piedmontese, that it was difficult to exchange their provincial loyalties for a national patriotism. Wars against a common foe had taught them coöperation and had given them a solidarity of interest. But when political unity was won, the old state rights feelings revived. Patience, wise laws, and the blessings of the new union gradually developed a spirit of nationalism.

Sectionalism

Sharp contrasts divided the north and the south. In the north, where industry had made more progress, a well-to-do middle class and a more independent working class have developed. Large and fairly prosperous cities are more numerous. There is a larger number of independent farmers, who till the soil profitably and live in contentment. Greater attention is given to art, literature, and education. South of Tuscany, on the contrary, there are few large cities, and the land is mostly in the hands of landlords but cultivated by half-starved, discontented peasants. Large sections are desolated regions, uncultivated and sparsely settled. There are few industries and little wealth. The people in 1870 were so illiterate that about 70 per cent

of them could neither read nor write. Public letter writers were common sights on the street corners. Centuries of misrule under the Bourbons in Naples had produced a contempt for law and order. Secret criminal bands, like the *Mafia* in Sicily and the *Camorra* in Naples, were responsible for a state of anarchy and dagger warfare. Rome and Naples were filled with thieves, criminals, and beggars. Brigandage was a respectable occupation for the bold and daring. These conditions the new government faced, and with energy and wisdom law and order were established. Local government was centralized on the French model. Compulsory service in the army was introduced, and a national police instituted. Brigandage was suppressed and the dangerous secret societies broken up. In 1913 the leaders of the *Camorra* were tried and convicted. As industry improved, and the means of communication increased, Italy was transformed into a more orderly state.

Illiteracy was a blot on the new kingdom keenly felt by patriots. Hence in 1877 elementary education was made free and compulsory for all children up to nine. Schools were few, however, the teachers poorly prepared and badly paid, and the middle class objected to paying taxes for the education of the masses. Nevertheless such progress was made that by 1901 illiteracy had dropped to 58 per cent — 28 per cent in the north, 51 per cent in the center, and 69 per cent in the south. In 1904 every commune was required to provide at least one school, and arrangements were made for 5,000 night and Sunday schools for illiterate adults. Soldiers were compelled to attend. Two years later 3,000 schoolhouses were ordered built. By 1914 illiteracy had declined to 25 per cent. The 21 universities had 25,000 students, and other special higher schools 5,000 more. The budget for national education amounted to $35,000,000. Newspapers and magazines multiplied, and over 1,800 libraries were established. In all these ways Italy was developing an educated, democratic people.

Illiteracy and educational problems

The problem of paying for her progress was one of the gravest facing the nation. The national debt in 1914 was the fourth largest in Europe, and three and a half times that of the United States. An enormous annual budget was needed to pay the interest on the national debt, to run the government, to support the army and navy, to make public improvements, and to further education. To raise this money taxes were placed on business documents, tickets, lands and buildings, inheritances, incomes, bread, sugar, cheese, tobacco, salt, quinine, and imports. The burden fell heaviest on the poor who were least able to pay. So badly were national finances managed that up to 1906 the country was on the verge of bankruptcy. After that time there was such marked improvement that by 1914 the budget was balanced without a deficit. As a result of the World War by 1920 the national debt had been increased seven times. How Italy, with the billions added to her national debt by the World War, would survive economically was a perplexing question but during the past few

Financial problems

years commendable progress has been made in solving the financial problem.

Emigration to the New World

As a result of the heavy taxes and the bad economic conditions, millions of Italians have gone to other lands. From 1870 to 1914 the population increased from 25,000,000 to 37,000,000; and the official estimate in 1924 added 4,000,000 to that number. But this growth in numbers was not equalled by the increase in opportunities to earn a living. The exodus, which began shortly after unification, increased from 96,000 in 1878 to 788,000 in 1906, when a decline was noticeable, but in 1913 it was still 450,000. It was estimated in 1910 that there were 6,000,000 Italians abroad — half of them in the United States; the rest in Europe, Africa, and South America. Cheap transportation made them the common laborers of the western industrial world. Most of them went from the small towns in southern Italy, some of which lost 20 per cent of their population. Amalfi, which had a population of 10,000 in 1890, had only 3,000 in 1914. To the visiting premier, the mayor of one of the towns said: "I welcome you in the name of 8,000 inhabitants — of whom 3,000 have just left for America, and the other 5,000 are at home preparing to follow."

Among the benefits of emigration to Italy were these: (1) It relieved the overcrowded population and enabled those remaining to secure higher wages. (2) It opened new markets for Italian goods. (3) It enabled emigrants to send home $75,000,000 annually. (4) About two thirds returned home with new ideas, a new self-confidence, and money in their pockets. On the other hand, the state was injured in the following ways: (1) Millions of able-bodied men and women helped to increase the wealth and industries of other lands instead of their own. (2) Italy was weakened in a military way. (3) The agricultural regions of the south were left without adequate labor, and hence suffered losses. (4) The state was deprived of large sums in taxes. (5) Serious discontent was engendered at home by comparing poverty-stricken Italy with richer countries. Italian statesmen were not slow in recognizing the menace of emigration to other nations, and sought to borrow capital to build up their own industries so that the people might be kept at home occupied and contented.

National resources

In some respects few countries have more natural advantages than Italy. By location, she holds a favorable position in the Mediterranean world. The climate is fine, the harbors are excellent, the soil is fertile, there is an abundance of water power, labor is plentiful, and the country is fairly rich in certain natural resources. Yet in 1914 Italy was poor and lived, as it were, from hand to mouth. She ought to have fed herself and had farm produce and fruit to export, but agriculture, employing over one third of her people, lagged far behind France and Germany. Considerable progress was made in draining marshes, in reclaiming waste lands, and in reforesting the hills and mountains. Agricultural schools were opened, and coöpera-

tive societies and rural banks established. A beginning was made to break up the large estates in the south into little farms like those in the north. Many mines and quarries were operated, but the methods and machinery were old-fashioned.

Forced to import most of her coal and iron, Italy was handicapped in developing factories, but was securing capital from France and Germany for that purpose. Her steel mills employed 100,000 men, the textile industry had a good start, and her silk mills produced more than half of the silk thread in the world. Yet raw silk was exported to the value of $119,000,000 instead of being made up at home, and the large quantities of flax and hemp were sent out of the country. The exports between 1897 and 1914 trebled but still fell short of the imports. There has been much talk of utilizing the large water power to supply "white coal" in the form of electricity for power, light and heat, and of exploiting the vast beds of aluminum clay to produce a metal that is lighter and tougher than iron. The unfortunate condition of the industrial worker in Italy was scarcely equalled anywhere in western Europe, although the government sought to remedy these conditions by improving the factories, and by forbidding the employment of women and children of tender years in the mines and at night. Employers were obliged to provide for their workers in case of accident. Provision was also made for voluntary insurance in the event of sickness, and for old age pensions. In 1908 one rest day in each week was decreed for all industrial workers. Maternity insurance was made compulsory for working women. In 1912 life insurance was nationalized. Municipalities were encouraged to control their own public utilities. Trade-unions might be legally organized, and their finances and rights were safeguarded. Coöperative societies began in 1900 and by 1920 numbered 7,500 with nearly a million members.

Industrial conditions

Condition of labor

Few countries have been so disturbed by labor troubles in recent years as Italy. Dire poverty and high taxes won many among the wage-earners, farm laborers, and even the middle classes, to socialism and anarchism. Labor riots in the country and cities of southern Italy, especially in Sicily, had to be put down by government troops. "Bread riots" in the industrial north were common. An uprising of workers in Milan in 1898 threatening a social revolution, was suppressed only after fierce street-fighting, and the imprisonment of the leaders. King Humbert in 1900 was killed by an anarchist. Under Victor Emmanuel III and Premier Giolitti, the government sought to placate the workers by industrial reforms and the extension of the right to vote, but without much effect. A series of strikes and boycotts kept the nation in a constant turmoil. Each election sent more Socialists to the Chamber of Deputies. Syndicalism, imported from France, attracted many supporters. "Chambers of Labor" were formed. The strike of 1904, which covered all northern industries, closed the mills and factories, and frightened the conservatives.

Labor and radical agitation

Peace was made with the Roman Catholic Church in 1905 to win its support against the radicals, who were seeking to overthrow the social and political order. In 1913 the Socialists brought their representatives in parliament up to 196. The General Federation of Labor in 1914 declared a nation-wide strike to show disapproval of the death of a laborer at the hands of the police. For two days all business life in the nation stood still. Then the workers went back to their jobs. The government was too frightened to take action. The settlement of these economic problems was postponed by the World War, but when it ended the workers were in a worse condition than before. As a result in 1920 no fewer than 1,782,000 workmen went on strike. Industrial conditions were disorganized and in 1921 about 145,000 men were unemployed, and 300,000 more were working short hours. Matters were made worse by the inflated paper money and the greatly increased cost of living. More recently unemployment has been reduced and in 1925 less than 100,000 were affected.

3. Foreign Policy of Italy

The foreign policy of Italy was concerned with (1) the recovery of "unredeemed Italy"; (2) the establishment of a colonial empire; and (3) the commercial penetration of the Balkans and the Near East. By 1870 eight Italian states, with an area about two and a quarter times the size of the state of New York, were united under the House of Savoy. But outside the new kingdom were a million Italians under foreign rule. Nice, Savoy, and Corsica belonged to France.

Irredentism

Ticino was a part of Switzerland. Trentino, Triest, Fiume and Dalmatia were ruled by Austria-Hungary. Malta belonged to Great Britain. The Pan-Italians hoped sooner or later, by war or peace, to incorporate these regions into a greater Italy. *Italia irredenta* was a cry raised in every political campaign, and a party known as the Irredentists kept the nation in a state of agitation for the "redemption" of these Italian-speaking regions. In the World War Italy secured an area of 8,900 square miles with 1,600,000 people.

Mazzini, an exile in Paris sixty years ago, said: "North Africa will belong to Italy." From that day onward, Italians dreamed of a new Punic conquest. But her weakness and poverty forced Italy to remain inactive, while France and Great Britain gobbled up that coveted region. When France seized Tunis, Italy was thrown into the arms of Germany and Austria-Hungary in the Triple Alliance.

Imperialism

In 1893 Italy under Crispi felt the urge of imperialism so strongly that she was ready to make a beginning of a colonial empire. Tunis was lost but Eritrea, larger than Pennsylvania, and Somaliland, as big as Italy plus Denmark, were secured in Africa. As early as 1870 Assab on the Red Sea had been purchased. The further effort to take Abyssinia, in which a little Italian colony had been planted in 1885, resulted in the defeat of the army and caused the fall of the Crispi ministry. Italy had to recognize the independence of Abyssinia. As

early as 1901 France and Italy had mutually agreed to recognize each other's interests in northern Africa. Through a war of conquest in 1911, Tripoli, equal in extent to two Germanies, was taken from Turkey and renamed Lybia. At the same time the Dodekanese islands and Rhodes off the coast of Asia Minor were occupied, and in 1915 Italian possession was recognized by Great Britain, France and Russia. A concession of seventeen square miles in China was secured at Tientsin in 1900 as a result of the Boxer rebellion. Italy's colonial empire, including the additions from the World War, is six times the size of the mother country, contains over 2,000,000 people, and ranks fourth among the colonial empires of the world. It was secured at an enormous cost, but up to date has not been a source of much profit.

Of far more importance to Italy than her own dependencies, are the "colonies" established under other flags in the United States, Brazil, and Argentina, where they have planted Italian civilization and opened markets for Italian goods. In 1914 the exports of Italy fell considerably short of her imports and in 1924 the imports exceeded the exports by $221,000,000. The exports went mostly to France, Germany, the United States, the Balkans, and the Turkish Empire. Trade with South America has been going forth by leaps and bounds, and fine steamers run from Italian ports directly to Argentina, where large numbers of Italians are found. With Austria-Hungary, Germany, and Russia excluded from the Balkans by the results of the World War, Italy has been ambitious to secure control of that field for commercial purposes. It is largely for this reason that she has been so eager to obtain possession of the Adriatic coast and of Adalia in Asia Minor. Indeed Italy entered the World War deliberately to advance the cause of Irredentism, colonial expansion, and opportunities for foreign commerce.

Emigration and commerce

4. The Spanish Kingdom

After the Hohenzollern prince, Leopold, declined the Spanish throne in 1870, Prince Amadeo, the second son of Victor Emmanuel II of Italy, was chosen king by the militarists in control of Spain. The Carlists and Republicans both denounced him as a foreign intruder and plotted his overthrow. Hence within two years, in disgust, he resigned the unstable crown. Then in 1873, the Republicans, backed by the army, proclaimed a republic. Some of them wanted a centralized republic like France; others, a communistic republic. When in the confusion President Castelar assumed a dictatorship, the republican militarists by force seated Marshal Serrano in the presidential chair. He in turn was soon set aside in 1875 for the restoration of the throne under King Alfonso XII.

This popular young monarch ruled Spain until his death in 1885. Lawlessness and disorder were suppressed. The rebellion in Cuba was checked by the abolition of slavery in 1886. A revised constitution

Political conditions

was adopted in 1876, which still serves the nation. It reduced the power of the king to that of a British monarch, and placed the real executive authority in the hands of a ministry reflecting the will of the lower house of the Cortes, which was elected at first by a limited franchise but since 1890 by all males. The Senate consisted of members who held their seats partly by right of birth or office, partly by appointment, and partly by provincial elections. The act of 1907 made voting compulsory as in Belgium. Local government resembled that of France. Prime Minister Canovas improved the finances, reorganized the army, promoted agriculture, married the king to an Austrian archduchess, cultivated the friendship of Germany, and came to a friendly understanding with the Roman Catholic Church.

Six months after the death of Alfonso XII, his son and heir, Alfonso XIII, was born. For seventeen years his mother, Maria Christina, ruled as queen-regent. She called to her aid two able statesmen, Canovas, the conservative, and Sagasta, the liberal, who worked together in harmony to control elections and to share patronage. They held the Republicans at bay, and won the support of the clericals. Foreign relations were managed with skill. The sultan of Morocco was forced to make a new treaty of peace and to pay Spain an indemnity of $4,000,000. The Cuban revolt, which had broken out again in 1895, proved to be a thorny problem. The island was overrun with Spanish troops under General Weyler, who employed barbarous methods to gain control of about two thirds of the island. An indignant protest from the United States, whose capitalists had large investments in Cuba, forced his recall. General Blanco was sent over to Cuba with instructions to give the Cubans self-government. But meanwhile public opinion in the United States demanded intervention on humanitarian grounds and for the protection of commercial interests. This demand rapidly developed into a cry for war to secure the complete independence of Cuba. Spain promised autonomy and equal trading privileges. In February, 1898, the *Maine*, an American battleship, sent to Havana harbor, was mysteriously blown up with the loss of 260 men. This horrible deed was charged up to Spain by the excited Americans and precipitated a crisis. In vain Spain appealed to the pope and to the European states for mediation. In April the United States declared war on Spain. A Spanish squadron was destroyed outside Santiago harbor, and American troops soon had possession of the island. In the Far East another Spanish fleet was defeated by Admiral Dewey, and Manila, the capital of the Philippine Islands, was captured. By August the war was over. Spain sued for peace; Cuba was set free; and to the United States were ceded Porto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines. For the latter Spain received $20,000,000, and two years later an additional $100,000 for a few outlying islands. The Carolines and the Pelew Islands were sold by Spain to Germany for $4,000,000. Thus the Spanish colonial empire was completely lost,

Spanish-American War 1898

except the Balearic and Canary islands, and some holdings in Africa.

Alfonso XIII in 1902, at the age of sixteen, assumed the crown, and four years later married a niece of Edward VII of England. The birth of a male heir in 1907 assured the perpetuation of the Bourbon dynasty. The ability of Alfonso XIII and his attachment to the constitution, have made him popular with the people. Although anarchists have several times attempted to assassinate him, his rule on the whole has been stable and fairly prosperous. The system of taxation has been modernized. The power of the Roman Catholic Church in political and educational affairs has been curtailed, and there has been much talk of secularizing education and of separating the church and state, but thus far the clericals have been strong enough to prevent such changes. The law of 1902 granted state aid to primary schools, and that of 1909 made attendance compulsory. All private schools must be authorized by the state. The institutions of higher learning are backward as compared with others in western Europe. In 1910 about 59 per cent of the people, and in 1920 only 45 per cent, were reported as illiterate. Universal military service was not adopted in Spain, and thus the country was spared the crushing burden of militarism, but service is now compulsory. There are strong tendencies towards socialism on the one hand, and towards state rights and federalism, on the other. In 1925 a military dictatorship was set up and the Cortes was dissolved.

Alfonso XIII

Religion and education

In economic development, Spain lags far behind the other countries of western Europe. Industrial progress is slow, but grows more promising every year. With a population of 22,000,000, Spain is distinctly an agricultural state, although notably unprogressive. Half of the land, for lack of irrigation, is unfit for cultivation. The other half is partly in the hands of large proprietors and cultivated by poor tenants. The mineral resources are rich and varied, and there is an abundance of coal and iron ore. The output of the mines in 1914 amounted to $40,000,000. The Industrial Revolution is just creeping over the country, and was greatly aided by the neutrality of Spain during the World War. Factories are growing but do not yet produce enough goods to supply the home markets. The factory hands are poorly housed and badly paid. Hence thousands of the people (87,000 in 1924) emigrate yearly, chiefly to South America; and in 1925 half a million Spaniards were working in France. The seaports are excellent, and in 1924 over 10,000 miles of railroads covered the country. Commerce has had a healthy growth, and the exports are far in excess of the imports. Between 1912 and 1917 the general trade of Spain increased only 25 per cent, but she made much money during the World War. Foreign capital is going into the country, and the future looks much brighter than the immediate past.

Economic conditions

5. The Portuguese Republic

Portuguese history during the past century resembled that of Spain in its backward civilization and undeveloped resources. Progress towards constitutional government was slow, although after 1853 the rulers were disposed to recognize the constitution. Slavery was abolished in 1869 in the Portuguese colonies. In 1885 hereditary peers were deprived of seats in the upper house. The reign of the licentious Carlos I (1889–1908), however, was full of trouble. He pillaged the national treasury and threw the public finances into frightful disorder. The colonies were badly managed. A financial crisis in 1892 resulted in national bankruptcy and an attempt to repudiate debts due foreign bondholders. Heavy taxes and corrupt practices, together with the neglect of educational and social reforms, and the influence of the clergy, produced a spirit of rebellion. Strikes and riots occurred; anarchism, socialism and republicanism spread among the people through secret societies. When the king and his prime minister, Franco, resolved to cast aside the constitution and create a dictatorship, the monarch and his son were assassinated in 1908, and a younger son, Manuel II, mounted a shaky throne.

Reign of Carlos I

As a result of the growing discontent, in 1910 a revolution overthrew the monarchy, and the people proclaimed a republic like that in France. Hereditary titles were abolished; and free speech, the right of assembly, and religious liberty were granted. The Cortes consisted of two chambers, which in joint session elected the first president, Dr. Arriago, for four years. The ministry was made responsible to the lower house. The religious orders were driven out of the country and the state and church were separated. Out of the 6,000,000 people 78 per cent could not read. To remedy this condition, free public schools were established with compulsory attendance. The government was in the hands of the middle class, who seemed to care little for social and economic reforms, and had no interest in improving the lot of the common people. Hence the new Republic was disturbed by strikes and riots, which were suppressed by bayonets and martial law. In 1917 President Machado was overthrown by an uprising.

The establishment of the Portuguese Republic

Much remains to be done in Portugal to modernize the country and to educate the people. The system of landholding is mediaeval, and agriculture is a century behind the times. The Industrial Revolution has scarcely touched the country. In 1914 the imports were double the exports, but the World War in which Portugal took the side of the Western Allies, added much to her material prosperity. Portugal still owns a colonial empire, in 1800 ranking next to that of Great Britain and Spain, but now consisting of a few islands and settlements in Asia, and large sections of Africa. It is a costly burden rather than an asset. In 1919 Portugal granted autonomy to her colonies.

Economic conditions

6. Holland

The kingdom of the Netherlands, after the loss of Belgium in 1830, was left with an area about one third the size of Portugal. Throughout the long reign of the well-meaning William III (1849–1890), the liberals were in control. They bettered the government, widened the franchise, and made many public improvements. In 1890 William III was succeeded by his daughter, Wilhelmina. Her marriage in 1901 to a German, Prince Henry, made many Dutch people fear that their country might be brought under German rule, but the birth of an heiress in 1909 quieted this alarm. The government rests upon the constitution of 1848, which provides for a parliament of two houses, and a responsible ministry. The right to vote has been gradually extended until the law of 1918 granted the franchise to all adult men and women. The eleven provinces have a large degree of self-government. The national government aids both public and private schools, and since compulsory school attendance was required in 1900 illiteracy has almost disappeared. Compulsory military service on the Swiss model was introduced, and the law of 1913 provided for an enlargement of the navy and for stronger fortifications at the chief seaports. Roads, railways, dykes, and canals form a vast network of transportation over the flat country. Holland declared her neutrality in the World War and prepared to offer every resistance to any attempt to violate her territory.

Government of the Netherlands

The Dutch people, numbering over 7,000,000, are devoted to commerce, dairy farming, the growing of flowers and shrubs, shipbuilding, and fishing. A third of the land is in pasture. The exports in 1924 amounted to $666,000,000; and the imports to $280,000,000 more. The Dutch merchant marine does business in all parts of the world. Lacking an adequate supply of coal and iron, small attention has been paid to manufacturing. Holland is a free-trade country, depending upon the peace and goodwill of the nations of earth for her prosperity. She was selected as the seat of the two famous peace conferences in 1899 and 1907, and is now the home of the International Court of Justice. Like Switzerland, she has been a haven for political refugees and exiles. To Holland fled Paul Kruger after the Boer War, and the ex-Emperor, William II and the ex-Crown Prince William, of Germany, after the World War.

Economic conditions

The colonial empire of Holland, which is all in the tropics, is sixty times her own size and has a population about seven times greater than the homeland. The Dutch govern their colonies in a business-like manner and make them a source of much wealth to the mother country. Large quantities of coffee, tea, sugar, spices, hemp, vegetable oil, rubber, tobacco, and indigo are sold to other countries. The exports from the East Indies almost equal those of the motherland. The island of Java is the most densely populated land area on the globe.

7. Belgium

Races

Smaller than Holland, Belgium in 1920 had a population of over 7,500,000, or 652 to the square mile, and was the most densely peopled country in Europe. Pennsylvania with an area four times that of Belgium had the same population. The people are divided into two different racial groups: (1) The Flemings in the north, numbering 4,000,000, are of Teutonic origin and speech. They are mostly farmers and ardent Roman Catholics, and are conservative in politics and opposed to free public schools. (2) The Walloons in the south, numbering 3,500,000, are of Celtic origin, liberal Roman Catholics in faith, and French in language, institutions, and ideals. They wish to separate the church and state, to secularize the schools, and to create a modernized industrial state.

Government

These two factions, after securing their independence in 1830, formed a new constitution, which provided for a king, two houses, and a responsible ministry. It declared that "all powers emanate from the people" and established freedom of speech, press, worship, petition, and assembly. The king might initiate legislation. In 1839 the leading powers of Europe "neutralized" Belgium — an act that was to become a world issue in 1914. With the consent of Great Britain and France, a German prince, Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, who had married the daughter of Louis Philippe of France, was invited to become king. The rulers of this house have been enlightened and progressive, and the country has made astonishing progress in many directions, particularly under Leopold II (1865–1909) and Albert I (1909–), the present monarch.

Political progress

Until 1893, the right to vote was limited by property qualifications. Then every Belgian above twenty-five was given a vote, but at the same time the system of plural voting was introduced. Married voters, if taxpayers, received an additional vote. Educated men, high officials, and owners of property, were given two extra votes, but no man might have more than three votes. Voting was also made compulsory. Women were granted suffrage in 1919. The system of plural voting was devised to permit the conservative rural districts to outvote the radical working classes in the cities. In 1912 *the elections showed that 18 per cent of the electorate cast* three votes; 24 per cent two votes; and 58 per cent one vote. The Socialists at once raised the cry "one man, one vote." To offset the evils of plural voting, and to insure the representation of minorities, in 1899 the system of proportional representation was introduced for the first time in the history of Europe. It has given general satisfaction, although it is opposed by the Socialists.

So much attention was given to education after 1880 that illiteracy dropped from 42 per cent to 13 per cent. A far-sighted factory code was framed. Trade-unions were legalized and guarded in their rights. Old age pensions, housing laws, and other measures were enacted

for the material welfare of the working classes. Farming was made profitable through scientific methods and machinery. With an abundance of iron, coal and oil, Belgium became the "bee-hive of Europe." Immigration exceeded emigration. As an economic power, she ranked next to the large industrial nations and in 1910 was the third greatest manufacturing power on the continent. Her foreign trade in 1913 was larger than that of Russia, and four times that of Spain.

Imperialism in Africa

As early as 1878 the Belgian king sent Stanley, the American explorer, to Africa to lay the foundations for the Belgian Congo Free State. The natives, who were practically enslaved, were forced to gather rubber and ivory, and thus pile up fortunes for Leopold II and his friends. Protests against this world scandal ended with reforms and the annexation of the Congo Free State, with an area about one fourth that of Europe, to Belgium. This vast region with 6,000 whites and 15,000,000 blacks, is now ably ruled and is being scientifically developed. In the World War, Belgium secured Ruand and Urundi, formerly a part of German East Africa, including 18,000 square miles.

Fearing the violation of her neutrality, Belgium in 1912 instituted compulsory military training. Strong fortifications were built along the German frontier, since the greatest danger seemed to lie in that direction. This fear was amply justified by the German invasion in 1914. The appalling loss of life, the barbarous treatment of the people, the destruction of towns, and the general paralysis of her industries, which resulted from the World War, made Belgium the saddest victim. Her resistance to the invader won the admiration of the world. The revival of Belgium after the conflict was remarkable. Within a year her railroads were restored, roads rebuilt, and canals cleared. By 1920 her industries were producing 80 per cent of the pre-war output. In 1919 over 18,500,000 tons of coal were mined. The war added about 64,000 square miles to Belgian territory to strengthen her eastern frontier. Perhaps one of the most significant results of the war was the declaration that Belgium, by the abrogation of the treaty of 1839, was a free, sovereign state.

8. Switzerland

The Swiss people are composed of three races — German in 15 cantons, French in 5, and Italian in 3 — and of two religions, Protestant and Catholic. From 1874 to 1914 the history of Switzerland was characterized by (1) the encroachment of the national government on "state rights"; (2) radical political experiments in both federal and cantonal government; and (3) the industrial growth of the republic.

In some parts of the country the men meet each year in open air assemblies. By a show of hands they elect officers, levy taxes, and make laws. The larger cantons have representative assemblies, but

Government

the people exercise control over them through the referendum and initiative. In some cantons, all laws are submitted to the people for adoption or rejection; in others, this may be done by petition. At the same time, a certain number of voters may propose laws, which must be submitted to a popular vote. This is called the initiative. These processes of law-making are also applied to the federal government both for ordinary laws and for constitutional amendments. They create "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Some American states and cities have adopted the initiative and referendum in order to bring the government nearer the people. Proportional representation was adopted in 1919 for the National Council and has now been adopted by most of the cantons.

Army

The Swiss military system is distinctive and thoroughly democratic. The powers of Europe in 1815 guaranteed the neutrality of Switzerland. Fearing the violation of her neutrality in case of the outbreak of a European war, a national militia was organized in 1907. Compulsory military serivce is required of all men between the age of 20 and 48. The first training lasts only a few months, and thereafter but a few days each year. This system provides an army of 300,000 men, but does not take men out of business for a long period of time and is comparatively inexpensive.

Industry

Of the 4,000,000 Swiss, 65 per cent speak German, 23 per cent French, and 12 per cent Italian. Between 1880 and 1910 the Italians increased from 41,000 to 203,000. There is little racial feeling, and party divisions are based on educational, religious, and social problems. The people are remarkably well-educated, and illiteracy is almost unknown. Thrift and economy characterize the nation. The north is agricultural; the mountainous regions are given to grazing and mining. The lack of coal and iron is a disadvantage, but water power is utilized to create electricity, which runs 250,000 industries. Textiles, gloves, laces, watches, clocks, cheese, and milk chocolate are produced. The exports in 1916 amounted to $472,000,000. Tens of thousands of tourists flock to Switzerland to enjoy the unsurpassed scenery and luxurious hotels. The country is famous for the numerous international societies meeting there. It is the home of the International Postal Union, the International Red Cross Society, and Geneva has been selected as the official seat of the League of Nations. For more than a century this land has been a haven of refuge for patriots and monarchs fleeing from their own countries. When the World War broke out, Switzerland declared her neutrality, and was forced to serve as a common meeting ground for propagandists of both belligerents.

9. Denmark

After losing Norway in 1814, the importance of Denmark declined. As a result of the Revolution of 1848, the Danes forced their king to grant them a constitution, which provided for an upper house.

named by the monarch, and a lower house elected by the property owners. Today all citizens, male and female, elect the lower house directly and the upper house indirectly. Public opinion forced the monarch to accept the cabinet system of government in 1901, so that the king and his ministers now coöperate with the Rigsdag in making laws. Minority parties are insured representation. In 1864 Denmark was forced to give up all claim to the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, and this loss left Denmark one of the smallest states in Europe. Through the defeat of Germany in the World War, however, Denmark in 1920 by a favorable plebiscite recovered northern Schleswig. Down to 1857 Denmark collected dues on all cargoes passing through the "sound" to the north of her, despite many protests, but at last relinquished this right for an indemnity of $20,000,000.

Government

Under the rule of her wise kings, Denmark has made commendable progress. The population is now about 3,200,000 and the people are mostly engaged in farming and dairying. The law forbids the union of little farms into large estates. Great quantities of butter, cheese, and eggs are sold to Great Britain and Germany. The fisheries in 1915 yielded a value of $7,000,000. Without coal and iron, industries have not been far developed. Like Holland, Denmark carries on a large world commerce. About half of the railroads belong to the state, and public utilities are quite generally in the hands of the government. The national militia resembles the Swiss. The established church is Lutheran. School attendance has been compulsory since 1814 and illiteracy is almost extinct. Efficient poor relief, old age pensions, and aid to widows with children, show a thoughtful concern for the welfare of the working people. Socialists hold 32 out of the 140 seats in the Folkething.

Economic and social conditions

For a small country, about the size of Switzerland, Denmark has a large colonial empire. Iceland which is as big as the state of Ohio, with 85,000 people, was granted home rule in 1874, when it celebrated its thousandth anniversary, and in 1918 was made nominally independent of the Danish king. It is ruled by the Althing with 40 members chosen by the people. Its exports to Denmark amount to $2,500,000 a year. Greenland is nearly the size of the state of New York, has a population of 14,000, and its trade is a Danish monopoly. The Danish West Indies were sold to the United States in 1917 for $25,000,000 and renamed the Virgin Islands. In return the United States relinquished certain vague rights in Greenland due to discoveries by Greely and Peary.

10. Sweden and Norway

The Congress of Vienna compensated Sweden for the loss of Finland to Russia by giving her Norway. Bernadotte, one of Napoleon's marshals, was permitted to ascend the Swedish throne in 1818 as Charles XIV (1818–1844), and his house still reigns. After crushing a Norwegian rebellion, Norway was given home rule under the

Swedish king. Thus the two kingdoms had a common monarch, but separate constitutions, ministries, and laws. Norway was democratic; Sweden, aristocratic and feudal. The Norwegians had a parliament elected by a general franchise; the Swedes, a diet of four houses representing classes. The union was not a happy one, and led to bitter quarrels. The Swedes looked upon Norway as a dependency, which the Norwegians resented. The breach reached its crisis in 1905, when the king vetoed a law passed by the Norwegians to abolish their nobility. The Norwegian Storthing voted unanimously "that the Union with Sweden under one king has ceased," and a vote of the people almost unanimously confirmed this action. Sweden then quite sensibly recognized Norway as a separate nation with the understanding: (1) that future differences be settled by the Hague Tribunal; and (2) that no fortifications be built by either state along the common frontier. Thus the blunder of the Congress of Vienna was undone.

Separation of Norway from Sweden

There was much sentiment in Norway for a republic, but a Danish prince was chosen as King Hakon VII. The new government is one of the most democratic in Europe. The king merely reigns, and has no veto. His cabinet really rules subject to the will of the democratic legislature. Norway was one of the first countries in the world to give women equal rights with men and to permit them to sit in the national parliament. In 1907 Great Britain, France, Germany, and Russia guaranteed the neutrality of Norwegian territory. In the World War Norway was neutral, but lost 2,000 sailors and 800 ships with over a million tonnage, which caused her mercantile marine to drop from the fourth to the sixth place.

Norway

The earlier Swedish kings were inclined to autocracy. In 1866 the progressive forces abolished the antiquated diet and created a modern parliament of two houses, but the franchise remained limited to property owners. Under Gustav V (1907–) the lower house was elected directly and the upper house indirectly by universal male franchise. Proportional representation was also introduced, but all efforts to extend the vote to women failed. The Socialists made rapid progress, and in 1911 elected 64 members to the popular house. Fear of Russia developed a sentiment in favor of compulsory military service and in 1918 a standing army of 85,000 was created. The state church is Lutheran, although there is complete religious freedom. Elementary education is free and compulsory, and a high degree of intelligence prevails.

Government of Sweden

The economic development of these two countries has not been marked. Norway's wealth is in her fine forests and, like Sweden, she exports large quantities of wood pulp, lumber, and wooden wares. In Norway with a population of 2,400,000 only 3 per cent of the area of the country is under cultivation, while in Sweden half of the 5,600,000 people are engaged in agriculture. Both countries carry on mining rather extensively, and Sweden is one of the largest

Economic conditions

producers of iron ore in Europe. In Norway fishing furnishes lucrative employment for many persons. Both countries have to import coal for industrial purposes, but electrical power is being used. The two peoples are industrious, frugal, and fairly prosperous. Social legislation in both these states has gone far to protect women and children, and the workers generally. Socialism has made steady gains. Possibly a million emigrants have gone to America during the past seventy years. Both countries remained neutral in the World War, and thereby increased their wealth. Sweden secured the Aland Islands in the eastern Baltic Sea. In foreign relations Norway looked to Great Britain and France, while Sweden, fearing Russia, was in close relations with Germany.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

P. L. Orsi, *L'Italia Moderna*, 2d edition (1902); B. King and T. Okey, *Italy Today* 2d edition (1909); W. R. Thayer, *Italica* (1908); F. M. Underwood, *United Italy* (1912); E. Lemonon, *L'Italie Économique et Sociale, 1861–1912* (1913), A. Pinguad, *L'Italie depuis 1870* (1915); W. K. Wallace, *Greater Italy* (1917); T. Tittoni, *Modern Italy* (1922); W. J. Stillman, *Francesco Crispi* (1899); *Memoirs of Francesco Crispi*, 3 vols. (1912–1914); M. A. S. Hume, *Modern Spain, 1788–1898* (1900); C. E. Chapman, *History of Spain* (1918); E. H. Strobel, *The Spanish Revolution, 1868–1875* (1898); J. L. M. Curry, *Constitutional Government in Spain* (1899); D. Hannay, *Don Emilio Castelar* (1896); Y. Guyot, *La évolution politique et sociale de l'Espagne* (1899); A. Marvaud, *La question sociale en Espagne* (1910); *L'Espagne au XX^e siècle* (1913); *Le Portugal et ses colonies* (1912); G. Young, *Portugal Old and Young* (1917); P. J. Blok, *History of the People of the Netherlands*, English translation by R. Putnam, 5 vols. (1898–1912); C. Day, *The Policy and Administration of the Dutch in Java* (1904); R. C. K. Ensor, *Belgium* (1915); L. van der Essen, *A Short History of Belgium* (1916); L. Bortrand, *Histoire de la Democratie et du socialisme en Belgique depuis 1830*, 2 vols. (1906–1907); B. S. Rowntree, *Land and Labour: Lessons from Belgium* (1910); J. Barthelemy, *L'organization du suffrage et l'experience Belge* (1912); W. H. Dawson, *Social Switzerland* (1897); P. Seippel, editor, *La Suisse au XIX^e siècle*, 3 vols. (1899–1901); H. D. Lloyd and J. A. Hobson, *A Sovereign People: a Study of Swiss Democracy* (1907); R. C. Brooks, *Government and Politics in Switzerland* (1918); W. Oechsli, *History of Switzerland, 1499–1914*, English translation (1922); R. N. Bain, *Scandinavia, A Political History of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden from 1513 to 1900* (1905); P. Drachmann, *The Industrial Development and Commercial Policies of the Three Scandinavian Countries* (1915); J. Carlsen, H. Olrik, and C. N. Starke, *Le Danemarck* (1900); P. Fahlbeck, *La constitution suedoise et le parlementarisme moderne* (1905); K. Gjerset, *History of the Norwegian People*, 2 vols. (1915).

CHAPTER XXVI

TURKEY AND THE BALKAN STATES, 1815–1914

1. Turkey at the Opening of the Nineteenth Century

Turkey still bulked large on the map of Europe, Asia, and Africa in 1815. Although for over a century and a quarter she had been quite consistently losing territory, particularly to her powerful neighbors Russia and Austria, she remained with the sole exception of Russia the most extensive European state. Her northernmost boundaries included within their limits the broad plains of Moldavia and Wallachia stretching eastward and southward from the Carpathian Mountains to the Pruth and Danube rivers. Farther south within her boundaries was almost the whole of the Balkan peninsula. Indeed within the peninsula, which extends from the Danube and Save to the Mediterranean and lies between the Adriatic Sea on the west and the Black Sea and the Straits region on the east, only the Dalmatian coast along the eastern shore of the Adriatic and Montenegro in the mountainous region to the southeast could boast of complete freedom from Turkish rule. Beyond the limits of Europe, Turkey held sway over the whole of Asia Minor, the true homeland of the Ottoman Turks in modern times, as well as over the Armenian and Kurdish highlands. Astride the Arabian desert the sultan's dominions extended through Mesopotamia in the valleys of the Tigris and Euphrates to the east and through Syria, Palestine, and the region of the Mohammedan Holy Cities to the west. Finally in Africa, Turkish overlordship was recognized — in a very nominal sense it is true — from Egypt on westward as far as Algiers.

Territorial extent of Turkey in 1815

Within these extensive territories still a part of the Turkish empire at the opening of the nineteenth century, there was one of the most complex racial situations that has ever existed anywhere. Only in Asia Minor did the Turks, the ruling race, constitute an overwhelming majority of the population. In northern Africa the bulk of the natives were either of Arabic or Berber extraction. In the Arabian peninsula and the so-called Fertile Crescent region encircling its northern limits they were predominantly Arabic in stock, although along with the Arabs there were in certain quarters minorities of other peoples — particularly Kurds and Persians in the northeast and Jews along the Syrian coast. In the region of the Taurus Mountains, between Arabia and Asia Minor, the chief inhabitants were Armenians and Kurds, the former most numerous in the north and in the southwest and the latter in the southeast, but both being scattered generally, living together or among Turks, in a

Racial situation in Turkey

way that was most confusing. In addition to Turks in Asia Minor there were some Armenians scattered throughout the inland regions and numerous Greeks grouped particularly in the cities along the coast. Most complicated of all, however, was the situation in the Balkans where Spanish Jews, wandering gypsies, and others in comparatively small numbers as well as six numerous racial groups — Albanians, Greeks, Jugo-Slavs or Serbs, Bulgars, Vlachs or Rumanians, and Turks — were all very complexly crowded together.

The Albanians

Perhaps the oldest of the Balkan peoples in point of residence were the Albanians dwelling for the most part in the mountainous region northwest of Greece. Just how numerous these people were or are now is not known. One authority estimated in 1893 that they numbered about 1,500,000 of whom some 200,000 were under Greece and nearly 100,000 under Italy. Others of the race, it is well to note, are scattered through Serbia, particularly in northern Macedonia. There is a theory that these people are descendants of the ancient Illyrians and are of pure Alpine stock, but since we know there has been much racial intermixture in the Balkan peninsula in medieval and modern times it seems doubtful if we can put much trust in such an assertion. There are important physical variations among them — different shaped skulls, differences of complexion, and the like — as well as marked variations of dialect. Still they possess characteristics which distinguish them as a distinct people. They are for the most part tall and powerfully built, have either black, brown, or fair hair, are noted for their courage, and have revealed considerable intellectual capacity when they have been given educational opportunities. They have always enjoyed considerable local independence but have permitted local quarrels to develop into very bitter blood feuds. Travellers who visited their country late in the nineteenth century mention houses built of stone with loopholes instead of windows and describe how they maintain "peace paths" along which a sort of "Truce of God" is recognized. "The blood feuds," one traveller informs us, "affect the whole life deeply in that not only single families, but whole villages and clans live in a constant vendetta. For this reason intercourse is almost null, the cultivation of the land is limited to the immediate neighborhood of the hamlets, and a state of war between the different *communes* is the rule."

Another people who have inhabited the Balkans since ancient times are the Greeks. However the modern Greeks who number about 9,000,000 are by no means pure descendants of the ancient Greeks. There has been much racial intermingling in Greece as in other Balkan areas, notably in the Medieval period, when a considerable Slavic element was assimilated. Beyond the Greek peninsula and the coast line of Asia Minor, as mentioned above, the Greeks have occupied practically all the islands of the eastern Mediterranean and most of the coast area of the Balkan peninsula excepting only that of Dalmatia. They have been the sea-faring commercial

The Greeks

people of the Near East. On the mainland of Greece some have become shepherds and gardeners but they have never revealed a particular aptitude for agriculture. Their products have been fruits and luxuries rather than the staple cereals. They have remained generally a city-dwelling people and have been looked upon by westerners as alert, acute, and subtle. Some westerners who have visited them have been quite critical, charging the Greeks with cruelty, covetousness, and questionable commercial dealings. Others, it is true, are ready to defend them. "The Greeks are inclined to public speaking and the press, all of which are hateful to the Ottoman Government," writes one, "and therefore they are regarded with disfavor; but in all the learned professions their intelligence and ambition secure them preëminence, and in the most trying circumstances they manage to lead a busy life." "It is not that the Greeks cheat more than other commercial nations," writes another, "it is merely that they make more money on the same amount of cheating."

A third Balkan people of ancient stock are the Vlachs; they claim as their ancestors the soldiers and colonists who settled north of the Danube in the Roman province of Dacia by the aggressive Emperor Trajan. These people, numbering at least 12,000,000, speak a language which reveals a marked Latin influence but it cannot be supposed that their stock could have remained pure throughout the centuries while Gothic, Slavic, and Tartar waves of migration swept repeatedly through their homeland. In modern times they have occupied the plains of Moldavia and Wallachia, the district of Bukowina to the north of Moldavia, most of Transylvania in and beyond the Carpathian area, and, to the east, parts of the lowlands of Bessarabia. Some in addition have been scattered through southern Russia and in various parts of the Balkan peninsula including the barren Dobrudja region between the lower Danube and the Black Sea. Vlachs have alro inhabited the heart of the Balkans extending from northeastern Serbia southward to the extremity of Greece. In the latter area they have in the main constituted a migratory pastoral element living with their flocks along the upper mountain slopes in summer and finding shelter in the plains — particularly those of Thessaly and southern Macedonia — in winter. At the opening of the nineteenth century these wandering Vlachs alone numbered about a half million but in more recent times the breaking up of the Balkans into hostile national states has curtailed their activities causing many to migrate away permanently or to lose their identity among some one of the other Balkan peoples. In 1913 it was estimated that they numbered between 150,000 and 160,000.

The Vlachs or Rumanians

Among the three peoples who entered the Balkan peninsula after the close of the ancient period, the Jugo-Slavs (South-Slavs) perhaps came first. According to Slav historians they, along with other Slavic peoples, inhabited the northern Carpathian region at

the opening of the medieval period. From here during the sixth and early seventh centuries they invaded the Balkans in company with and probably under the leadership of Avars, a Tartar people from central Asia. The Avars eventually moved out of the peninsula but the Slavs remained, settling throughout the inland country and in the west, occupying even the Dalmatian coast. These Slavs unlike the Greeks took readily to agriculture and, along with the Bulgars, soon gained virtually a monopoly over peasant farming in the numerous fertile basins scattered throughout the Balkans.

The Serbs or Jugo-Slavs

Close on the heels of the Jugo-Slavs came the Bulgars. They, like the Avars, it is believed were once natives of central Asia. Before the close of the fifth century A.D. they had established themselves in southern Russia from the Volga valley westward over the steppes north of the Black Sea. There is some question as to just when and how they moved on from here to the region south of the Danube but it is quite certain that at least by the close of the seventh century a comparatively small number of them had established themselves among the Slavs in the eastern Balkan area. Here they soon mingled with the older population and lost their identity as Asiatics. Even their language was given up. Modern Bulgarian contains some words of Turkish origin introduced during the period of Ottoman rule but it is otherwise a pure Slavic tongue. Some authorities believe that the Bulgarians have shown greater virility, cohesion, and driving power than their cousins the Serbians. Others claim that they are more energetic and are more easily influenced by western ideas while the Serbs, though less efficient, take life more lightly and are more attractive. Be that as it may, it is certain that the two peoples in spite of bitter hatreds for each other have differed so slightly that it has been possible for members of the same family to claim either nationality.[1]

The Bulgars

The last people to enter the Balkan peninsula were the Ottoman Turks who came in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries as conquerors and feudal lords. They like Avars and Bulgars came from central Asia but they came by way of Persia and Asia Minor instead of through southern Russia. They settled at least in small numbers in almost every part of the peninsula, their most numerous European settlements being in Thrace, eastern Bulgaria, and Macedonia.[2] The Turks have uniformly held themselves aloof from the subject peoples but they have always admitted to their ranks all who have been willing to accept the Mohammedan religion and to speak the Turkish language. Consequently the Turkish stock of recent times has been far from pure Turanian. The Turk has often been accused of indolence and indeed he has usually been either a landlord depending for his

The Turks

[1] Today the Serbo-Croats (Jugo-Slavs) number over 8,000,000 while the Bulgars number about 5,500,000.

[2] The Turks in the Near East number over 10,000,000. Most of them are located in Asia Minor.

livelihood upon the exploitation of subject natives or he has been a member of the poor ignorant lower class. Nevertheless westerners who have lived for some time in the Near East have often gained a greater respect for him than for other nationals located there. "A Turk will prevaricate sometimes if necessary," wrote an American diplomat in 1836, "and is skillful as a diplomatist and negotiator, in which character he endeavors to gain every advantage, is always covetous, and perhaps sometimes may be corrupted, but in general no one respects truth more than he does, or holds it more sacred or inviolate; . . . Perhaps no people in any part of the world are generally so regardless of truth as the Franks [westerners] and Rayahs [subject Christians] of the Levant." Still there is some truth in the explanation offered by others that the long continued position of unquestioned superiority which the Turk has enjoyed has conduced to develop in him those qualities which in the words of an English historian constitute "the theme of uniform admiration with foreigners who have been dwellers in the Ottoman Empire."

Religious situation in Turkey

The religious situation as well as the racial was most complicated in the vast Turkish Empire at the opening of the nineteenth century. The dominant Turks were Sunnite (Orthodox) Mohammedans. Others, including Kurds and various Arabic groups outside Europe, numerous Albanians, and lesser minorities among other Balkan peoples, were of the same faith. Among those accepting distinct and hostile beliefs, but within the Mohammedan fold, were the unorthodox Druses of Syria and the puritanical Wahabites of the Arabian desert. Outside of the Moslem fold were Jews, present in small numbers in both the European and Asiatic portions of the Empire. Most important of all, however, were the millions of subject Christians — mainly Greek Orthodox, Gregorian (Armenian), and Roman Catholic — who constituted a great majority of the inhabitants in the Balkan peninsula and the eastern Mediterranean islands as well as an important minority in Asia Minor, Armenia, and Syria. These latter people were looked upon by Mohammedans as *giaours* (infidels). They were "cattle" — *rayahs* — fit only to obey and serve their masters, "the faithful."

Mohammedan law and its application

It is easy to understand this situation when one remembers that the Mohammedan point of view although tolerant to a degree was still extremely narrow and fanatical, something like that of western European Christians in the Middle Ages. The *sheri* (sacred law) bound even the sultan theoretically and was applied in courts under the control of *cadi* (judges) and *mufti* (interpreters of the law) who were in reality religious officials. Education was limited to religious matters. Schools were confined to the mosques. Dervishes (monastics) were numerous and enjoyed prestige generally. The Turkish government, upholding this narrow religious point of view, removed its Christian and Jewish subjects from the jurisdiction of the ordinary legal and administrative agencies. Each sect was organized as a

separate *millet* presided over by its patriarch, bishop, or other ecclesiastical head. Most important of these, particularly in the European parts of the Empire, was that of the Greek Orthodox Church under control of the patriarch at Constantinople. His authority extended over all affiliated with the Greek Church regardless of nationality or location so long as they were Turkish subjects, covered the collection of the sultan's military tax as well as church taxes, and included control over marriage, divorce, certain matters of inheritance, etc. The patriarch, appointed by the sultan and residing in Constantinople, could be counted on ordinarily to further the interests of Turkey. The organization of the *millet* nevertheless served as a powerful instrument to preserve the traditions of the past, to spread Greek culture, and thus to prepare the way for future independence. *The millets*

Economic conditions in Turkey were likewise very discouraging. The Turks, who were the landlords generally, took very little interest in the development of their estates, which were cultivated usually by exploited *rayah* peasants. "Where the Turk plants his foot the grass never grows again," so ran a saying. The more mountainous sections were limited largely to grazing, while even the fertile basins of Bulgaria, Serbia, and Macedonia were under only partial cultivation. Lands after having produced grain for two or three years were left fallow often for a term of years and sometimes even were allowed to become overgrown with brushwood. Implements were scarce and crude. Mixing of crops, for instance the sowing of wheat with barley or rye in the same field, was by no means uncommon. One observer maintains that quite recently in Bosnia at the northwestern end of the Balkan peninsula cultivation was often carried on entirely with the hoe, and he ventures to state that weeds frequently constituted ten per cent of the crop. Trade and commerce remained either in the hands of *rayahs*, particularly Greeks and Armenians, or in those of foreigners. In the case of the former there was never complete security from being plundered by government tax-farmers or by bands of fanatical Mohammedans. The latter, on the other hand, uniformly enjoyed a special favored position under the so-called capitulation system. This system, based on a treaty signed between France and Turkey in 1535, embodied capitulations or articles assuring to French citizens freedom of trade throughout Turkish territory and, along with the right of trial in French consular courts, immunity from the operation of Ottoman laws. In the period between 1535 and 1815 these privileges were frequently renewed and at least once, in 1740, considerably extended. Furthermore in the same period almost all of the other western states gained similar privileges for their nationals. *Economic conditions in Turkey* *The capitulation system*

In addition to being handicapped by racial, religious, and economic factors Turkey was confronted by a most serious political situation. The sultan's government was without question the weakest and most corrupt of any among the major states of Europe. In

The Turkish administrative system

theory it was centralized and absolute. The sultan in addition to being the *padishah*, "King of Kings," was the *khalif* or supreme ecclesiastical head of the orthodox Mohammedan world. His administrative officials, including even the grand vizier (prime minister) and the members of the divan (council of ministers), as well as his soldiers, the janissaries, were merely his *kuls* or slaves. In early modern times when Turkey was the most powerful state in Europe they had been slaves in fact as well as in name. They were recruited almost entirely from among the *rayahs* in the Balkans and elsewhere. Every five years commissioners of the sultan collected children in the Christian villages. These children were usually so young that they soon forgot about their origin, became good Mohammedans, and, not being permitted to marry, looked forward solely to careers as professional soldiers or as the favored administrators of the government. Long before the nineteenth century this system became corrupted. The practice of levying tribute children was abandoned between 1640 and 1676 when the last levy on record was made. Thereafter both the army and the hierarchy of officials became truly a sort of privileged aristocracy. The janissaries even became hereditary in part. They were permitted to marry and introduce their children into the ranks. The sultan, secluding himself in the *serai* (royal harem), withdrew largely from active participation in governmental and military affairs. He ceased attending meetings of the divan and seldom accompanied the army when engaged in foreign wars. Palace intrigues, as one would expect under such circumstances, became numerous. Grand viziers and lesser ministers rose and fell according to the whims and jealousies of the sultan's favorite "slave" wives who often practically ruled the country. Even more serious disturbances, perpetrated particularly by unruly janissaries, developed at times and threatened the position of the sultan himself. Within the two centuries preceding 1815 no fewer than seven *padishahs* were either deposed or murdered.

Corruption in the Ottoman government

Along with the decline of the power of the sultan came a very startling growth of corruption. Offices of all grades both civil and military were arbitrarily sold by those in control of appointment. Incidentally the sultan and the ladies of the harem took their full share of the plunder. To make matters worse officers held appointment at the will of those who had appointed them. Naturally if they were to profit by their appointments they had to make hay while the sun shone, recouping themselves by exactions on those below them and on the people in their districts. Not only were offices sold in the most shameless fashion but also bribery — *baksheesh* — was universally required for the services of the government. The *cadi* or judges even were bribed, often by both parties to a dispute, and it may be ventured with considerable certainty that they could usually be depended upon to give their judgments to those who contributed of their funds most freely.

Internal weakness and corruption began bearing bitter fruit for Turkey long before 1815. In the period between 1683 and 1718, she was humbled on two occasions in struggles with Austria; losing to the latter by the Treaty of Carlowitz (1699) all the Turkish possessions in Hungary except the Banat, and by the Treaty of Passarowitz (1718) the latter area, western Wallachia, and northern Serbia including the important city of Belgrade. It is true that later after a more successful struggle ending with the Treaty of Belgrade (1739), she regained the portions of Wallachia and Serbia lost in 1718. Nevertheless in a series of three disastrous wars which soon followed with Russia she lost all of her territorial possessions north of the Black Sea from the mouth of the Danube to that of the Kuban. Furthermore by the important Treaty of Kuchuk-Kainarji (1774) she was forced to concede to her Muscovite enemy, (1) freedom of commerce in the Black Sea and through the straits of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles, (2) trading privileges as enjoyed by the French and others throughout Turkey, (3) a virtual protectorate over Moldavia and Wallachia, (4) the right to protect certain Orthodox churches in Constantinople, and (5) a promise to obstruct in no manner the free exercise of the Christian religion.

Territorial losses of Turkey in the eighteenth century

Treaty of Kuchuk-Kainarji, 1774

Also alarming for Turkey was the threatened breakup of the Empire from within. Pashas (governors) and other local authorities quite generally carried on secret negotiations with each other, intrigued against the sultan's ministers, and in some cases boldly defied the central government. Asia Minor was virtually ruled by petty *derebeys* (valley lords). Pasvan Oglu, a bandit who had seized the important fortress of Vidin and forced the sultan to recognize him as its pasha, governed until his death (1807) an important part of northern Bulgaria. Ali Pasha of Janina established himself similarly in a large section of northern Greece. Others did likewise in Asia at Bagdad and Acre. Most famous of all perhaps was the enterprising Albanian Mehemet Ali who succeeded in establishing himself in Egypt (1805) where he exterminated the rival Mameluke Turkish nobility, took over control of the land and of industry, and with the aid of French experts built up a military and naval force more powerful than that of the sultan. Indeed so critical did the position of Turkey become by the opening of the nineteenth century that westerners began to speculate as to how soon the Empire would collapse.

Breakdown of local government in Turkey

Turks as well as westerners realized the danger confronting their country. "I come back more convinced than ever that if we do not hurry to imitate Europe, we shall resign ourselves to go back to Asia," declared a prominent Turk in 1830 after having visited Russia. The first sultan to reach a similar conclusion was Selim III, 1789–1807. He outlined an elaborate program of reform calling for (1) the sweeping away of feudalism, (2) the curtailment of the authority of the pashas, (3) the restricting of the powers of the grand vizier, (4) the reorganization of the divan, (5) the abolition of tax farming, (6)

Reforms of Selim III

the establishment of permanent embassies to western European states, and (7) the reorganization of the army on a western model. He failed, however, to carry his program into effect. The janissaries, aroused by the threatened loss of their privileged position, rose in revolt, first deposing and later murdering the unfortunate *padishah* to protect their interests.

Reforms of Mahmoud II

The cause of reform was next taken up by Sultan Mahmoud II, 1808–1839. His program, carefully concealed for some time after his accession, included both the revival and the extension of Selim's reforms. He proposed judicial as well as administrative reforms, revived the practice of the sultan's attending regular meetings of the divan, reorganized the imperial household, introduced western manners and methods of dress, and most important of all exterminated the janissaries (1826), substituting an army organized after the western fashion. For a time it appeared as though he might succeed. "Very great has been the improvement in the nation in every respect," wrote the American minister to Turkey; "they scarcely appear any longer the same people." Perhaps the chief difficulty with Mahmoud's reforms — and the same criticism may be directed against those of Selim — was that they were too pretentious. Even the army reforms, in spite of the fact that western officers were employed to drill the troops, were most unsatisfactory. "It is very apparent," the American wrote in 1833 after witnessing the review of 10,000 new troops, "that there was not one among the higher officers, who was qualified to command the combined operations of an army. . . . Every regiment appeared to act independently and without any concert with the rest . . . the Seraskier, the commander in chief, limiting his attention to ordering the maneuvers of one regiment. . . . The great aim appeared to be as much motion and noise as possible, without any definite design, or other result, than waste of powder and fatigue of men."

At the close of the reign, Mahmoud was completely outclassed by his powerful vassal Mehemet Ali, and Turkey, defeated in a civil war, lay helpless before the latter's victorious army. Her defense depended entirely upon the intervention of the great powers.

Still to do justice to the sincere sultan it must be admitted that the following most serious handicaps over which he had no control hampered and at times even blocked the success of his work: (1) there was the inherent conservatism of the Mohammedan religion and the Turkish tradition; (2) the determined opposition of the "Old Turk" party which demanded a return to the principles and standards of the great sultans at the opening of the modern period; (3) the awakening of national feeling leading to revolt among the subject peoples in the Balkans; and (4) the almost total lack of sympathy from governments and peoples outside of Turkey. These obstacles were sufficient to nullify any reform program.

Why reform failed in Turkey

2. The Awakening of Nationalism in the Balkans

The awakening of national feeling in the Balkans had its beginning in the eighteenth century. Among the factors contributing directly to it were (1) the geographical barriers in the Balkan peninsula, inviting provincialism and the survival of old national traditions, (2) the failure of the Turks with their superior point of view and system of *millets* to assimilate conquered peoples, (3) the decline of Turkish power, bringing with it corruption, lawlessness, and tyranny of local officials, (4) the propaganda of outside powers — particularly Russia — wishing to derive selfish profits therefrom in the form of protectorates and perhaps eventual annexations, and (5) the influence of nationalism, developed in western Europe in the time of the French Revolution and Napoleon.

Causes of national awakening in the Balkans

At the opening of the eighteenth century Danilo, the bishop of Cettinje (1696–1735) aroused the Jugo-Slav inhabitants of mountainous Montenegro and successfully defied the Turks. He allied himself with Russia (1711), enlarged the territories held by his people, and succeeded in making his position with the title of *vladika* (prince) hereditary, the succession going as a rule from the bishop-prince to one of his nephews. After failing to conquer the country the Turks finally conceded Montenegrin independence in 1799.

Montenegro gains independence, 1799

Approximately five years later (February, 1804) brother Jugo-Slavs in Serbia rose in revolt. The leader of their revolt, Kara (Black) George Petrovich, was a typical Serb pig dealer who had the merit of possessing great energy and qualities of leadership although his record branded him as being little more than an ordinary bandit. At first the rising which he headed was directed against tyrannical janissaries who had defied the sultan and had committed shocking excesses throughout the country. Indeed they had murdered even the popular governor of Belgrade, Mustapha Pasha, a Turk whom the Serbs fondly termed their "mother." Later, however, after the janissaries had been crushed and the sultan refused to meet the rebel demands for an extension of local rights, the rising developed into a movement for independence. For almost a decade this movement gave promise of success. The rebellious Serbs defeated the armies which the porte (Turkish government) sent against them; they effectively cleared their country of the enemy; they organized a provisional government; and they formed an alliance with Russia. But in 1812, when Turkey was freed from intermittent war with the Muscovites and when Russia temporarily ceased to remember her obligations as Serbia's ally, the sultan brought more pressure to bear against them. A "holy war" was proclaimed. Fresh armies were despatched to attack the rebellious subjects. Within a year, in fact, the crushing of the revolt was assured. Kara George, obviously suffering from an attack of nerves, fled across the Austrian border leaving his defenseless land to be occupied by triumphant Moslem troops.

The Serb revolt of 1804

Although the Turkish triumph over these revolting Jugo-Slavs seemed complete it was destined to be short lived. The sultan's followers were unable to refrain from indulging their appetites for revenge, the result being that a fresh uprising was provoked (April, 1815) led this time by Milosh Obrenovich a well-known *knez* or native lord. Milosh, in addition to possessing many of Kara George's qualities of leadership, was a consummate diplomat. Through shrewd negotiations he secured a settlement with Turkey in 1817, whereby the Serbs, in return for acknowledging themselves as the sultan's vassals, gained the right to retain their arms and the privilege of sharing in the control of their own local administration. In a similar way and during the same year Milosh secured as a reward for himself a formal vote of his fellow *knezes* selecting him as their supreme chief.

The Serb revolt of 1815

Russian intervention was largely responsible for the next steps taken in furthering Jugo-Slav freedom. By the Convention of Akerman, which the tsar forced upon the *padishah* in 1826, the latter agreed that within eighteen months he would draw up a settlement with his troublesome Serb subjects ceding to them autonomy, the right to choose their own chiefs, and the control over six Serbian districts which had been held by Kara George but had not joined in the revolt under Milosh. It is true the porte promptly ignored the arrangement but by the Peace of Adrianople (1829) concluded after Russia had intervened against Turkey to further the cause of Greek independence, the sultan was forced to renew his promises and permit the establishment of a Russian protectorate. Thereupon the way was prepared for the virtual emancipation of Serbia from Turkish rule. Within half a decade her autonomy was formally granted, Milosh was named hereditary prince, the ties with the Greek church were cut, thus nationalizing the church of Serbia, the six districts were acquired, and finally provision was made for the withdrawal from the country of all Turks except those in Belgrade and other garrison towns.

Serbs gain autonomy

Nationalism, stimulated by diverse factors, likewise made progress at an early date in the Rumanian provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia. The people of these provinces, unlike the Serbs — and also unlike the Greeks and Bulgars — could not look back to a great age in the past when their princes had ruled most of the Balkans. Nevertheless tradition played a part in their national awakening, just as it did in that of each of the other Balkan peoples, for they took great pride in their supposed Roman origin. A second factor contributing directly to their awakening was the attempt of Turkey in the eighteenth century to strengthen her hold over them. In Rumania the Turks had never replaced the native *boyars* or nobles as lords of the land, and for two centuries after the completion of the Turkish conquest these *boyars* remained practically the only local political agents of the porte. But in 1711 the sultan, justly suspicious

Origin of Rumanian nationalism

of the loyalty of the native lords and covetous of the sums he might gain through the sale of new offices, inaugurated the practice of sending Phanariotes (rich Greeks from Constantinople) as governors to the two provinces. The incumbents of the governorships were invested with extensive powers, especially financial, and were exalted with the princely title of *hospodar*. Consequently the office was much sought after and dearly bought. All of which meant that very heavy exactions were continually wrung from the poor Rumanians to fill the empty purses of their oppressors. Western influence, a third factor furthering the national cause, came almost exclusively from France, and it came mainly through Russia, whose government, as has been mentioned formerly, gained a sort of protectorate over Moldavia and Wallachia in 1774. Before the close of the eighteenth century a small patriotic Rumanian party arose. At an early date also students began careful study of the national language with an eye to eliminating Slavic words and making it conform more closely to Latin, vernacular literature was developed, schools were founded, and even a nationalist newspaper made its appearance.

The actual steps in the freeing of Rumania were taken almost simultaneously with those for the liberation of Serbia: (1) In 1802, thanks to Russian influence, it was arranged that the Phanariote *hospodars* should be appointed for a definite period of seven years. (2) Twenty years later, at an early date during the Greek struggle for independence, the practice of appointing Greeks as *hospodars* was abandoned. Thereafter selection was confined to the native *boyars*. (3) By the Convention of Akerman the Russian protectorate was strengthened, it was provided that the princes should be elected for their term of seven years from among the native lords, and it was promised that they should draw up a scheme of administrative reform for their much vexed principalities. (4) Finally by the Peace of Adrianople provision was made for the election of the *hospodars* for life, and the sultan's connection with the provinces was reduced practically to the claim of a fixed annual tribute.

The Danubian provinces gain autonomy

Most extensive and most successful of all the early national movements within Turkish territory was the one among the Greeks. It was the first in which there were developed secret societies, extensive propaganda, and an intense national spirit such as was common in similar movements in the west. It was the first also to attract wide attention abroad leading to international intervention. Furthermore it was the only early movement in the Balkans outside of mountainous Montenegro which was sufficiently successful to assure complete independence for part of its adherents. Very important among the special influences encouraging the growth of the movement were the geographical location of the Greeks, their nearness to the sea, and their economic advantages as the commercial people of the Near East. These influences not only facilitated the exchange of ideas and sentiments between Greeks but also brought them in direct touch

Character of the Greek national movement

with the revolutionary feelings and political theories of western Europe. Also important were other special influences including the rich cultural past of the Greeks, their strong tradition of former greatness, their control over the Orthodox church, the political advantages which they held among the *rayahs*, and the semi-independent position which they enjoyed in their homeland in the Greek peninsula and the islands of the eastern Mediterranean.

Origin of Greek nationalism

Evidence of the growth of Greek nationalism was apparent long before the flames of revolt burst forth. In the latter part of the eighteenth century there was an important expansion of Greek commerce stimulated in the beginning by the terms of the Peace of Kuchuk-Kainarji. These terms enabled Greek traders to sail their vessels under the tsar's flag claiming for their goods all privileges and immunities enjoyed by Russians. The expansion became most significant during the period of the French Revolution and Napoleon when Greeks, being neutrals, gained a virtual monopoly of the Mediterranean trade. In addition to increasing their wealth, they enlarged their merchant marine and equipped it with cannon for defense against pirates, thus providing themselves with a potential war fleet for the future. Also in the latter part of the eighteenth century there was a remarkable intellectual revival connected with the restoration and purification of the Greek language. Korais, a scholar, was very successful in his efforts to purify the language of the people sufficiently to make the classics accessible to the living generation. Rhigas, a young poet, succeeded in writing a Greek version of the *Marseillaise*, in publishing Greek translations of numerous foreign works, and in drawing up a popular collection of national songs. Early in the nineteenth century there was a political awakening among the Greeks. It found most successful expression in the development of secret societies which eagerly championed the notion of a national war of liberation. Most formidable of the societies was the so-called *Philike Hetairia*, or Association of Friends, with its headquarters at Odessa in southern Russia and with its branches in all parts of Turkey where there were numerous patriotic Greeks. By 1820 the *Hetairia* claimed 80,000 members and it boasted of the military support of Russia. It had collected considerable sums of money, had purchased arms, and waited only for a favorable opportunity to begin an insurrection against the Turks.

It is convenient to divide the Greek War of Independence into three periods. First that in which the insurrection, kindled by the *Hetairia*, spread throughout Greece (1821–1824). The period opened with a futile invasion of the Danubian provinces led by the *Hetairist* chief Alexander Ypsilanti operating from his base in southern Russia. It was marked by most brutal atrocities on both sides. When the Greeks rose in revolt they butchered the Turkish officials and residents in their midst. The Turks responded by murdering the patriarch at Constantinople and by massacring thousands of Greeks on

The Greek Revolution, 1821–1829

the island of Chios and elsewhere through the Empire. The second period, 1824–1827, ushered in after Sultan Mahmoud had exhausted every means within his power to stamp out the rising, may well be termed the period of the Egyptian intervention. In order to secure the assistance of the trained forces of *Mehemet Ali, pasha of Egypt*, the sultan was forced to offer huge concessions, among them the promise of the governorship of the Morea in southern Greece for Mehemet's son Ibrahim. During the period the Egyptian army commanded by Ibrahim swept through the island of Crete and over the mainland of Greece threatening to turn the tide completely in favor of Turkey. However, the ruthless suppression of the Greek rebels attracted wide attention abroad. In the west there developed a strong philhellenic or pro-Greek movement. Through it both sympathy and substantial aid were extended to the would-be worthy descendants of the ancient Greeks. In Russia there was a similar movement, influenced mainly by ties of a common religion. At last in 1827 public opinion in the different countries became so strong that the governments of England, France, and Russia consented collectively by a Treaty of London to demand an immediate cessation of hostilities in the Near East, and they agreed to secure autonomy for Greece under the sultan's over-lordship. This marked the opening of the third or international period of the struggle. Two years elapsed before Turkey agreed to meet the demands of the allies. In the meantime a European fleet destroyed that of the Turks and Egyptians in the bay of Navarino at Ibrahim's base of operations in the Morea, and Russia, declaring war on the porte, sent an army over the Balkan mountains almost to the gates of Constantinople.

Peace of Adrianople, 1829

At the close of the struggle for Greek independence Russia rewarded herself in the Peace of Adrianople. In addition to strengthening her influence in Serbia and the Danubian provinces, she secured an extension of her commercial privileges in Turkish waters and gained minor accessions of territory at the mouth of the Danube and in the Caucasus area.

Greeks gain independence and a king, 1833

It was not until 1833 that the status of Greece was definitely established. Then after long drawn out negotiations the great powers decided, and Turkey agreed, that she should receive complete independence but that her limits should be confined to the central and southern portions of the Greek peninsula including only those islands of the Greek Archipelago which were immediately along the European shore. Along with the settlement of boundaries the protecting powers established a form of government for the new state. Greece herself had tried out a republic but it had proved unsuccessful. Civil dissension had developed and in 1831 the president, Capo d'Istria, had been murdered. The powers declared that Greece should be a monarchical state. After experiencing some difficulty in finding a suitable monarch they placed the crown on the head of the youthful Prince Otto of Bavaria.

3. The Development of International Rivalry in the Near East, 1832–1856

During the period from the close of the Greek War of Independence to 1856, international rivalry developed between the great powers — particularly Great Britain, France, and Russia — over the problem of what to do with Turkey. Russia, eager to secure Constantinople because its possession would assure her of an outlet to the Mediterranean and give her control over the traditional religious center of the Greek Orthodox church, obviously favored a partitioning of the Ottoman Empire among the great powers. Great Britain, fearing that if Russia should gain her objective in the Straits region she would disturb the European balance of power and challenge British commercial interests in the eastern Mediterranean, championed the strengthening of Turkey as a bulwark in the Near East against Russia. On one occasion France seemed to favor the replacing of the decadent Empire of the sultan by a new virile state headed by Mehemet Ali, Pasha of Egypt. At other times she supported Britain in championing Turkey. Within the Ottoman Empire the weakness of the sultan and the national awakening among Christian peoples in the Balkans served continually to invite foreign intervention and to keep before the powers the problem of what to do with Turkey. Outside the Ottoman Empire two factors which developed soon after international rivalry over Near Eastern affairs became acute, added greatly in the eyes of Europeans to the importance of what should be done with Turkish territory. These factors, fanning the flames of international rivalry, were largely responsible for making agreement among the powers for a solution of the problem impossible. One of them was the growth of the territorial interests of the three powers in areas near the frontiers of Turkey; in other words it was the growth of British influence in India and Afghanistan, of Russian control over parts of central Asia and the Caucasus region, and of French authority in north Africa. The second element influencing the solution of the international problem in the Near East was the revival of western European interest in the Suez route to the Orient, a revival brought about by the development of steam navigation which opened up possibilities for regular periodic communications through Egypt to India, China, and other eastern areas.[1]

Causes of international rivalry in the Near East

International rivalry in the Near East, developing after the awakening of nationalism, had only slight beginnings in the eight-

[1] The Suez canal was not opened until 1869, but over 30 years earlier steam communication between west and east was successfully established through Egypt and the Red Sea. Steamers ran periodically from English and other European ports to Alexandria. Goods, passengers, and letters were transported from here, mainly by caravan, to Suez where other steamers were in waiting to take them on to the east. Before the development of steam navigation it was impossible to maintain such communications because monsoon winds and other natural forces prevented sailing vessels from navigating regularly in the Red Sea.

eenth century. During that century, Turkey was looked upon by the great powers largely as a pawn which might be made incidental to their rivalry with each other elsewhere. France posed as the friend of Turkey because it was convenient to enlist Turkish support in her struggles with Austria. Great Britain attempted to employ the Turks in similar ways but was less successful than her neighbor. It appears that not until the time of the younger Pitt in the last decades of the century did a British statesman think seriously of bolstering up Turkey as a bulwark against Russia. Throughout the century Russia and Austria were frank partners in despoiling the Turks. There is slight indication that they were at all jealous of each other although it is true that Austria in 1775 insisted on getting the district of Bukowina as compensation for what Russia had gained a year earlier by the Peace of Kuchuk Kainarji. In fact Turkish affairs did not become a major source of difference between European powers until the decade following the Greek War of Independence. Then for the first time there was serious danger of a general European war as a result solely of rivalry in the Near East.

Origin of international rivalry in the Near East

A quarrel between the sultan and his powerful vassal Mehemet Ali provided the occasion for the development of the first marked international rivalry over Turkish affairs. The *padishah*, maintaining that he had not profited by Egyptian intervention in Greece, refused to grant all the concessions he had promised to his vassal. Mehemet responded by sending an army into Syria, the governorship of which he claimed as a part of his reward. Mahmoud attempted to coerce his unruly subject, but his forces were disastrously beaten (1832), and the triumphant Egyptians pushed over the Taurus Mountains threatening the destruction of the Ottoman Empire. The sultan, deprived of all adequate means of defense, appealed urgently to Great Britain, France, and Russia for assistance. The western powers, being occupied with other problems, hesitated to send aid to the Turks. Only Russia responded favorably. Acting on the theory that her interests in Turkey could be furthered as well through befriending the sultan as by using force and intimidation against him, she dispatched both military and naval assistance to the defense of Constantinople.

The first Turco-Egyptian crisis, 1832–33

The appearance of Russian forces on the Bosphorus (February 1833) served as the signal for the breaking of the storm of international rivalry. Both Great Britain and France, whose suspicions of Russian policy had been growing during the period of European intervention in Greece, were now thoroughly alarmed. They protested vigorously against the establishment of the Russians near the Ottoman capital and, with the aim of removing the excuse for their presence there, took steps to secure a settlement between the Turks and the Egyptians. Such a settlement was negotiated but at the expense of the sovereign power of the sultan. Syria and also the strategic district of Adana at the southeastern corner of Asia Minor.

Russian intervention in the Near East: The Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, 1833

had to be surrendered to Mehemet Ali. Moreover before the Russian troops and ships were withdrawn from Turkey, Mahmoud was forced to sign a treaty greatly strengthening the influence of Russia within his domains. The tsar gained by this arrangement, known as the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi, two very important concessions. First he secured recognition as an ally of the sultan with the right to furnish substantial aid to him if an enemy should again threaten Turkey, and second he obtained an understanding whereby the Straits of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles were opened to the warships of Russia but closed to those of all other foreign nations.

Anglo-French hostility to Russian policy in the Near East

When Great Britain and France learned of the terms agreed upon at Unkiar Skelessi, their hostility to Russia was almost unbounded. Threatening articles appeared in the press, formal and identical notes announcing a determination to ignore the provisions of the treaty were presented at the Russian as well as the Turkish capital, and even a combined fleet was dispatched to cruise in the waters of the eastern Mediterranean. Russia replied similarly defying her western opponents. Indeed for a considerable period of time war appeared as gravely imminent. "With Russia we are just as we were, snarling at each other, but neither wishing for war," declared Lord Palmerston, the British minister of foreign affairs in 1834. "Their last communication on Eastern affairs is anything but satisfactory. However there is nothing at present done by us, because there is no danger of anything being done by them. . . . Our policy as to the Levant is to remain quiet but remain prepared."

The Second Turco-Egyptian crisis, 1839

Thus the situation remained with but slight abatement until almost the close of the decade; then a fresh crisis arose in the Near East. Mahmoud, far from being reconciled to the loss of Syria and Adana, made extensive preparations for a renewal of the struggle with his dangerous vassal. At last in 1839, ignoring the warnings of representatives of the European powers, he judged the time opportune for success and ordered his forces to advance into Syria. On this occasion the Turks were defeated even more decisively than in 1832. The army was routed, the fleet surrendered without attempting a fight, the sultan died in the midst of the crisis, and the only thing that saved Turkey was the promise of collective intervention on the part of the great powers.

International intervention in Turkey, 1839–40

All Europe was aroused during the second Turco-Egyptian crisis. At first many westerners feared that Russia would act independently under the terms of her treaty of alliance with Turkey. However the tsar realized that if he attempted so to intervene he would inevitably encounter the armed resistance of Great Britain and France, and he might encounter that of Austria also. Having no appetite for such an adventure he hastened to make it clear that Russia would not intervene under any circumstances without the coöperation of the other powers. Then another question arose. France, claiming that Russia could not be trusted, urged that liberal terms be granted to

Mehemet Ali and that chief attention be given to the negotiation of a convention guaranteeing the independence and territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire. Great Britain, Austria, and Prussia, on the other hand, were willing to credit the professions of Russia, and, being distrustful of French interests in Egypt, were eager to force severe terms upon the ambitious pasha. When Russia realized that in diplomacy there was an opportunity to separate the two western powers, she quickly brought her policy into harmony with that of Great Britain, even conceding that the troublesome Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi might be abandoned. Consequently France became isolated, and the other four powers, ignoring her, drew up a treaty at London (1840) providing for the coercion of Mehemet Ali.

The European crisis of 1840

A European crisis which was very serious for a time followed the concluding of the Treaty of London. France, eager to prevent the execution of the treaty, threatened to support the pasha in waging war against Turkey and her allies. She enrolled new regiments, strengthened her fleet, and set about building fortifications for the city of Paris. With similar spirit the four powers, refusing to promise concessions which might conciliate the French, developed and firmly pursued plans for the driving of the Egyptians from Syria. Thus for three months the crisis continued to be most acute. Then fortunately it began to recede with considerable rapidity. The resistance of the sultan's vassal collapsed and, as the allies refrained from entirely dispossessing him, the French abandoned their threat to join in the struggle. Thereupon resentment on all sides subsided, removing the immediate danger of a European war. Eventually France resumed negotiations with the other four powers and in 1841, after allied influence had induced the Turks to grant to Mehemet Ali the hereditary possession of his Egyptian territories, the five states were reunited in signing the Straits Convention which proclaimed the Straits of the Bosphorus and Dardanelles closed to the warships of all nations except Turkey.

The Straits Convention of 1841

After the signing of the Straits Convention there was comparative calm in the Near East for a few years; then once more the question of Russian advance against Turkey, destined at last to lead to a destructive European struggle, became a paramount issue. Most significant in this period of renewed international rivalry was the evolution in Anglo-Russian relations. It should be remembered that the tsar had abandoned the privileges he enjoyed under the terms of the Treaty of Unkiar Skelessi chiefly because he gained thereby a temporary understanding with the British relative to the affairs of the Near East. The temporary understanding he was eager to develop into a permanent one. He not only believed that the eastern policies of Great Britain and Russia could be reconciled but in addition dreamed of a formal alliance and of an agreement relative to the partitioning of the Ottoman Empire. Few possibilities could have been farther removed from the thoughts of Englishmen. They wished to see the

Renewal of international rivalry over Russian policy in the Near East

limitation of Russian influence at Constantinople equal at least to the limitation of French influence in Egypt. Hence when the tsar visited England in 1844, with the idea of cautiously feeling out opinion regarding his schemes, his remarks about the "Sick Man" of Europe (Turkey) were given a cool reception. Still he did not despair of ultimate success. In January, 1853, he approached the subject more boldly, this time to the British ambassador at St. Petersburg. Alluding to the "Sick Man," he declared that it would be a misfortune "if one of these days he should slip away," especially before all necessary arrangements had been made. He, Nicholas, was quite willing that Great Britain should have Crete and Egypt as her share of the spoils. All he desired for himself was the privilege of "occupying" Constantinople and of acting as the protector of autonomous Christian states in the Balkans. Such suggestions were shocking to British ears. They were of course promptly rejected, Great Britain again becoming thoroughly alarmed lest Russia alone should renew her aggressions against Turkey. Similarly the relations of France and Russia, which in reality had not been cordial since before 1830, became greatly estranged. Only a spark — a quarrel between Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox monks in the Holy Land — was needed to set the Near East aflame and plunge Europe into the useless Crimean War.

Russia presents an ultimatum to Turkey, March, 1853

The Crimean War like the crisis of 1840 was preceded by a period of extensive negotiations between the powers. The tsar, impatient because of his failure to win British support for a partitioning of Turkey and irritated by the French championship of the cause of the Roman Catholic monks in the Holy Land, drew up an ultimatum which he forwarded to Constantinople in March, 1853, by a special envoy, Prince Menshikov. The ultimatum involved two demands: first that the dispute relative to the Holy Places should be settled immediately in favor of the Greeks, and secondly that the tsar be recognized as the protector of *all* Greek Christians residing in Turkey. Menshikov, who proved to be an overbearing army officer rather than a diplomat, was totally unable to cope successfully with the able British ambassador to Turkey, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe. Lord Stratford, popularly known among the Turks as the "Great Ambassador," tactfully induced the porte to separate the two Russian demands, conceding the first but rejecting the second, and thus to place the responsibility for aggression on Russia. Hence the prince, unable to accept the Turkish reply as satisfactory, was forced to withdraw from the Ottoman capital as abruptly as he had come. Later Vienna became the center of prolonged and feverish negotiations in the interest of peace, but to no avail. In July, 1853, the tsar ordered his troops to occupy the Danubian provinces. Three months later a combined Anglo-French fleet entered the Dardanelles, and finally in March, 1854, after hostilities had begun between Russia and Turkey, the allies presented the tsar with a formal declaration of war.

The war dragged on for almost two years. The losses on both sides were enormous but the accomplishments were slight. In spite of the fact that over half a million lives were lost and about two billion dollars were spent neither side gained a decisive military advantage. It is true that the Russians were driven from the Danubian provinces and after a protracted siege were forced to surrender their great Black Sea naval base at Sebastopol on the southern end of the Crimean peninsula. Yet their vast inland territory was not threatened and their troops won some success, capturing particularly the important Turkish fortress of Kars in the Caucasus area. It was not until January, 1856, almost a year after the death of Tsar Nicholas I, the Russian perhaps most interested in the struggle, that the new tsar, Alexander II, with comparatively slight interest in the conflict, agreed to petition formally for peace. France and Great Britain, weary of the war, did not hesitate to embrace the opportunity for adjustment, and through the mediation of Austria it was arranged that a Congress of Europe should be assembled at Paris to negotiate a settlement.

The Crimean War, 1854–56

During the negotiations at the Congress of Paris the idea of rejuvenating Turkey, as well as that of providing against possible future aggression of Russia in the Near East, triumphed. By the treaty signed March 30, 1856, Turkey was recognized as a member of the "Congress of Europe" equal in standing with all others. Among the adjustments safeguarding her interests and limiting Russia five were of particular importance: (1) The powers collectively guaranteed the independence and the territorial integrity of the Ottoman Empire. (2) They renounced the right to intervene either collectively or separately in the internal affairs of Turkey. (3) The Black Sea was neutralized; warships were not to be maintained on its waters nor were arsenals to be built along its coast. (4) Russia renounced her exclusive protectorates over the Danubian provinces and Serbia, and the powers collectively undertook to guarantee the special privileges of those areas. And (5) Russia ceded southern Bessarabia to Moldavia, thus abandoning all control of shipping at the mouth of the Danube. No longer could Russia, claiming to be the special protector of Greek Christian subjects of the sultan, legally exercise influence within Ottoman territory. For the moment it appeared as though Great Britain's idea of bolstering up Turkey as a bulwark against Russia had triumphed.

Treaty of Paris, 1856

4. Failure of the International Attempt to Rejuvenate Turkey, 1856–1878

The excuse which westerners offered in 1856 for depriving Russia and other powers outside the Ottoman Empire of the privilege of protecting the *rayahs* was that the porte if freed from the danger of foreign intervention would bring about reforms safeguarding the rights of all peoples within Turkey. "As to the Turkish Empire,"

The idea of rejuvenating Turkey

the English Lord Palmerston once declared, "if we can procure for it ten years of peace under the joint protection of the five powers, and if those years are profitably employed in reorganizing the internal system of the Empire, there is no reason whatever why it should not become again a respectable power." Eager to strengthen such convictions the porte on two occasions, in 1839 and in February 1856 on the eve of the assembling of diplomats at Paris, issued organic statutes — the *Tanzimat* of 1839 and the *Hatti Humayun* of 1856 — proclaiming its intention to secure equality before the law for all Turkish subjects.

Failure of the Turks to grant equal rights to all subjects

Turkey's promises were in reality far-sweeping concessions to the Christians; the reforms she actually carried into effect were very limited. Between 1839 and the date of the opening of the Crimean War the army was reorganized and feeble attempts were made to extend the reforms of Mahmoud II, to improve the administration, to introduce western judicial ideas, and to secularize education, but the essential thing, equality before the law for all the sultan's subjects, remained ungranted. Likewise after 1856, although Ali and Fuad Pashas, two very prominent ministers of the sultan, were acknowledged reformers, little serious attempt was made to secure the execution of the organic statutes. Indeed there was not even a serious attempt to stamp out corruption in government affairs. In 1871 an English consul complaining of "the open bribery and corruption, the invariable and unjust favor shown to Mussulmans in all cases between Turks and Christians," estimated that "of all cases of justice [in Bosnia], . . . ninety out of a hundred" were settled by bribery alone. Under the circumstances certainly it was inevitable that the idea of rejuvenating Turkey should fail.

Turkey embarrassed by financial troubles after 1856

Evidence of the failure of the idea accumulated alarmingly in the period between 1856 and 1878. Sultan Abdul Medjid and also Abdul Aziz who succeeded him in 1861 were spendthrifts. They borrowed large sums in the west, particularly at Paris and London, claiming that the money would be used for internal improvements within their domains. On the contrary most of the funds secured were squandered on huge commissions to financiers, bribes to Turkish officials, new palaces, and court pleasures. As the debt mounted, funds were borrowed to pay interest on former borrowings. At last during a period of financial stringency, which developed in 1873 throughout the world, the sultan's creditors awoke to a realization of the true situation in Turkey and called a halt. Turkey, unable to meet her obligations which amounted to nearly a billion dollars, was forced to declare herself bankrupt (1875), and to agree to the establishment of an international commission to administer the Ottoman debt (1881). While these occurrences, threatening to weaken western European friendship for Turkey, were taking place in the sultan's capital, disturbances destined to destroy much of his authority at were developing in outlying provinces of the Empire. In

1860 serious strife broke out between Mohammedan Druses and Christian Maronites in the Mount Lebanon area in Syria. The Mohammedans quickly gained the upper hand and, as the sultan seemed helpless and unable to protect the Christians, France, passively supported by Britain, sent troops to their defense. Thus just four years after the signing of the Treaty of Paris the powers most interested in guaranteeing the independence of Turkey were the first to ignore their pledges to her and to challenge her freedom. In 1866 a more serious disturbance occurred on the island of Crete. It developed into a bloody civil war which raged there for two years between Turks and native Greeks, with the latter succeeding generally in holding their ground. In both the Lebanon area and Crete the porte was induced by the "advice" of the powers to make concessions. In 1865 a special régime administered under a Christian governor was established in Lebanon and in 1868 an organic statute was proclaimed conceding extensive local autonomy to Crete. Still more significant of the failure of the idea of rejuvenating Turkey in the period between 1856 and 1878, were certain developments in the Balkans. Three of the Christian peoples in that part of the Empire — Rumanians, Bulgars, and Serbs — made important progress in preparation for their complete independence. In fact, at the close of the period Rumanians and Serbs, who had secured autonomy a half century earlier, gained independence, and the Bulgars, who had been without special liberties, gained autonomy.

Disturbances in Syria, 1860–64, and Crete, 1866–68

The Rumanians were first among the three Balkan peoples to secure advances toward independence after 1856. By the Treaty of Paris they gained freedom from Russian "protection" but were denied the right to form a united nation. In 1858, after elections in Rumania had made apparent the fact that the people desired union, the powers still hesitated to concede to them more than a mere suggestion of unity implied in the name "United Principalities." According to this arrangement the two provinces, Moldavia and Wallachia, were to have separate princes, separate national assemblies, and separate governments. Nevertheless the Rumanians, stayed by national enthusiasm, were not to be reckoned with so easily as the diplomatic agents of the powers imagined. Early in the year 1859, though deprived of the right to elect *one* prince, representative bodies of the two states elected the *same* prince, Alexander John Cuza. Late in 1859 they formally adopted the name "Rumania." Two years thereafter the sultan at the suggestion of the powers grudgingly gave his consent to the ingeniously arranged union. Finally, in 1862, the last step in the uniting of the provinces was taken through the establishment of a single ministry and a single assembly. Thenceforward Rumania, completely autonomous, awaited only the formal pronouncement of independence.

Union of the Danubian provinces

Far more threatening to Turkish power in the Balkans were developments in Bulgaria. An intellectual awakening made progress

there in the first half of the nineteenth century. After a long sleep during which they had been the *rayahs* who were most deeply submerged under the Ottoman system, the Bulgars began falteringly to follow in the footsteps of Serbs, Rumanians, and Greeks. In 1829 a Bulgar published at Moscow a history of his country and in 1835 the first Bulgarian school was founded. From these modest beginnings an educational movement grew until in 1876 the Bulgarians with 1,479 schools had the best developed system of education of any people in Ottoman territory. American missionaries also contributed something to this intellectual awakening. They established schools, such as the "American Collegiate and Theological Institute" founded at Samokov in 1860, and while Bulgarian education was still in its infancy helped to prepare textbooks written in the native language. During the period following 1856, much attention in the movement for national regeneration was diverted to the freeing of the Bulgarian church from Greek control. In 1860 Bulgarians refused any longer to recognize the patriarch of Constantinople, and ten years later, after anti-Greek agitation in Bulgaria had grown to alarming proportions, the sultan agreed to the establishment of an independent national church under an exarch residing at Constantinople. Still more ominous to the Turks was the growth of revolutionary outbursts. These outbursts, lacking general enthusiastic support in Bulgaria at first, were put down by the porte with great rigor but, being fostered by secret committees located in places like Odessa and Bucharest, they steadily increased in number. Hence in 1875, on the eve of revolution elsewhere in the Balkans, ground was prepared for the instituting of a Bulgarian insurrection of a fairly national scope.

Beginnings of a national awakening in Bulgaria

Jugo-Slavs also prepared for a reckoning with the Turks under the leadership of Prince Michael Obrenovich III of Serbia, the ablest Jugo-Slav prince who reigned during the nineteenth century. On his accession to the Serb throne in 1860 he secured the abolition of a law by which the porte enjoyed the privilege of approving the appointment of his councilors; he initiated important political and economic reforms, and he set about building up an efficient army to be employed in obtaining for his state complete independence from Turkish rule. Also he initiated a successful foreign policy. In 1862, after the Turkish commandant of Belgrade had rashly ordered his troops to bombard the city, Michael secured, through the intervention of the powers, an agreement whereby the entire civilian Turkish population of Serbia had to quit the country. Five years later without the aid of the powers he induced the porte to withdraw its garrisons from his territories, thus freeing Serbia almost completely from Ottoman influence. At the time of his assassination, in 1868, he was planning a union of Jugo-Slavs and Bulgars in preparation for an irresistible national uprising that would sweep Ottoman power out of Europe.

Prince Michael Obrenovich III secures advantages for Serbia

A final day of reckoning for Turkey in most of her European territory came as the result of insurrections which broke out in July, 1875, among Jugo-Slavs in Bosnia and Herzegovina. These insurrections were brought about by exactions of Turkish tax-farmers (which were particularly burdensome in 1875 after a year of poor harvests), by the tyranny of local *beys* or lords, and by tsarist propaganda. They spread quickly from the places of their origin in Herzegovina northward over most of Bosnia. Serbians and Montenegrins, wishing to aid in the movement, openly proclaimed their sympathy for the rebel cause and secretly sent military supplies or went as volunteers into the disaffected area. After winning preliminary successes over Turkish garrisons within the country, the rebels appealed to the powers demanding the adoption of one of three very practical alternative arrangements which would safeguard their interests: either (1) a place in some Christian state into which they could migrate, or (2) autonomy under a foreign Christian prince, or (3) temporary occupation of their land by foreign troops.

Insurrections in Bosnia and Herzegovina 1875

Fearing the spread of the insurrection throughout the Balkans, the powers agreed to intervene though not to accept one of the three demands. At the close of the year 1875 they endorsed a document drawn up by the Austrian chancellor, Count Andrassy, and known as the Andrassy note, outlining five demands to the porte for religious and economic reform. The porte agreed to comply with four of the five demands, but the insurgents, holding to their practical ideas about reform, refused to lay down their arms without securing more substantial guarantees. In May, 1876, three of the powers, Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Russia, made a second feeble attempt to intervene in the Balkans but it also failed. Consequently Serbia and Montenegro, seething with national enthusiasm and eager to champion the cause of their fellow Jugo-Slavs, declared war on the porte at the close of June, 1876.

Attempts of powers to intervene collectively in the Balkans, 1875–76

Meanwhile Bulgarians, profiting by the embarrassment of the Turks, had risen in revolt (April–May, 1876). The Turks, irritated by the conduct of their subjects and regarding the Bulgarian rising as less dangerous than that among the Jugo-Slavs, sought to suppress it with only a small force of regular troops and a host of irregulars known as Bashi-Bazuks. The latter lacked organization and were under no restraint whatsoever. They swept through the country perpetrating upon unarmed peasants one of those horrible massacres which unfortunately were destined to take place in the Near East several times during the following half century. A member of the British embassy at Constantinople, who made first-hand investigations on the occasion of the Bulgarian "atrocities," described what had taken place as "perhaps the most heinous crime" of the century. According to report sixty villages were burned and about twelve thousand men, women, and children were massacred.

The Bulgarian rising and "atrocities" of 1876

The events in Bulgaria were destined to have very important consequences. For a moment the Turks gained a political advantage. The Bulgarian insurrection collapsed and the Serbs, forced to bear the full force of Ottoman attack, were driven back far into their own territory. It even appeared as though the sultan might succeed in forcibly restoring order in his distracted Empire. Then public opinion in Great Britain and other countries shocked by the events in Bulgaria, which were vividly described in the press, began exercising a more marked influence than formerly upon Balkan affairs. In fact, it soon became apparent that European opinion would not permit the complete restoration of Ottoman authority over the insurgent Christians of the Balkans. In England the eminent statesman, Mr. Gladstone, wrote a pamphlet sharply condemning what he termed the "horrors" of Bulgaria, and at public meetings held in every part of the country sympathy was expressed enthusiastically for the Christian cause in Turkey. At Constantinople representatives of the powers formed a conference through which they made a final effort to force concessions from the porte. They demanded that Serbia and Rumania as well as Montenegro be recognized as independent and that Bulgaria, Bosnia, and Herzegovina be given a degree of autonomy. When the porte rejected these demands, the conference broke up, and Russia, seeing that public opinion would not permit the western states to stand in her way, prepared for war, which she declared against Turkey, April 24, 1877.

Consequences of events in Bulgaria, 1876–77

During the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78 a Russian army advanced to the village of San Stefano on the Sea of Marmora within sight of the city of Constantinople, but because of the hostility of Austria-Hungary and Great Britain, aroused at last in favor of defending Turkey, it did not dare to progress farther. There representatives of the tsar negotiated with the Turks a settlement known as the Treaty of San Stefano (1878). By this settlement it was arranged that: (1) Rumania, Serbia, and Montenegro were to be declared independent states and were to receive additions of territory. (2) A large autonomous Bulgaria including territory extending from the Danube to the Ægean and from the Black Sea to Albania was to be created. (3) Sweeping reforms were to be carried out in Bosnia, Herzegovina, and also Armenia. (4) Russia was to receive, in addition to a considerable money indemnity, certain territories in northern Armenia, and the Dobrudja region which she planned to exchange with Rumania for Bessarabia. And (5) the Turkish fortresses on the Danube were to be destroyed. When this settlement was published it at once caused great consternation in Europe. A crisis developed. Great Britain and Austria-Hungary, fearing that "Big Bulgaria" was an instrument through which Russia hoped to dominate the Balkans, practically forced the submission of the treaty to a congress of the powers for revision. Russia resisted for a time but finding herself endangered by isolation she finally backed down

The Russo-Turkish war of 1877–78, and the Treaty of San Stefano, 1878

and consented to the negotiation of a new arrangement for Balkan affairs at a European congress scheduled to meet at Berlin.

The Congress and Treaty of Berlin, 1878

At the Congress of Berlin the opponents of Russia attempted to save something from the wreckage of the Ottoman Empire. Big Bulgaria, as projected by the Treaty of San Stefano, was chopped into three sections. The small strip of territory between the Danube and the Balkan Mountains was left autonomous with no obligation to the sultan other than the payment of tribute; a district south of the Balkan range known as Eastern Rumelia was given a lesser degree of autonomy with the right to administration under a Christian governor; and the remainder of the former Bulgarian area, including the important region of Macedonia, was restored to Turkey. Nevertheless the idea of rejuvenating the Ottoman Empire was crowded into the background. The European statesmen who assembled at Berlin were disillusioned as regards the ability of Turks to transform their state into a "respectable power." By the Treaty of Berlin they forced the porte to promise solemnly that it would undertake extensive reforms in Crete, Macedonia, and Armenia, the most important Christian territories remaining directly under Turkish control. Not only was the idea of rejuvenating Turkey discredited but also it was to a considerable extent superseded by that of partitioning the domains of the sultan. Russia managed to gain practically all the territories she had sought to acquire through the Treaty of San Stefano. Rumania was forced to give up southern Bessarabia to Russia but she was given "compensation" in the Dobrudja region and together with Serbia and Montenegro secured a formal proclamation of her complete independence. The additions of territory promised to Serbia and Montenegro at San Stefano were rearranged leaving the district of Novibazar as a wedge between the frontiers of the two states. Austria-Hungary gained the right to "occupy and administer" Bosnia and Herzegovina and also the privilege of garrisoning Novibazar. Great Britain took her share of the spoils in a special convention with Turkey whereby she gained the right to assume administration of the important island of Cyprus off the coast of Syria so long as Russia held Kars and Batoum in northern Armenia. Even Greece eventually received an award. At the Congress of Berlin she was promised an increase of territory to be adjusted later, and accordingly in 1881 she was authorized to annex Thessaly and a part of Epirus along her northern frontier.

Thus ended the Balkan and general European crises provoked by the insurrections of 1875. "I bring you peace with honor," declared British Prime Minister Disraeli to his fellow countrymen upon his return from Berlin. Waiving the question as to what he may have brought Great Britain, the opinion can now safely be ventured that the European statesmen in 1878 brought neither peace nor honor to the states of the Near East.

5. National Problems in Turkey and the Balkan States, 1878–1908

The Turkish Constitution of 1876

In 1876, when the failure of the porte to crush the Jugo-Slav insurrections in Bosnia and Herzegovina became apparent, two sultans, Abdul Aziz and Murad V, were deposed in quick succession and a new party with democratic and nationalist sympathies secured temporary control of the government. This liberal or "Young Turk" party under the leadership of Midhat Pasha forced upon Murad's successor, Sultan Abdul Hamid II, a constitution modeled after those of democratic western states. It theoretically established individual, political, and civil liberty for all subjects of Turkey; it proclaimed equality before the law and eligibility of all citizens to hold office; it abolished distinctive national names other than the general name "Ottomans"; and it provided for the creation of a parliamentary system including a chamber of deputies, a senate, and responsible ministers.

Unfortunately the constitution, which would have transformed the autocratic Ottoman Empire into a liberal monarchy if it had been observed loyally, did not gain permanent adoption. Abdul Hamid accepted it merely to gain time. Three months after its promulgation, he drove the Young Turks from power and dissolved the two chambers of the new parliament ordering their members to leave the capital and return home. Thereafter for over a quarter of a century the sultan himself was master of political affairs in Turkey. He employed ministers, councilors, and other advisers simply to conceal the reality of his personal power. Establishing his residence in a secluded park (the *Yildiz Kiosk*) on a hilltop near Constantinople he kept in touch with all parts of the Empire through an extensive spy system, directed the affairs of his ministers by correspondence, and

The régime of Abdul Hamid II, 1876–1908

resorted to terrorist means to defeat the aims of his enemies. He promoted the building of telegraph lines and railways — particularly the Hedjaz railway for travel from Syria and Asia Minor to the Mohammedan Holy Cities, and other lines important for military purposes — but in the main he was absolutely opposed to western influence and the introduction of western ideas. Convinced that the rivalry of the powers alone prevented their attempting to partition all his domains he employed every means within his power to encourage their differences. Turkey's hope, he believed, lay in her championing Pan-Islamism — the uniting of all Mohammedan peoples. Only through a conservative Pan-Islamic policy could she hold the powers at bay and prevent further dislocations of Ottoman territory. Following such a policy he succeeded in retaining throughout his long reign most of the territory remaining to Turkey after 1878, but in succeeding thus he failed to prevent the growth of national problems which were destined eventually to destroy the Ottoman Empire.

1. The problem of Bulgarian unification

The national problem within Ottoman domains which attracted attention first after 1878 was that of the unification of Bulgaria. Bulgarians then, like Rumanians after 1856, were eager to overturn the arrangement made by European statesmen separating their territories into two autonomous principalities. In 1879 an assembly of notables in northern Bulgaria, summoned by a Russian commissar who provisionally ruled the principality, drafted a liberal constitution providing for a *Sobranje* or unicameral legislative body and an hereditary prince. Grateful to Russia for giving military aid to their national cause in 1877–78, they selected as their prince Alexander of Battenberg, a nephew of the reigning tsar. For four years this prince slavishly followed the dictates of Russia. In 1881, upon the suggestion of Muscovite advisers, he even suspended the constitution. However in 1883, feeling the tutelage of the tsar to be irksome and finding his subjects almost unanimously opposed to the Russian brand of absolutism, he reversed his policy and restored the instrument which he had recently suspended. Two years later he openly defied his august relative by endorsing a popular rising in Eastern Rumelia in favor of the union of the two Bulgarian principalities. After nationalists in the southern principality had deposed their governor, Alexander triumphantly proclaimed himself "Prince of North and South Bulgaria." In taking this bold step he braved the wrath of Russia and also of Serbia. The latter, jealously desirous of securing "territorial compensation" to match the strengthening of her neighbor, revealed her resentment by sending troops across the Bulgarian frontier. In the war that followed, although Russia withdrew her officers, Bulgaria was victorious and, although Austria shielded Serbia from being punished, the victory assured Bulgarians of the ultimate triumph of unification. Great Britain, believing that a strong Bulgaria hostile to Russia would be friendly to her interests, became a champion of the Bulgarian national cause and succeeded in restraining opposition to it on the part of its most dangerous enemies, Russia and Turkey.

The union of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia

Yet almost a decade elapsed before the *fait accompli* was formally recognized by the great powers. In the meantime dramatic events occurred in Bulgaria. In 1886 Prince Alexander was kidnapped and hustled out of the country by enemies who forced him to sign his abdication. Nationalist defenders of the prince, headed by the noted leader, Stambulov, gained control of the government, but Alexander, embarrassed by the hostility of the tsar to his resumption of power, made his abdication permanent. After a delay of almost a year, the Bulgarians chose as his successor Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg. Then during a period of seven years governmental affairs were left almost entirely in the hands of Stambulov, "the Bulgarian Bismarck," who as prime minister pursued an aggressive anti-Russian policy. Finally in 1894, the new prince, forcing his imperious minister to resign and asserting his own control over the government,

The powers recognize united Bulgaria

initiated more friendly relations with Russia, and gained, in 1896, official recognition from the powers and Turkey for his régime in united Bulgaria.

Development of Bulgaria into a modern state

In spite of foreign dangers and heavy military burdens at home, Bulgaria developed rapidly into a modern state in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Between 1878 and 1908 she improved her agriculture, developed her coal mining industry, extended her railway and telegraph systems, and more than trebled the value of her foreign trade.

2. The problem of what to do with Armenia

Soon after the triumph of the movement for Bulgarian unification, a very troublesome national problem developed in Armenia along the eastern border of Asia Minor. Armenians generally were loyal to the Turks before 1878. After that date, largely as a result of the sultan's failure to concede reforms he had promised to grant, a nationalist movement developed among them, and a minority of aggressive young Armenians organized secret societies, incited revolutionary agitation, and even connived at the idea of encouraging the Turks to massacre some of their Christian countrymen. The aggressive elements believed that after such a massacre European public opinion would exert pressure upon the powers and force them to intervene in Turkey to secure independence for Armenia. The Turks were greatly alarmed by this growth of Armenian nationalism for two reasons. First, it should be remembered, the Armenians were scattered over a wide area in Turkey in no part of which they constituted more than about half of the population. Hence if they should gain their independence, they would undoubtedly not only free themselves but also destroy the sultan's authority over hundreds of thousands of loyal Mohammedan subjects. Furthermore most of the Armenian settlements were between the Sea of Alexandretta at the extreme northeastern corner of the Mediterranean and the eastern end of the Black Sea. If an independent state should be created to include all territory between these two points it would cut the Ottoman Empire in Asia into two sections. This would strike the most decisive single blow that had ever been struck at the territorial integrity of the Empire. Therefore Abdul Hamid concluded that Armenian nationalism must be stamped out root and branch. In the summer of 1894, taking a disturbance between Kurds and Armenians as his excuse, he inaugurated a series of massacres which continued during a period of two years, broke out on one occasion in Constantinople, and resulted in a loss of lives estimated to number at least 26,000.[1] Under the leadership of Great Britain the powers presented to the sultan a scheme for administrative reform in Armenia but jealousy among them prevented their forcing him to carry it into effect. Consequently his ruthless policy triumphed completely. Nevertheless the problem of what to do with Armenians in Turkey

[1] Some writers estimate that the Turks massacred over 50,000 Armenians between 1894 and 1896.

was not permanently solved. Armenian nationalism was merely checked. Armenian revolutionary societies continued to carry on their propaganda after 1896 much the same as they had carried it on before the beginning of the tragic occurrences of the preceding two years. Fresh outbreaks and additional massacres occurred in central Armenia in 1904 and 1908, in lesser or southern Armenia in 1909, and finally in all parts of the country during the World War when the bitter vendetta between the two peoples culminated logically in an attempt on the part of the Turks to deport all Armenian nationals from Armenia and virtually to destroy their race.

3. The problem of a Greater Greece

A third national problem which developed in the Near East during the reign of Abdul Hamid II was that of the disposal of more than 2,500,000 Greeks — particularly those on the island of Crete — who owed allegiance to the sultan. Independent Greece, enticed by nationalists who advanced the "Great Idea" of a Greater Greece, dreamed of a day when she would annex the territories which these Hellenes (Greeks) inhabited.

Greece in the nineteenth century

Truly the record of Greece in the nineteenth century scarcely entitled her to aspire thus to the attainment of a pretentious national program. During the period between the close of the Greek War of Independence and the time when Thessaly was ceded to Greece "the kingdom of Hellas," as an English authority has exclaimed, "seemed to have failed in its mission altogether." Athens was rebuilt, education was extended to a part of the masses,[1] and a national university was founded (1837), but brigandage and the threat of bankruptcy "chronically incapacitated" the government. In 1843 revolutionaries forced King Otto to grant a constitution, and in 1862 they drove him from the throne. Greeks then tendered their crown to a Danish prince who assumed the title George I, and in 1864 issued a new constitution by which the entire legislative power was vested in a *Boulé* or single representative chamber of 184 members. Thereafter bitter strife between native political leaders, particularly Trikoupes who urged domestic reform and Delyannes who was interested in furthering a chauvinist foreign policy, was added to the woes of Greece. Not until a period following 1881, in fact, did even Greek material development, thanks to the work of Trikoupes, become appreciable through the building of railways and wagon roads, the opening of mines, and the expansion of commerce.

When Greeks became relatively more prosperous than they had been formerly, they also became relatively more insistent that they should realize their dream of a Greater Greece. Foreigners who visited them were impressed by their growing national zeal. "When will the oppressed majority of our race escape the Turkish yoke?" one westerner believes the Greeks were continually inquiring. "If the Ottoman dominion is destroyed, what redistribution of its provinces will follow? Shall we then achieve our national

[1] Even as late as 1910, 30 per cent of the army recruits in Greece were illiterate.

unity, or will our Balkan neighbors encroach upon the inheritance which is justly ours?" In 1896 an insurrection (by no means the first) against the Turks broke out on the island of Crete and a year later Greek nationalism forced the Hellenic king to send aid to the insurgents. The powers intervened to stop fighting on the island but they were unable to prevent Greece and Turkey from fighting a brief though bitter national struggle on the continent of Europe. In the struggle Turkey won decisively. Nevertheless the powers induced Abdul Hamid, *Ghazi* (the conqueror) as he proudly styled himself for winning the war, to be satisfied with the cession of a small strip of Greek territory in Thessaly, and they forced him to pay liberal compensation for it to the cause of a Greater Greece by proclaiming the autonomy of Crete. In 1905 Cretans led by Eleutherios Venizelos, a statesman who later played a leading role in founding Greater Greece, declared for union between their island and the independent Hellenic state. The powers intervened again and on this occasion upheld the sovereignty of Turkey, but in 1906, after further disturbances, they conceded that the king of Greece should appoint a high commissioner to rule Crete and that Greek officers should reorganize the Cretan military units. Formal annexation of the island by Greece was delayed for seven more years until 1913. Meanwhile the king of the Greeks, finding his state bankrupt as a consequence of the war of 1897 with Turkey, called Venizelos to Athens (1909) to put the Hellenic house in order. The Cretan leader at once proved himself worthy of the royal confidence. He suppressed brigandage, reformed government finance, reorganized the army and navy, and through diplomacy made sure that in the next offensive against Turkey, Greece would not fight alone as she had fought hopelessly in 1897.

The Thirty Days' War between Greece and Turkey, 1897

The union of Crete and Greece, 1913

Closely related to the problem of the disposal of territory inhabited by Greeks in Turkey was that of what to do with Macedonia. Macedonia, it is well to note, is the area of rolling hills and rich agricultural basins which occupies a central location in the Balkan peninsula. It constitutes there, as an American authority has correctly stated, "the natural focus of the whole Balkan world." During modern times it has contained a residuum of all racial groups in the Balkans. Bulgars, Greeks, and Serbs especially have been well represented within its limits. Before 1878 Turks misruled and exploited the inhabitants seemingly without fear of molestation. Soon after that date, however, Christian Balkan peoples with strong ethnological claims to Macedonia bid, one after another, for its possession.

4. The problem of what to do with Macedonia

Bulgars with perhaps the strongest ethnological claims to Macedonia were naturally first among the Balkan Christians to give serious attention after 1878 to the problem of winning the country. In the beginning their policy was one of peaceful penetration. Bulgarian churchmen, taking advantage of the sultan's decree of 1870 which permitted residents of districts in Turkey to secure

Bulgarian propaganda in Macedonia, 1878–1895

through petition their transfer from the jurisdiction of the patriarch to that of the exarch, quickly won over to their faith most of the Christians in central Macedonia, secured the expulsion of Greek churchmen there, and installed their own priests and bishops in the places left vacant after the departure of the Greeks. Moreover they aided in founding schools to teach the children of the peasants the Bulgarian language and national history. Within the decade following the time when Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia were united (1885), this furthering of Bulgarian propaganda proved so successful that Greeks and Serbians became alarmed lest it should destroy all hope of their gaining advantages in Macedonia. Accordingly they spread counter-propaganda throughout the country to check the influence of their Balkan neighbors.

Brigandage in Macedonia, 1895–1903

Directly, the rivalry of the three peoples ceased to be one of words and became one of deeds. Bulgarians again took the lead. In 1895 they formed a "Supreme Macedo-Adrianopolitan Committee" which busied itself by encouraging the organization of armed bands to raid the Macedonian area. The aim of the committee in so busying itself was to overawe Turkish officials and rival Balkan agents. Greeks and Serbs soon followed the example of the Bulgars. Turks, in turn, unable to apprehend the raiders, retaliated by punishing Macedonians whom they suspected to be in league with the enemy nationalists. Consequently life in Macedonia became almost intolerable.

The Mürzsteg Program, 1903

An Austro-Russian agreement of 1897 committed the European powers to long inaction, through fear of disastrous consequences by disturbance of the *status quo*. At last in 1903 the powers intervened and forced upon the sultan the well-known Mürzsteg Program, a program of reforms drawn up by representatives of Austria-Hungary and Russia. It provided that (1) Austrian and Russian civil agents should supervise the work of Turkey's administrative officials in Macedonia; (2) an Italian general and officers from all the great European states except Germany should reorganize and command the local *gendarmerie* or police force; (3) after pacification was secured, Turkey should modify the boundaries of her administrative units in Macedonia with a view to a more regular grouping of nationalities; (4) mixed commissions made up of an equal number of Christians and Moslems should enquire into the recent crimes; and (5) Turkey should pay reparations to those of her subjects who had suffered as a result of the disturbances.

The failure of reform in Macedonia, 1908–13

Unfortunately the reform program of the powers proved to be only a temporary remedy for the ills of Macedonia. In 1908 it was abandoned entirely, soon anarchy resumed its sway in the heart of the Balkans, and in 1912–13 the latter area became the chief bone of contention in wars in which every Balkan state was at one time or another actively involved.

A fifth national problem which developed in the Near East at the close of the nineteenth century bore a direct relation to the

origin of the World War; it was the problem of Jugo-Slav unification. During most of the nineteenth century, it is true, the prospect for a union of Jugo-Slav territories was by no means bright. Serbia, the state to which nationalists looked for leadership, freed her peasants of feudal obligations so early as 1833, but she remained unprogressive in other respects and seemingly was incapable of assuring success for an aggressive nationalist program. Perhaps the most discouraging thing in her record was her inability to escape from tragic domestic strife which centered in a blood feud between the prominent Obrenovich and Petrovich families. The origin of this feud dated back to 1817 when Kara George Petrovich, returning home from abroad, was murdered and Milosh Obrenovich was accused of having prompted the deed. Its influence threw a shadow over Serbian history for the ensuing century. It was at least partly responsible for three changes of dynasty, the assassination of Prince Michael in 1868, and the wiping out of the only surviving direct branch of the Obrenovich family in 1903.

5. The problem of a Greater Serbia

Domestic strife in Serbia during the nineteenth century

While Serbians delayed the furthering of a program for Jugo-Slav unification, Montenegrins adopted measures which threatened to transform their ancient theocracy into a permanent separate state organized after a western fashion. Peter II (1830–51) introduced administrative reforms and created an elective senate. Danilo II (1851–60) divested himself of his religious functions as bishop of Cettinje, established the principle of primogeniture for the inheritance of the princeship, made the senate appointive instead of elective, and effected judicial and military reforms. Indeed not until the close of the World War was successful consideration given to the idea of a union between the two self-governing Jugo-Slav states.

The political reorganization of Montenegro, 1830–1860

Nevertheless soon after 1878 Jugo-Slav nationalism became a potent force in the Balkans. It was without question the chief influence which prompted Serbia to attack Bulgaria in 1885, to adopt an aggressive policy in Macedonia at a later date, and to assume a hostile policy towards Austria-Hungary early in the twentieth century. In 1903 its triumph over opposing influences in Serbia was signalized when nationalist partisans of the Petrovich family placed Peter I upon the throne. After that event Serbians aggressively extended preparations for an expansion of their state into a Greater Serbia or Jugo-Slavia. They zealously continued to look after Serbian interests in Macedonia and, defying the powerful dual monarchy, flooded Bosnia and Herzegovina with propaganda, hoping, almost without an obvious cause to hope, that somehow it would prepare the way for Serbia's eventual annexation of those two Jugo-Slav districts. In 1908 when Austrians announced a permanent uniting of the districts with Austria-Hungary, Serbian resentment was so intense that it provoked a serious international crisis. Six years later, Jugo-Slav nationalism struck down the Austrian, Archduke Francis Ferdinand, and the World War ensued.

Growth of nationalism in Serbia after 1878

Another important national problem which developed in the Near East at the close of the nineteenth century was that of the expansion of Rumania to include all territories in which Rumanian inhabitants were predominant. As in Greece and Serbia, domestic difficulties within the Danubian provinces prevented Rumanians giving much attention to the problem until after 1878. During the period when Alexander Cuza was in power (1859–66) the state severed its connections with the Greek Orthodox Church, confiscated the property of the Rumanian monasteries, abolished feudal obligations, and allotted to about 400,000 peasant proprietors approximately 4,000,000 acres of the nobles' land at low prices fixed by government agents. Furthermore Cuza initiated legislation for the founding of universities at Jassy and Bucharest, introduced the telegraph into his country, improved the coinage, and encouraged the growth of cities. Still the idea of reform was not popular with the nobles or *boyars* who constituted the most powerful political element in the country. They effectively prevented the extension of a governmental system of universal education,[1] insisted upon a policy of anti-semitism, and even procured the abdication (1866) of their zealous though overbearing prince and reformer. With Cuza out of the way, a German prince, Charles (Carol) of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, was invited to ascend the throne and a constitution providing for a bicameral legislature was adopted. An idea of the way in which many foreigners regarded Rumania at the time of Prince Charles' accession may be gained from the following remark of the Austrian ambassador at Constantinople: "If Prince Carol manages to pull through without outside help, and make Rumania governable, it will be the greatest *tour de force* I have ever witnessed in my diplomatic career of more than half a century. It will be nothing less than a conjuring trick."

6. The problem of a Greater Rumania

Domestic difficulties within Rumania, 1859–78

After 1878 Rumanians continued to neglect popular education, to ignore demands for an extension of agrarian reform, and to persecute the Jews, but they succeeded at least in furthering the material development of their country. Railways, something which did not exist in Rumania before 1869, were rapidly constructed until, in 1913, 2,100 miles of government-owned tracks traversed virtually every district within the state. Likewise water transportation was developed. Besides river services on the Danube, the government established lines of sea-going vessels plying from the Black Sea port of Constantsa to Constantinople and beyond. Also it fostered private development of industries, coal mines, and oil wells. Finally, in spite of Rumania's unprogressive agrarian policy — her failure to adopt remedial legislation satisfactory to the small landholders resulted in no less than five peasants' risings between 1866 and

Material development in Rumania after 1878

[1] An American authority estimates that as late as the opening of the twentieth century "*sixty per cent of the Rumanian population above seven years of age was still* illiterate."

1907[1] — agriculture was improved to such an extent that at the opening of the twentieth century the little Danubian state ranked third among the grain-growing countries of the world.

Development of aggressive nationalism in Rumania after 1878

Along with material development in Rumania, as in Greece, came the growth of aggressive nationalism. The problem of Rumanian expansion dated really from the year 1878 when Russia, at the close of the war in which Rumania had aided her to defeat Turkey, ungratefully forced her ally to exchange the fertile southern part of Bessarabia for the barren Dobrudja region. Thereafter Rumanians continually looked forward to the day when they would regain their lost province. In due time they dreamed also of procuring the other parts of Bessarabia, Bukowina, and Transylvania — in fact all the areas inhabited predominantly by brother Rumanians. Nationalism influenced the policy of their government as it did that of all other Balkan states. It even prompted Rumania to take an interest in Macedonian affairs. Three times — in 1905, 1906, and 1910 — rivalry over the persecution by Greek raiders of wandering Vlachs in Macedonia led to Rumania's breaking off diplomatic relations with Greece. In 1913 nationalism led Rumania to enter the second Balkan War; similarly in 1916 it led her to place her existence at stake by casting her lot with the Entente Allies in the World War.

6. International Rivalry in the Near East at the Close of the Nineteenth Century

The Treaty of Paris which was signed at the close of the Crimean War failed to serve as an instrument for the prevention of future international rivalry in the Near East. Several important influences, in addition to the native inability of the Turks to rejuvenate their state and the development of national problems in the Near East, contributed to its failure. First, Russia never really gave up her ambition to gain Constantinople, and since she did not abandon it her rivalry with Great Britain continued. Russians, it is true, accepted the provisions of the Paris treaty which provided for the destruction of Russian power in the Black Sea area. Nevertheless their pledge, given under duress, was of little value, for at the time it was given they resolved to renounce these provisions when a favorable occasion to do so appeared. Accordingly in 1871, when France was defeated in the Franco-Prussian War, they boldly flouted British opinion by announcing that Russia would no longer respect the neutralization of the Black Sea. Not only Russia but also Austria-Hungary, excluded from both Germany and Italy after 1866, prepared to resume an aggressive

Causes for international rivalry in the Near East after 1856

[1] The chief agrarian difficulty in Rumania was due to the smallness of the peasant holdings. Even after the state domains (the former church lands amounting to nearly one third of the total land area of Rumania) were sold to the peasants, under the provisions of the land act of 1889, the great majority of holdings included less than twenty-five acres. About half of the agricultural lands of Rumania remained in the hands of a few thousand large landowners.

policy against Turkey. Even more important as causes for continued international rivalry in the Near East after 1856 were two economic factors. The construction of the Suez Canal was one of these. The canal was dug between 1854 and 1869 by a French company which was assisted financially by the Egyptian government; yet it was of more concern to Great Britain than to any other power because it was a vital link on the most direct route from England to India and the British Australasian colonies. Its construction prepared the way for international rivalry over the control of Egypt as well as over the control of the isthmus which it spanned. The second economic factor was the growth of European commerce and investment, in other words, western "economic penetration," in Turkey. Although all of the powers shared in Turkey's trade, Great Britain, France, and Germany were the states most interested in it. Germany, entering the international scramble for raw materials, markets, and colonies later than her two leading rivals, staked out extensive economic claims in Asia Minor. In so doing she provoked serious rivalry with them and also with Russia.

Evidence of international rivalry over Turkish affairs after 1875

The continuance of international rivalry over Turkish affairs became abundantly evident after insurrections broke out in the Balkans in 1875. In 1875–76 rivalry among the powers contributed materially to the defeat of international intervention designed to end the Balkan insurrections. Later, as has been suggested heretofore, it forced the tsar to permit a revising of the Treaty of San Stefano at the European Congress of Berlin (1878), it led to Anglo-Russian complications when the question of Bulgarian unification was raised (1885), and between 1894 and 1896 it neutralized lamentably international pressure to terminate Turkish massacres in Armenia.

Anglo-French rivalry in Egypt, 1882–1904

In Egypt international rivalry was limited almost entirely to competition between Great Britain and France, and it resulted in the establishment of British ascendancy over the country. It developed in this manner. In 1875 the Egyptian government, menaced by bankruptcy, offered its shares of Suez canal stock for sale. They were purchased immediately by agents of the British government, thus assuring to the latter important financial interests in the Egyptian region. A year later the *khedive* (the ruler of Egypt had assumed that title in 1867), unable to stave off financial difficulties longer, was forced to yield dual control of his finances to Britain and France. Between 1876 and 1881 the two receivers worked harmoniously together but at the close of that period an event occurred which was destined to occasion a serious misunderstanding between them. It was an insurrection of Arab soldiers led by a native Egyptian, Colonel Ahmed Arabi Pasha, who aimed to destroy the influence of foreigners in Egypt. Regardless of the French government's unwillingness to act because of the emergency, the British promptly sent troops into Egypt to crush the rising. After the troops had accomplished their purpose (1882), the British assured to themselves control over the

country by establishing there an English financial "adviser" to replace the former dual administration. Henceforth for over two decades Great Britain and France quarreled over the ultimate disposal of Egypt. British statesmen persistently claimed their "occupation" was not permanent but they refused to comply with French demands that they set a time when they would withdraw. Not until their fear of German power became pressing did the two powers consent to compromise their differences in North Africa (1904). Then at last France recognized British supremacy in Egypt and Britain agreed to support French interests in Algiers, Tunis (which the French had occupied in 1881), and Morocco.

Growth of German interest and influence in Turkey

The most serious international rivalry in the Near East at the close of the nineteenth century owed its origin to the development of German interests in Turkey. Bismarck once stated that he never took the trouble "even to open the mail bag from Constantinople." According to his opinion the whole of the Balkans was not worth "the bones of a single Pomeranian grenadier." Far different however were the views of William II and numerous other Germans. They, after 1878, like the British at an earlier date, were eager because of political as well as economic reasons to strengthen Turkey and to assure her territorial integrity. Germans would contribute "not a penny for a weak Turkey," a prominent German writer declared (1903), "but for a strong Turkey" they would contribute everything they could give. In 1883 Bismarck, even, consented to the appointment of a military mission under General von der Goltz to reorganize the Turkish army as a sort of insurance that if anti-German elements should gain the ascendancy at the court of the tsar, Russia would not dare to attack Germany. In 1889 and again in 1898, the kaiser paid visits to the sultan and personally demonstrated his friendship for his fellow sovereign. On the second occasion he delivered an address at Damascus declaring that the 300,000,000 Mohammedans dispersed throughout the East might rest assured that at all times the German emperor would be their friend. During the period from 1897 to 1912, when the waning of British friendship for Turkey became very apparent, the capable German ambassador at Constantinople, Baron Marschall von Bieberstein, won Turkish confidence almost completely in the intentions of Germany in the Near East. He succeeded in winning the favor of the Young Turks after they gained control of the Ottoman government (1908) as he had won earlier the favor of their predecessors. The reason for his success can readily be seen. "Germany," Turkish leaders believed on the eve of the World War, ". . . was the *only* Power which desired to see Turkey strong. Germany's interests could be secured by the strengthening of Turkey, and that alone. Germany could not lay hands on Turkey as if she were a colony, for neither the geographical position nor her resources made that possible. The result was that Germany regarded Turkey as a link in the commercial and trading chain, and thus became her

stoutest champion against the Entente governments [Britain, France, and Russia] which wanted to dismember her, particularly as the elimination of Turkey would mean the final 'encirclement' of Germany." [1]

Railway concessions in Asiatic Turkey

The chief question over which Germany and her rivals quarreled in the Near East was that of the building of railways. In 1866 British capitalists opened a road in Asia Minor extending from the important port of Smyrna southeastward to Aidin. Later French capitalists opened a line from Smyrna, northeast to Cassaba. In 1888, at a time when Frenchmen gained rights to build additional lines in Syria, the Germans gained their first concession for railway building in Turkey. It was for a road to connect Constantinople with Angora, a city in the heart of Asia Minor. The Germans proved to be very efficient builders. They completed the construction of their road (301 miles in length) by January, 1893, and promptly were awarded the right to build a branch line planned to run from Eski Shehr, about midway along the Constantinople-Angora road, southeastward 276 miles to Konia. This was the line, completed in 1896, which was finally (1899) projected on towards the southeast, crossing the Taurus Mountains and extending into Mesopotamia through Bagdad to the head of the Persian Gulf, to become a link of the famous "B.B.B." (Berlin-Byzantium-Bagdad) Railway. As soon as it was projected thus Englishmen became alarmed lest it should endanger their interests in Mesopotamia, Persia, and India. The formal granting of the concession for the Bagdad line (1903) served as the signal for international rivalry — particularly between Britain and Germany — perhaps as bitter as the great powers have ever indulged in without immediately resorting to armed conflict.

The Berlin-Byzantium-Bagdad Railway

The powers agree to divide Turkey into economic spheres of influence, 1910–14

In spite of their bitter misunderstanding over the building of the Bagdad railway the powers eventually adjusted the matter. In 1899 after Germans had been awarded the preliminary concession for the Bagdad line they made an agreement with Frenchmen whereby the latter, abandoning a rival railway scheme, gained the right to purchase a 40 per cent interest in the German project. In 1903 the British government refused to grant permission for British capitalists to make a similar agreement. Nevertheless between 1910 and 1914 Germany and her rivals adjusted all important questions over which they disagreed relative to railway building in Turkey: (1) In 1910 the kaiser and the tsar met at Potsdam where they agreed that in return for Russian recognition of German rights in the Bagdad system Germany should recognize Russian interests in Persia. (2) In February, 1914, German and French financiers drew up an agreement which they induced their governments to accept; it provided that

[1] *The statement quoted above was made by the noted Young Turk leader D'jemal* Pasha in memoirs which he wrote after the close of the World War. On August 2, 1914, it is interesting to note, the Turks and the Germans signed a secret treaty of alliance. According to the opinion of D'jemal the treaty was "an excellent compact between two independent governments on the basis of equality of rights."

northern Asia Minor and Syria should be recognized as French spheres of economic influence (for building railways, etc.), that the region through which the Bagdad railway was being built should be accepted as a similar German sphere, and that the Germans should repurchase the shares of the Bagdad line which Frenchmen had secured under the agreement of 1899. (3) Finally in June, 1914, British and German diplomats, prompted from behind the scenes by capitalists of the two countries, negotiated a treaty by which British economic interests in Mesopotamia were safeguarded to compensate Great Britain for her recognizing German control of the eastern section of the "B.B.B." Thus the powers assured to themselves the protection of their interests in Turkey. But, what had they done to safeguard the interests of Turkey? The real purpose of the treaties, according to the statement of a prominent German diplomat "was to divide Asia Minor into spheres of interest, although this expression was anxiously avoided, out of regard for the rights of the sultan." Truly, Turkey's territorial integrity was intact; still she was bound, bound completely and subject to the dictates of the powers in an economic sense.

7. The Young Turk Revolution and the Balkan Wars

Before European financiers had completed their plans to divide the Ottoman Empire into spheres of economic influence a day of final reckoning came for the reactionary political régime of Sultan Abdul Hamid II. The reckoning came as a logical result of the failure of the sultan to obtain a solution for the troublesome national and international problems which grew alarmingly within his domains after 1878, but it was occasioned immediately by the activities of an organization known as the Party of Union and Progress. The members of the party, the so-called Young Turks, favored constitutional government in Turkey. Many of them were men young in years who had been educated in western Europe where they had gained admiration for, and a veneer of, European culture. They were ardent nationalists as well as political liberals. They aimed to revive the constitution of 1876, to westernize Turkey, to abolish all inequalities and also all special privileges such as the ones enjoyed by foreigners under the capitulation system and the exemption of the *rayahs* from military service in the Ottoman Empire, and to make all subjects of the sultan Ottomans. They perfected their organization gradually during the first decade of the twentieth century. Working at first from headquarters outside of Turkey, they permeated their native country and scattered propaganda after a manner similar to the way in which Greeks and Bulgars had spread their separatist agitation at earlier dates. In July, 1908, with their preparations for revolt complete and even with the assurance of the support of the Turkish army, the Young Turks struck a decisive blow to guarantee the success of their movement. At Salonica in southern Macedonia they proclaimed the

The Young Turk movement

constitution of 1876, and two army corps supporting their cause threatened to march on Constantinople if the sultan refused to recognize the proclamation. Deserted by his army, Abdul Hamid did not attempt in July, 1908, to resist his enemies. Instead he hastily gave official sanction for the restoration of the constitution, dismissed his corrupt ministers and appointed others approved by the central committee of the Party of Union and Progress, issued a decree abolishing the system of espionage (which had cost Turkey about $6,000,000 yearly), and published a writ summoning a national Parliament. Soon, in fact, the triumph of the Young Turks became complete. In 1909, when Abdul Hamid did attempt to resist them and to head a counter-revolution, their armed forces occupied the capital; thereupon the national Parliament supported the cause of the Young Turks and deposed the reactionary sultan.

The Young Turk rising of July 1908

The Young Turks depose Sultan Abdul Hamid II, 1909

Although the triumph of the Young Turks was complete, they failed to carry into effect their lofty aims for the improvement of Turkey. It is true that in 1908 an era of good feeling seemed momentarily to have begun in the Ottoman Empire. Even in the Macedonian region strife ceased between the rival nationalist factions. Nevertheless before many months had passed the emotional enthusiasm which the revolution had aroused subsided, and the new administration found itself confronted by insurmountable difficulties in widely separated parts of the Empire. The non-Ottoman races in those areas resented particularly the "Turkification" policy of the Party of Union and Progress which the "young men in a hurry" — an observer of the revolution gave that appellation to the Young Turks — evolved in a practical way soon after their initial triumph through the adoption of measures, (1) to make the Turkish language the official language of the Empire, (2) to standardize education, and (3) to exact rigorously taxes and military service from all subjects of the sultan. The subject racial elements of Turkey had hailed the downfall of Abdul Hamid because they expected to gain fresh privileges from the new régime and not because they shared to the slightest extent the desire of the Young Turks to see all peoples in the Empire become Ottomans. Consequently they promptly renounced their friendship for the new administration. The insurgent bands reappeared in Macedonia, a serious nationalist revolt flared up in Albania (1910), and disturbances, almost equally serious, developed in Arabia, Armenia, and Kurdistan. Unfortunately the "young men in a hurry," impatient with opposition, adopted anew the familiar despotic methods of their predecessors. They used bribery and violence to influence elections, forbade public meetings and anti-Ottoman agitation, disarmed the people of Macedonia, planted new Moslem colonies among them, and, as was suggested above, permitted the renewal of Armenian massacres in Cilicia (southern Armenia).

Consequences of the Young Turk Revolution in Turkey

Balkan and western states, taking advantage of the porte while it was embarrassed thus by domestic troubles after the Young Turk

Bulgaria proclaimed independent, 1908

Revolution, profited extensively at Turkish expense. First, on October 5, 1908, Ferdinand of Bulgaria proclaimed his state entirely independent of Turkey and declared himself tsar of the Bulgarian people. Two days later the Austro-Hungarian government announced its formal annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Turks recognized these arbitrary arrangements though they derived slight satisfaction from the small indemnities which they received as compensation from the two offending states.[1] In 1911 Italy also profited at the expense of Turkey; she struck a sudden unprovoked blow to destroy Turkish influence in Tripoli. The porte attempted desperately to defend its interests against the aggressions of the Italians, but it was too weak to challenge Italian control of the sea, and eventually, in October, 1912, when even more serious dangers threatened Turkey in a quarter nearer the heart of the Empire, the Turkish ministers had to consent reluctantly to the negotation of a settlement with the government at Rome. By the Treaty of Lausanne, signed October 18, 1912, Italy gained a clear title to Tripoli and obtained the right to hold temporarily a number of islands in the Ægean Sea. These islands — Rhodes, Patmos, and the Dodekanesê group — had been occupied by Italian forces during the Turco-Italian War. Unfortunately, at least it was unfortunate from the Turkish point of view, the settlement with Italy did not forestall the more serious dangers which threatened Turkey nearer home. Indeed, almost simultaneously with the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne, Bulgaria, Greece, Serbia, and Montenegro united at last to drive the Turks from Europe and, ignoring the warning of the great powers that they would not admit at the end of the conflict "any modification in the territorial *status quo* in European Turkey," formally declared war upon the sultan.

Austria-Hungary annexes Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1908

The Turco-Italian War, 1911–12

During the month and a half following the outbreak of the first Balkan War, contrary to the expectations of many western military authorities, the Balkan allies won decisively over the Turks. The Greeks swept the Turks from the Ægean Sea area and occupied important territories in Epirus and southern Macedonia where they captured the important city of Salonica. The Montenegrins confined their military operations to the vicinity of Scutari, a strategic town along the southern frontier of Montenegro. The Serbs defeated the Turks in the battle of Kumanovo, overran northern and central Macedonia, captured the Turkish stronghold of Monastir, and after crossing Albania reached the Adriatic at Durazzo. The Bulgarians attained the successes which contributed most to the triumph of the Balkan allies. Because of the location of their country they had to bear the brunt of the fighting against the Turks. Within a fortnight after the beginning of their offensive operations they won brilliant victories in eastern Thrace at Kirk Kilisse and Lule Burgas; these

The opening period of the first Balkan War, 1912

[1] Austria-Hungary agreed to evacuate Novibazar and to pay an indemnity of $11,000,000. Bulgaria consented to pay $24,000,000; to be applied, however, towards the indemnity debt of 1878 to Russia.

victories prepared the way for a Bulgarian advance to the Chataldja line of fortifications which was only about twenty miles west of Constantinople.

In December, 1912, after the Turks had appealed to the great powers for mediation, an armistice was signed between Turkey, Bulgaria, and Serbia. Under the terms of this armistice the belligerents dispatched representatives to London to negotiate peace. Only the three fortified towns of Adrianople, Janina, and Scutari remained under Turkish control beyond the Chataldja line; yet the porte's delegates who defended Ottoman interests at the Congress of London would not admit that the military situation confronting their country was a hopeless one. Persistently, they refused to concede demands which the representatives of the Balkan allies insisted that the porte must grant before the Balkan peoples would consent to lay down their arms. The Ottoman delegates refused particularly to promise the ceding of Adrianople to Bulgaria and the ceding of the Ægean islands to Greece. For several weeks the negotiations dragged along tediously. Then, early in the year 1913, every hope of securing an immediate settlement in the Balkans was blasted. Through a *coup d'état*, January 23, a Young Turk party of action headed by Enver Bey and favoring "no surrender" gained control of the government at Constantinople. Soon thereafter the Congress of London was disbanded and, on February 3, the war between Turkey and the Balkan league was renewed.

The armistice of December, 1912–February, 1913, in the Balkans

After the renewal of hostilities in February, 1913, the Balkan allies confined most of their attention to besieging the three strongholds beyond the Chataldja line which still remained under Turkish control. On April 23, Scutari, the last of the three to be surrendered, fell to the Montenegrins. Even before it fell the Turks, who had been unable to break the enemy lines threatening their capital, finally abandoned all hope of winning in the struggle and appealed a second time for the mediation of the great powers.

The closing period of the first Balkan War, 1913

The Congress of London reassembled promptly and on May 30, 1913, representatives of the Balkan states and Turkey signed a peace which ended the first Balkan War. In a secret treaty drawn up with Russian approbation[1] by Bulgarian and Serbian ministers (March, 1912) before the opening of the war, bargains had been made whereby most of Macedonia was allotted to Bulgaria. At that time the Serbians and Greeks expected to gain extensive territories in the Albanian area. However after victory was assured to the Balkan allies the Greeks emphatically announced that they intended to share in the Macedonian spoils and the great powers, led by Austria-Hungary and Italy, interposed to prevent Greece and Serbia's gaining what they desired in Albania. Hence at the Congress of London no agreement could be reached relative to a partitioning of the territories abandoned

The Treaty of London, May 30, 1913

[1] The Russian ministers to Serbia and Bulgaria, Hartwig and Nekludov, helped directly to bring about a Balkan league in 1912.

by the Turks. By the treaty which the belligerents signed on May 30, these difficult questions concerning Balkan affairs were merely avoided. (1) Turkey gave up all of her possessions in Europe beyond line extending from Midia on the Black Sea coast across Thrace to Enos at the northeastern corner of the Ægean. (2) An independent Albania was created but its organization and boundaries were not defined; those matters were reserved for decision by the great Powers. (3) The remainder of the territory which Turkey gave up on the mainland of Europe was ceded without its being partitioned to the Balkan allies. (4) Turkey definitely confirmed the ceding of Crete to Greece. (5) Finally, the status of the Ægean islands and the question of indemnities and redistribution of debts were left, as were the Albanian matters, to be adjusted by the great powers.[1]

Even before the Treaty of London was signed a quarrel that was destined to have fatal consequences developed between Bulgaria and her allies over the partitioning of the territory which they had conquered from Turkey. The Bulgarians, who presumptuously remembered their brilliant victories in Thrace, demanded that the terms of the Serbo-Bulgar secret treaty of March, 1912, should be rigidly carried into effect. If the terms had been so carried into effect Bulgaria would have received most of Macedonia, besides large gains in the direction of Constantinople. The Serbs, disappointed because the interposing of the powers to create an independent Albania had prevented Serbia's gaining access to the Adriatic, insisted upon a new apportionment of the spoils. "All those with whom I have spoken," the Rumanian minister to Serbia declared so early as March, 1913, "tell me that from the general to the last soldier, the Serbians under arms refuse to abandon Monastir and the other towns claimed by the Bulgarians in virtue of the treaty of alliance, and would rather be killed by Savoff [the Bulgarian acting commander-in-chief] than give up what they have conquered." The Greeks were aroused similarly by the demands of the Bulgars and the propaganda of their own leaders and on May 29, 1913, just a day before the Treaty of London was signed, Greek and Serb representatives concluded a secret treaty by which their governments were pledged to work together to prevent the attaining of Bulgaria's aims in Macedonia. The Greeks and the Serbs not only agreed thus to oppose the aims of the Bulgars but also actively prepared to draw other Balkan peoples — the Montenegrins, the Rumanians, and even the Turks — into a coalition against their Bulgarian neighbors.

The Balkan allies quarrel over the dividing of the Turkish spoils

[1] Late in 1913 the great powers selected the German, Prince William of Wied, to be the first prince or *mpret* of Albania. In March, 1914, the prince attempted to set up a government in his new realm but his turbulent subjects immediately rose in revolt and soon after the outbreak of the World War forced him to flee from the country. Also in 1914 the great powers agreed that Greece should keep all the Ægean islands which she had seized during the first Balkan War except Imbros and Tenedos. The question of indemnities and the Ottoman debt went over to be liquidated along with a new group after the World War.

Late in June, 1913, King Ferdinand and the Bulgarian military leaders, seemingly unaware that their action would invite the intervention of a Balkan league against their country, issued orders for a surprise attack upon the Serbian forces in Macedonia. These orders, issued regardless of the lack of a previous declaration of war, were unknown to the Bulgarian cabinet; they precipitated the second Balkan War during which Bulgaria, opposed by Serbia, Greece, Montenegro, Rumania, and Turkey was decisively beaten and forced to sue for peace.

The second Balkan War, 1913

At the close of the second Balkan War, Bulgaria was obliged to accept terms which were dictated to her by her enemies. She settled with the Christian enemy states at a congress which was held in Bucharest, the capital of Rumania. By the settlement negotiated there, and signed August 10, 1913, Rumania, whose troops had won the most decisive successes in the brief struggle with Bulgaria, gained a strip of Bulgarian territory in the southern part of the Dobrudja region. Serbia retained practically all the territory her armies had conquered in Macedonia during the first Balkan War. Montenegro received compensation in Novibazar. Greece shared southern Macedonia with Serbia and obtained control of the Ægean coast to a point as far east as the mouth of the Mesta River. Bulgaria and Turkey adjusted their differences by a treaty signed at Constantinople, September 29, 1913. By that treaty the Bulgarians ceded back to the Turks eastern Thrace including the city of Adrianople which Turkish troops had reoccupied during the second Balkan War. Only a small part of the Turkish spoils of the first Balkan conflict, in fact less than 10,000 square miles of territory, remained under Bulgarian control. Moreover most of Bulgaria's new territory was mountainous and sparsely populated. The Bulgarians gained a port on the Ægean at Dedeagatch but mountains near the coast almost completely cut off access to it from the hinterland.

The Peace of Bucharest, August 10, 1913

The Peace of Constantinople, September 29, 1913

Although the Treaties of Bucharest and Constantinople restored peace to the distracted lands of Turkey and the Balkan states they failed completely to solve the troublesome national problems of the Near East. Bulgaria refused to be reconciled to her losses. Her people were firmly convinced that Rumanians, Serbs, and Greeks had deliberately played them false, and her statesmen, looking forward to a renewal of war in the Balkans, proposed promptly after the signing of the treaties to negotiate an offensive and defensive alliance with the Turks. A treaty, providing in principle that if "one of the contracting parties were attacked by one or two Balkan states the other contracting party engaged unconditionally to assist it with all its forces," was actually drawn up by representatives of Bulgaria and Turkey but it was never ratified. Turks also looked forward to a renewal of war in the Balkans. Their political leaders made strenuous efforts to provide Turkey with a navy because they regarded a seafaring people, the Greeks, as their chief opponents of the future.

Turkey and the Balkan states prepare for new wars, 1913–14

They let contracts for the building of two cruisers and a dreadnaught in England, they ordered destroyers, submarines, and sea-planes in France, they purchased military supplies in Germany as well as in the two western states, and they invited a German military mission headed by General Liman von Sanders to reorganize the Ottoman army. "In view of all this activity," a prominent member of the Young Turk cabinet in 1913–14 wrote, "it will at once be admitted that our one object in life was to make our fleet superior to the Greek fleet at the first possible moment." Likewise Greeks, Serbs, Montenegrins, and Rumanians foresaw and prepared for future encounters. In reality the Balkan settlements of 1913 were mere truces, and the Balkan Wars were just preludes of a far more terrible struggle which started in the Balkans within a year after the signing of the Treaty of Bucharest and then spread rapidly until it engulfed almost the whole of the "civilized" world.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

L. Villari, editor, *The Balkan Question: the Present Condition of the Balkans and of European Responsibilities* (1905); H. M. Brailsford, *Macedonia: its Races and their Future* (1906); J. G. Schurman, *The Balkan Wars, 1912–1913* (1914); L. E. Gueschoff, *The Balkan League* (1915); G. Young, *Nationalism and War in the Near East* (1915); R. W. Seton-Watson, *The Southern Slav Question and the Habsburg Monarchy* (1911); *The Balkans, Italy and the Adriatic* (1915); *The Rise of Nationality in the Balkans* (1918); H. A. Gibbons, *The New Map of Europe* (1914); *Venizelos* (1920); G. F. Abbott, *Turkey in Transition* (1909); C. R. Buxton, *Turkey in Revolution* (1909); R. Pinon, *L'Europe et l'Empire Ottoman* (1909); *L'Europe et la Jeune Turquie* (1911); *L'Europe et la Jeune Turquie: les aspects nouveaux de la question d'Orient* (1911); *L'Europe et l'empire ottoman* (1913); B. G. Baker, *The Passing of the Turkish Empire in Europe* (1913); E. Prars, *Abdul Hamid* (1916); *Forty Years in Constantinople* (1918); F. Schevill, *History of the Balkan Peninsula* (1922); Lord Eversley, and Sir V. Chirol, *The Turkish Empire* (1923); W. Miller, *The Balkans* (1908); *The Ottoman Empire, 1801–1913* (1913); Vicomte de la Jonquière, *Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman*, 2 vols. (1914); N. Jorga, *Geschichte des rümanischen Volkes*, 2 vols. (1905); *Histoire des États Balcaniques* (1925); J. A. R. Marriott, *The Eastern Question* (1924); N. Forbes, and others, *The Balkans* (1915); M. I. Newbigin, *Geographical Aspects of Balkan Problems* (1915); L. W. Lyde, and Lieut.-Col. A. F. Mockler-Ferryman, *A Military Geography of the Balkan Peninsula* (1905); Sir E. Prars, *Life of Abdul Hamid* (1907); *Turkey and its People* (1911); Sir C. N. E. Eliot, *Turkey in Europe* (1908); A. H. Lybyer, *Government of the Ottoman Empire in the Time of Suleiman the Magnificent* (1913); H. W. V. Temperley, *History of Serbia* (1917); J. Samuelson, *Roumania, Past and Present* (1882); *Bulgaria, Past and Present* (1888); G. Finlay, *History of Greece*, 2 vols. (1861); Sir A. W. Ward, and G. P. Gooch, (ed.), *The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy*, 3 vols. (1923); F. S. Rodkey, *The Turco-Egyptian Question* (1925); S. Goriainow, *Le Borphore et les Dardanelles* (1910); S. Lane-Poole, *The Life of the Right Honourable Stratford Canning*, 2 vols. (1888); Sir E. Dicey, *The Peasant State* (1894); Earl of Cromer, *Modern Egypt* (1916); E. M. Earle, *Turkey, the Great Powers, and the Bagdad Railway* (1923).

PART VII

NATIONAL IMPERIALISM AND THE SPREAD OF EUROPEAN CIVILIZATION OVER THE WORLD

CHAPTER XXVII

THE OLD AND THE NEW IMPERIALISM

1. The Decline of the Old Imperialism

For three centuries before the American and French Revolutions, Spain, England, France, Holland, and Portugal had sought to build up rival colonial empires. Three principal motives, which led them to make a conquest of non-European regions and to plant colonies in them, were widely held in those days: (1) The belief prevailed that colonies would supply the home country with such raw materials as would make her economically independent of foreign powers. (2) It was expected that the possession of colonies would develop new markets for the sale of surplus goods from the motherland. (3) These new contacts with the outer world enabled the pious to realize their desire to spread the Christian faith among pagan peoples. The predominant theory that colonies should contribute solely to the power and prosperity of the mother country was called the "mercantile doctrine." It took little thought of the "rights" or of the welfare of the colonists, who were forbidden to establish manufactures of their own, and were forced to buy all their goods of the home merchants. By navigation laws and special tariffs, colonial industry and trade were controlled for the selfish interest of the home government. Although the expansion of Europe to the overseas continents was so pronounced from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, yet by 1800 about four-fifths of the land area of the earth had not been opened to Europeans through exploration.

Mercantilism

The "mercantile doctrine" was shattered by three new world forces: (1) the political and social revolutions in North and South America and in Europe; (2) the Industrial Revolution; and (3) the *laissez-faire* theory of industry and commerce. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, economists like Adam Smith in England and the Physiocrats and Turgot in France proved the false basis of the "mercantile doctrine" and urged the inauguration of a general policy of complete freedom of trade. This new *laissez-faire* theory grew rapidly until Great Britain, in 1849, abolished the ancient customs duties, and proclaimed free trade. Men like Ricardo, John Stuart Mill, and Malthus taught that a country was most prosperous when it bought in the cheapest market and sold in the dearest. The Industrial Revolution, which made Great Britain the "workshop of the world," forced her to care more for the new customers for her wares than for the small trade of her colonies. Further, the successful revolt of the colonies in North and South America from the political

Free-trade and anti-imperialism

control of the European motherlands caused European statesmen to conclude that it was both unwise and unprofitable to spend blood and gold in acquiring new colonies, or in holding old ones. Cobden, Bright, and even Gladstone were disposed to take this view. Furthermore the French Revolution and later insurrections on the continent set forth the idea of the right of self-determination for submerged nationalities, which naturally was extended to colonies. Consequently, by the middle of the nineteenth century, after the pronounced decline of the power of the conservative alliance created after 1815 by the absolute powers of Europe, old imperialism as a national policy seemed to be generally discredited as disadvantageous. It was commonly said by economists and statesmen that overseas possessions were only a "costly burden" to the homeland with no rewarding compensations.

The decline of the older colonial empires

By 1850, therefore, only remnants of the old colonial empires were in existence. Of the vast colonial possessions of Spain, nothing remained but Cuba and Porto Rico in the New World, vague claims in Africa, and the Philippines in the Pacific; and before the close of the century all of these were lost except the African regions. The Dutch had lost New Amsterdam in North America and Cape Colony in Africa, but still held Dutch Guiana in South America and important portions of the East Indies. France had lost all her colonial empire in the New World except French Guiana, and Guadeloupe and Martinique in the West Indies; and in India retained nothing except five trading-posts. Portugal had lost Brazil, but like Spain and France, had a loose title to certain parts of Africa. Great Britain had lost her Thirteen Colonies in North America, but had profited by the misfortunes of France and Holland. Throughout the world she had laid the foundations of a colossal empire, and was the foremost colonial and maritime power on earth. In Europe she held the strategic points of Gibraltar, Heligoland, and Malta. The United States had spread across the continent. Russia owned Alaska in North America, Siberia in northern Asia, and was forcing her way into the regions about the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea, while in Europe, Finland and Poland were parts of her gigantic Empire. China and Japan were not yet opened to European exploitation. The interior of Africa had not been penetrated, and large portions of North and South America were as yet unexplored.

2. Rise of Modern National and Economic Imperialism

About 1871 there began in world history a new period of national imperialism, which during the past fifty years has progressed with giant strides and is unabated today. At that time perhaps half of the habitable surface of the globe still awaited the conquest of Europeans, Americans, and Asiatics. This new movement to Europeanize the world is one of the most significant factors in modern

civilization and needs to be studied with more care than has been given to it hitherto.

Four fundamental causes help to explain this renewed and unprecedented interest in imperialism: (1) A powerful and able middle class had gained control of the governments of the states of the western world through the earlier political revolutions and the economic changes. Representing wealth and business interests, they demanded colonial expansion overseas not only to secure adequate supplies of raw materials for home industries and new markets for the sale of their goods, but also for opportunities to invest surplus capital profitably. (2) The newer Industrial Revolution with its inventive genius, its technical skill, and its capacity for world organization, coupled with improved methods of finance, transformed manufacturing, transportation, and communication. As a result factories produced enormous quantities of goods for export. Railways and steamships made it easy to send them to the most distant markets. The telegraph, telephone, and cable made it possible to transact business on a world scale. Modern banking institutions provided easy and safe systems of credit, and insurance companies took much of the risk out of business. With fortunes awaiting venturous investors in distant regions, governments were urged to increase their colonial possessions. (3) The missionary spirit of western Christianity, with the desire to add to the glory of Christendom and to save the precious souls of countless heathen from eternal torment, *has ever been a most potent force in the dynamics of European expansion.* (4) The new nationalism aroused an ambition in the various national groups to secure more power in world affairs, to increase the national wealth, to expand the national domain, and to open up new fields for all kinds of national enterprises — political, religious, and educational. Hence came the popular clamor for the annexation of the backward parts of the world and the scramble for "spheres of influence." The belief was commonly expressed that in the event of war conquered subjects might be drilled and used as soldiers, and that the possession of regions overseas, suitable for colonization and for supplying food to the home people, was a necessity for a great industrial state.

Causes of the new imperialism

After 1871 the industrial life of most of Europe and of much of North America was completely changed, while this newer Industrial Revolution was spreading over all the civilized portions of the whole earth. Industry was organized economically on a world basis not only in the exchange of goods but also in the dependence of the European nations upon food and raw materials from overseas. The advances made in chemistry and other physical sciences worked modern miracles. Scientific organization and management led to the creation of large business concerns in which vast sums were invested and thousands of workers were employed. These huge plants with their own expert scientists and laboratories flooded the world with

Industrial Revolution

their finished products. It has been estimated that within a century the world's commerce has increased a thousand per cent. To handle this gigantic business trunk railways with lateral branches were built across the continents of America, Europe, and even Asia, forming a veritable network of steel roads to carry freight and passengers. At the same time ocean liners carrying at a low rate thousands of tons of goods and five thousand passengers were crossing all the oceans in a few days. Newspapers, the post office, the cables and wireless, and the banks enabled business men of New York, Liverpool, or Hong Kong to conduct a world business as easily as a city merchant could cover a county fifty years ago. Coal, iron and electricity have revolutionized all sorts of industries. The Suez and Panama canals have shortened shipping by thousands of miles. It was under the improved conditions of this newer Industrial Revolution that national and economic imperialism developed. Since the captains of industry in the industrial states were producing more goods and amassing more capital than could be consumed at home, they turned their attention to the hundreds of millions of people in the non-industrial sections like Latin America, Russia, Turkey, China, and Africa. Protective tariffs and keen competition also made the markets of other industrial states less profitable.

Up to 1871 the large-scale textile and steel industries of Great Britain were without a rival in the world. The products of France were superior in artistic design, but gave her neighbor across the channel no uneasiness in the world's markets. These two countries had utilized all the earlier discoveries and inventions and led all other nations in industrial technique. But after 1871 the United States and Germany began to compete with England and France through the standardization of manufactured goods and large-scale production. The advance of Germany, particularly, owing to the fostering of industry by the state, began to be felt. In 1850 Great Britain mined six times as much coal, and made five times as much pig iron, as Germany; and nine years later the British exports of steel were still double the German exports. Then came the unification and industrialization of Germany under Bismarck, and soon the best men of the middle class were devoting all their intelligence and energy to the Industrial Revolution. They had the encouragement of the government and also all the discoveries already made in other countries to start with, and hence their progress was more marked than in other lands. No other state coöperated so enthusiastically and intelligently with the merchant classes as did Germany. After 1870 Italy, like Germany, wanted to share in the division of the overseas world. These two powers felt themselves handicapped in the race for empire, and began to look about frantically to see where there might be colonies not already appropriated by their more lucky rivals. Since practically all territory suitable for colonization by whites was occupied, they cast their eyes on parts of Africa, Asia,

and Oceania. Italy developed a "colonial sense" earlier than Germany but lacked the military power and money to push her projects to so successful an issue.

The overcrowded population of Europe is a factor oftimes disregarded in the consideration of the growth of imperialism. Most of the industrialized nations witnessed an unprecedented increase in the number of their inhabitants during the nineteenth century. For instance, between 1800 and 1900 the population of Great Britain grew from 16,000,000 to 41,000,000; that of Germany from 21,000,000 to 56,000,000; that of Italy from 18,000,000 to 32,000,000; that of Austria-Hungary from 23,000,000 to 45,000,000; that of European Russia from 39,000,000 to 111,000,000; and that of all Europe from 180,000,000 to about 400,000,000. As a result of this rapid multiplication of the inhabitants, Europe found it more and more difficult to live on the food raised at home. The large emigration of Europeans to all parts of the world tended to relieve the congestion in the homelands, and it was natural that the motherlands should wish to retain control of these nationals as they spread overseas. Largely owing to recruits from Europe, the population of the United States increased from 5,000,000 in 1800 to 77,000,000 in 1900. These new communities of whites in various parts of the world helped to supply Europe with food. Towards the close of the last century, however, the new states formed by the expansion of Europe became so populous that they could no longer export such large quantities of the products of the soil because they were needed at home. In the United States, for instance, all vacant lands were occupied. This new situation tended to make the necessities of life dearer in Europe, led to a keener competition for foreign markets, and induced European nations to reach out after colonies as new sources of food as well as raw materials for their home industries. The early Industrial Revolution was confronted by the simple problem of the exportation of goods. The newer Industrial Revolution was face to face with the question of obtaining means on which to live and materials with which to work. This change, in large part, accounted for the rise of economic imperialism.

Population pressure

It was soon realized that the best way to monopolize the business of an undeveloped region of the world, like Africa or Asia, was to establish a "sphere of influence" which, at a favorable opportunity, might be transformed into a protectorate, or annexed outright. Along with the export of manufactured articles for sale went the export of capital and capacity for organization to develop the natural resources of the backward parts of the earth. Factories were erected; railroads projected; banks opened; mines operated; steamship lines started; and loans made to overseas rulers. Thus the rubber groves of the Malay Peninsula, the oil wells of Persia and Mexico, the copper mines of Morocco and the Congo, the gold and diamond mines of the Transvaal, the wheat fields of Russia and Argentina, and the

"Spheres of Influence"

coffee plantations of Brazil, drew hundreds of millions of surplus wealth from the rich industrial states. Thousands of trained young men were sent out to manage these business enterprises. Concessions and special privileges were secured for all sorts of ventures, and the home governments were called upon to protect such business enterprises. Again and again defaulted payments, broken contracts, assassinated missionaries, the mistreatment of government officials, or some insult to the flag, was made an excuse for gaining a new colony. And thus the imperial game was played over the earth by most of the European powers, and not by individuals or commercial companies.

Extension of European civilization

The new national imperialism must not be viewed as merely the extension of military dominion over weaker peoples. Rather it was the extension of European civilization over the world, but more particularly in the eastern hemisphere. To the partly civilized peoples, who occupied such vast portions of the globe, it brought law and justice, and the beginnings of liberty. To the more highly civilized groups, who had secured for themselves a mode of political organization, which gave them security, order and legal equality, it brought many obvious advantages. The great nation-states like Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia and Italy became also great imperial states. Austria-Hungary, which was never a nation-state, never became a great colonizing power. The history of the world after the Congress of Berlin in 1878 has been the history of world-states. Since that date, practically all of the unexploited regions of earth have been brought either under the jurisdiction of one or another of the mighty western powers, or have been driven to adopt the modes of organization of the west. As a result, the entire globe has been revolutionized within the past half century through science, industry, and imperialism. Africa has been explored and divided among the powers. Australia and Oceania are occupied. Europe and the United States have established an economic hegemony in Latin America. In this manner have the powers interpreted their "civilizing mission" and the "white man's burden." Out of this race for overseas possessions grew clashes and sharp rivalries, which in turn determined home policies and political events. But it must be said that world public opinion has forced modern national imperialism to carry on its work on a somewhat higher moral level than was true of the old imperialism.

3. Missions and European Expansion

This unparalleled extension of European political authority around the globe, the overflow of European blood and institutions to distant lands, and the creation of a world trade centering in Europe, were the products of a series of impulses from the sixteenth to the twentieth century. One of the earliest and strongest motives for overseas activity was the desire of the European Christians to con-

vert the heathen, and rescue untold millions from imminent danger. Christianity, originating in western Asia, naturally spread over that region and thence to northern Africa and to southern Europe. When Rome became the most powerful center of the Christian Church, the missionary zeal of the early church was continued. Missionaries were sent to the Moslems in Asia and Africa, and in the thirteenth century the Roman pontiff sent Dominicans and Franciscans to Persia and Tartary. Two learned Dominicans accompanied Marco Polo to the court of Kublai-Khan, and early in the fourteenth century two Franciscans visited Pekin, even translating the New Testament into the Tartar language and training youths for a native ministry. The overseas discoveries of the fifteenth century opened up a new world to missionary enterprise for the churches of Spain and Portugal. The mendicants, who were sent to Mexico and Peru, sought to spread Christian principles among the natives, but too frequently those who refused to renounce their heathen ways were either massacred or enslaved. By 1520 five bishoprics had been established, and the Aztec worship was banished from the Spanish settlements. The Portuguese labored in India, and the Jesuit, Francis Xavier, met with singular success, extending his work from Goa in India around the coast of Asia to Japan and to some outlying islands of China, where he died in 1552. Other Jesuits continued his work in Asia, and some opened a new field in Paraguay, South America. With the French settlement at Quebec went Jesuit missionaries to work among the Indians of the region of the Great Lakes and the Mississippi valley. By the end of the sixteenth century a committee of cardinals was appointed to unify missionary work, and later a missionary college was founded to train both Europeans and natives for missionary activities.

Early Catholic missions

The French Huguenots sent a body of devoted men to Rio Janeiro to form a Christian colony, but the Protestant churches were for a long time indifferent to foreign missions. English colonizers were not unmindful of their duty to convert the natives, and this was encouraged by the state church. Religious persecution drove forth Catholics, Quakers, and Puritans from England; Huguenots from France; and Protestants from Germany, to seek homes in the New World, where they might worship in peace. Many representatives of these groups in America took a keen interest in the spiritual welfare of the Indians and won many converts. Meanwhile young Dutch and German missionaries were devoting their lives to the conversion of the heathen in Abyssinia, Java, the Moluccas, Formosa, and Ceylon. An Austrian baron, von Welz, went as an evangelical missionary to Dutch Guiana, and King Frederick IV of Denmark founded a mission in India. The Moravians labored in North and South America, Greenland, and Africa. In 1792, Carey, a self-educated cobbler of the Baptist faith, wrote an epoch-making book on *Means for the Conversion of the Heathen*. As a result, the first society for

Rise of Protestant missions

missionary work was created, and three years later the London Missionary Society was organized as an interdenominational organ. About $50,000 was raised and 29 missionaries were sent to Tahiti in the South Sea Islands. Societies were formed to promote missions in Africa. A new era of associated work had begun. Between 1792 and 1892 in Great Britain thirty-five associations were organized, and in the United States twenty-two.

During the past century millions of dollars have been raised to further missionary efforts, and thousands of men and women have gone to all parts of the globe to advance the cause. Bible societies, medical missions, and mission schools have supplemented the older type of work. When David Livingstone died in Africa, and the "Cambridge seven," of whom one was the stroke-oar of the university eight, and another captain of the university eleven, went to China in 1885, the imagination of the British people was profoundly stirred. The university graduates entered the mission field in large numbers, and soon 3,000 volunteers were ready to go to the foreign fields. The interest of the British self-governing colonies in mission endeavor was abreast of that of the mother country. The United States has been particularly active, and thousands of college men and women are devoting their lives to the service. The German, Danish, Scandinavian, Dutch, and French Protestant societies have taken a prominent part in the spread of the Christian faith over the globe.

Progress of missions

The Roman Catholic missions in the nineteenth century have carried on and extended the work of earlier centuries. The "Institution of the Propagation of the Faith" established at Lyons in 1822 has an income of $1,500,000 for missions. The work carried on by the various religious orders and societies is well-organized and economically managed. The majority of the missionaries are French — over 7,000 — and most of the money is raised in France. It was estimated that in 1918 there were 3,000 Catholic teachers, 8,000 priests, and 20,000 sisters from Europe in mission work among non-Catholics, while the native priests numbered 4,000, and the members about 17,000,000. The Greek Catholic Church established missions in central Asia, Siberia, China, Japan and Alaska, and the Russian church spent about $150,000 annually. Protestants in 1908 raised $25,000,000 for missions and claimed that they had in the foreign field 6,000 ordained missionaries, 2,806 laymen, 4,500 unmarried women, over 5,000 ordained natives, 29,000 schools, and about 5,000,000 members. In China alone in 1918 there were 12,000 missionaries, teachers and physicians. In India and Ceylon 14,000 mission schools were educating 650,000 pupils. Similar work was done in other fields. In 1920 the Church World Movement of the United States proposed to raise $104,000,000 and to send out 3,500 new missionary workers.

This brief survey of the gigantic work accomplished through the various Christian missionary agencies will make clear to what an extent they were instrumental in spreading western civilization

over the globe. There has always been a close relationship between the governments of the west and missions. Until the beginning of the nineteenth century, missionary labors were largely under the supervision of the states. Repeatedly the deep solicitude for the conversion of "the benighted heathen" was taken as a pretext for seizing backward parts of the earth and the extension of European rule. The murder of missionaries, or the destruction of mission property, supplied an excuse for the establishment of a protectorate, or the carving out of a "sphere of influence," or the opening of trading ports. At the same time the natives were made acquainted with European forms of government, with western concepts of law and justice, and were taught the meaning of self-government. As a result, much of the non-European world was organized more or less after the political models of the west. In this way the foundations were laid for a closer political coöperation in the world and for a better international understanding.

Missions and imperialism

Although the missionaries were engaged in an unworldly undertaking, they were not unmindful of the material advantages that might accrue to their homelands from their labors. The natural resources and native products, which they reported, attracted both capital for investment and business agents eager to make money. Employment was given to the natives to open mines, gather rubber and ivory, build railroads and factories, and construct harbors and wharves for steamship lines. Markets were opened for home goods. The natives were brought into touch with new systems of finance, banking, and credit; with the inventions of the west; and with a new business world. Too frequently they were also introduced to the engines of modern warfare and made the victims. Their eyes were opened to the marvels of modern science, and their knowledge of other peoples and other lands was widened. Schools and even universities were planted in regions where illiteracy, ignorance, and superstition had prevailed. Languages only spoken hitherto were written with an invented alphabet, and thus a native literature began to develop. Western medical knowledge and hospitals replaced the medicine man, and brought the alleviation of pain and the cure of disease. The missionaries introduced new types of home life, with modern conveniences, books and music, with different kinds of foods and drinks, and with strange habits and customs. Thus in a thousand ways the life of the savage, the barbarian, and even the cultured Hindu and Chinese was altered by the invasion of the missionary from the west.

Missions and the spread of European culture

The reaction of missionary work on the peoples of the west was felt in many ways. It brought about the interpretation of Christianity in terms of humanity, widened the horizon of Christian thought in the homelands, and aroused a greater spirit of philanthropy and self-sacrifice. It gave a new conception of the geography, the wealth, and the inhabitants of the earth. It brought to light an-

cient literatures and founded the science of comparative religions. It resulted in the education of thousands of young men and women from overseas in western institutions of learning. A new sense of unity in knowledge, and a new responsibility for the betterment of the human race arose.

4. Nationalism, Political Expansion and the New Colonialism

Political and economic motives supplemented the waves of religious endeavor. The sixteenth century witnessed a mad scramble to seize the backward parts of the non-European world under the belief that colonies were necessary to increase the wealth and power of the homelands; and this race for overseas possessions with many a war among the rivals continued through the following centuries *more or less intermittently to the present time.* Settlements were encouraged at advantageous spots, and charters were granted to trading corporations giving them large tracts of lands and special business privileges. These companies, in turn, offered various inducements to emigrants to go to the colonies. The British, Dutch, and French gave more attention to active colonization than did the Spanish and Portuguese, who were concerned chiefly with exploitation. The love of adventure and the hope of material reward from dame fortune sent many thousands of Europeans overseas to the newly discovered areas. This motive kept up a steady stream of individuals and groups from the Old World to the newer parts of the earth throughout the succeeding centuries. Among them were men, women, and children; the rich and poor; the educated and ignorant; the skilled workman and the bond servant.

European expansion into the colonies

By the close of the eighteenth century the two Americas had been largely explored and partially settled at advantageous points *along the coasts, and here and there inland,* by the British, Irish, Scotch, Dutch, Swedes, French, Germans, Spanish, and Portuguese. Somewhat less than four millions of Europeans and their descendants were living in the New World under ideas and institutions transplanted from the Old World. The Dutch and French Huguenots had gone to South Africa. The Danes were in Iceland and Greenland. In Asia the British, Dutch, French, Portuguese, Spanish, and Russians had trading posts and some settlements, and a profitable exchange of goods was under way. Great Britain was sending undesirable criminals to Australia, and Russia had a few trading posts in Alaska. Thus European civilization had been firmly planted in North and South America, and in South Africa and northern Asia. At the same time some points of contact had been established with the native peoples of America, Africa, and Asia through conquests and commerce. But in all the continents outside of Europe vast stretches of territory were still unexplored by Europeans. With the loss of the Thirteen Colonies and the Latin-American colonies, however, the European states,

The new colonial movement after 1850

for a time, lost interest in colonies as profitable investments. "Colonies are like fruits," said Turgot, "they cling to the mother-tree only until they are ripe."

The half century following the overthrow of Napoleon formed a transitional period between the old and the new colonial movement. The expansion of European civilization to other parts of the world, in spite of the pronounced indifference, was more remarkable than in any previous century. France, undeterred by the loss of her earlier colonial empire in America and India, and exhausted by twenty-five years of war, had interfered in Egypt and planted her flag in Algeria within fifteen years after the fall of Napoleon. Drawn on by the necessity of protecting her commerce from the Barbary pirates, France at first only occupied a few seaports, but between 1830 and 1848 her authority was extended by conquest over all of Algeria. Not since *France* the days of Rome had that region been brought under the reign of law and developed economically. The few posts held on the west coast of Africa about the mouth of the Senegal, as remnants of her old empire, were enlarged, and Frenchmen began to dream of an empire in north Africa. In Asia, France still held several cities in India and China. The maltreatment of missionaries in Annam led to war in 1858 and 1862 the result of which was the cession of Cochin China to France. In the Pacific and Indian oceans, France also claimed Madagascar and obtained control over Tahiti and the Marquesas Islands in 1842, and New Caledonia in 1855. These were the substantial beginnings of the new French colonial empire.

Meanwhile Russia cast greedy eyes on European Turkey and was pushing her empire into Asia in three directions: (1) over the Caucasus towards Persia, which was reached by 1825; (2) into west central Asia, where Afghanistan, Bokhara, and the Kirghiz deserts were penetrated by 1848; and (3) into the Far East, where in 1858–60 the Amur provinces with the port of Valadivostok on the Pacific ocean were secured from China. Thus Russia made one of the first *Russia* impacts against the Mohammedan civilization and became both a Mohammedan and a Pacific power. In 1875 Japan was forced to cede to Russsia the southern half of Sakalin island. These acquisitions brought Russia into the full stream of world politics and gave her the greatest continuous empire of any nation on earth. Austria, driven out of both Germany and Italy, turned her attention towards the Balkans and the eastern Mediterranean. The opening of China and Japan to intercourse with the western states not only gave a tremendous impetus to world trade but also encouraged some of the western powers to attempt to secure control over rich ports and "spheres of influence" in the Far East. In the New World, the United States had added to Louisiana and Florida, Texas and the southwestern portion of her present area. Treaties with England gave her possession of the regions of Oregon and Washington. Alaska was purchased from Russia in 1867 and Liberia was established

in Africa. Thus the spirit of imperialism was working as powerfully in the young Republic of the New World as in the monarchies of the Old World. The new American empire stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific was next in continuous extent only to that of Russia, and far richer in natural resources. Into this area poured a mighty flood of immigrants from Europe until by 1878 the population was 50,000,000, exceeding that of any European state except Russia.

The British Empire

It was left to Great Britain, however, to play the leading rôle in empire-building during this period. She was mistress of the seas and in a sense without a rival in the world. The Industrial Revolution had brought her wealth and the necessity of having world markets. The empire which she possessed in 1815, already the largest on earth, was extended and added to during the next half century. More than any other nation she was expanding European civilization over the globe, opening up new continents, and giving the word "empire" a new meaning. But her expansion seemed to be haphazard and without fixed policy. Her statesmen did not want further overseas expansion, but her commerce forced it, and the flag followed trade. Her harsh penal code made the transportation of criminals to distant lands necessary. Restless adventurers and zealous missionaries became unofficial agents of imperialism. The Russian menace in western Asia forced Great Britain to extend the frontier of India northward. Rebellions in Burma led to the conquest of that region. In South Africa, Kaffir wars and quarrels with the Boers resulted in the annexation of Natal, Orange River territory, and the Transvaal. Australia and New Zealand were added to the empire. In this way political necessity caused the colossal empire to become still more colossal, until by 1878 it was the largest the world had ever known. Further, the triumph of free trade, and its extension to the colonies, opened this vast empire to commerce with all nations, and left the British the sole function of keeping peace and enforcing law as a trustee of civilization. The governmental authority exercised over this mighty area with its pronounced diversity of race, religion, and civilization, was loose and indifferent. Defenders of imperialism in the mother country asserted that the empire would furnish opportunities for trade with the motherland, would drain off the surplus population, would open fields for missionary endeavor, and would enable the British to civilize the backward peoples. Opponents of imperialism called it unwise and an "immoral product of brute force, regardless of the rights of the conquered peoples."

5. The New Imperialistic Spirit

After nearly a century of comparative indifference to colonization overseas, there began about 1878 a revival of interest that soon became contagious. This new colonial movement sought to Europeanize the peoples of the earth and, during the past half century, has been one of the most potent forces in world history. The entire globe

Irresistible march of empire

from pole to pole has been explored and divided among the more aggressive nations. The great continents of Africa and Asia have been mapped and carved up into colonies, "spheres of influence," protectorates, and mandates. Great Britain, Russia, France, Holland, Portugal and the United States extended their colonial empires. Germany, Italy, Japan, and Belgium acquired new overseas empires. Spain lost all her colonies except those in Africa. To the barbarous and backward peoples was carried a new wave of western civilization — languages, institutions, laws, justice, fashions, foods, manufactures, opportunities for trade, education, and the Christian faith. Unfortunately, the peaceful penetration of missionaries, teachers, and business men was too frequently preceded or followed by wars of conquests. In the face of protests from the conquered peoples, who desired to live their own lives in their own way, and from anti-imperialists at home, who denounced "the invasion of the sacred rights of free men" as unjust, the march of western civilization swept across the earth.

The nature of the new imperialism

This recent manifestation of imperialism was more than merely a revival of the old forces and motives. The religious and political incentives of the earlier centuries were still active, it is true, but industrialism, nationalism, and science, late products of the west, now became fundamental factors in the movement. The Industrial Revolution produced a surplus of goods, money, and energy for the exploitation of Latin America, Africa and Asia. The railroad, telegraph, and printing-press facilitated the work. The needs of the modern industrial states forced them to look not only for better markets and more lucrative opportunities for investment, but also for larger sources of food, clothing, and raw materials. Soon millions of dollars were invested abroad in mines, oil wells, factories, transportation lines, banks, and plantations. Tens of thousands of enterprising men were sent out to manage these investments, new colonies were planted, and centers of western civilization established. The economic changes led to the scientific development of old colonies and to a keen scramble for new ones. The inventions and discoveries; labor-saving machinery; better business organization; and a greater supply of trained workers, which developed the mighty industrial states, were quickly reflected in altered world relations. Free trade gave way to high tariffs for the protection of industries, and world trade developed by leaps and bounds. The more highly industrialized states found themselves depending to a greater degree than ever before upon all parts of the globe not only for markets but also for supplies of various kinds to keep their factories running and to feed their workers.

The French Revolution, followed by political upheavals in other countries, placed government in the hands of the middle class. The patriotic nationalism, which was aroused, gloried in the increase of the power and territory of the state. Every new conquest, every

Nationalism and imperialism

acquisition of an additional "sphere of influence," and every gain in world trade was applauded. The intense nationalism, which appeared after the unification of Italy and Germany, gave popular support to the policy of expansion. The praise of the national state as the highest type of political organization, produced the conviction that it was the supreme duty of the nation to grow until it became the largest, strongest, and richest group on earth. Statesmen inspired their people to believe in the nation's "divine mission" and right to a "place in the sun." "God has assigned the German people a place in the world," said a German chancellor. "The Anglo-Saxon race is infallibly destined to be the predominant force in the history and civilization of the world," boasted the Englishman, Chamberlain. "Colonization is for France a question of life and death," said Leroy-Beaulieu. "We must play a great part in the world," urged Roosevelt. Hence every time the red, green, yellow, and blue spots on the map of the world were enlarged, the home people applauded the spread of their institutions and civilization.

The "unhealthy spirit of pride in mere dominion" found a powerful ally in the new science and technology, which brought the forces of nature under its control and made the organized conquest of the earth an easy task almost within one generation. Transportation, communication, the deadly firearms, and modern engineering were powerful aids. The progress in medical science conquered many diseases and enabled the white man to live in the tropics. Cold storage made it possible to carry fruits, meats and other foodstuffs from the hot to the colder climates. The improved science of finance and credit facilitated the most distant undertakings. Far-away peoples were brought within a few days of Europe or America. Nations needed no longer to be self-supporting because they could easily replenish their needs from all parts of the globe. Thus in many different ways science helped to spread western civilization to all corners of the earth. Christian workers, as sort of an advance guard of western civilization, were materially aided by this scientific progress. They opened schools and universities, founded hospitals, taught law and medicine, and spread the scientific knowledge and arts of the western world to pagan peoples around the globe.

Modern economics, politics, science and religion have enabled the more aggressive nations to lay the rest of the world under tribute. Every square mile of the backward regions of the earth has been staked off for administrative control. A steady stream of merchandise and of people has gone from the highly civilized nations to the less highly civilized groups. Most important of all has been the spread of machine technology from Europe and America to other parts of the world. At the same time, the products of the retarded areas have been carried home to meet the wants of the industrial states. Thousands of young men and women from Asia and Africa have been educated in the western institutions of learning. In all

Triumph of the industrialized nations

these ways the civilization of Europe, which first expanded to North and South America, has spread until its influence is felt to a greater or lesser degree among all peoples in Asia, Africa, and the islands of the seas. The results have been both good and evil. Whiskey, opium, and guns too frequently accompanied Bibles to heathen lands. The countries, which defended national freedom at home, too often became the destroyers of national freedom in Africa and Asia. Even the most democratic governments were slow to extend democratic institutions to their black, red, yellow, and brown colonies. Along with the spread of western civilization went the creation of misunderstandings, hatreds, "sore spots," and "arenas of friction," which left the world in 1914 in a critical condition.

If the overseas expansion of Europe was an epoch-making movement of world-wide significance to non-European peoples, the reaction on the west was almost as important. The introduction of new commodities changed the life and habits of Europe and America. Rubber, petroleum, copra, nitrate of soda, fruits, rice, cocoa, tea, spices, oriental rugs, and articles of dress and adornment from India, China and Japan left their effects. Gold from Australia and South Africa increased the volume of money and altered the technique of credit and banking. Western industry was stimulated and surplus capital accumulated. The autocratic rule of colonials abroad, it was said, weakened democratic institutions at home. Imperialism used up the national funds for gigantic armaments by land and sea, and thus augmented taxes and increased the cost of living at home. Thousands of young men were given a valuable training in colonial administration. Political experiments were made in the colonial laboratories. Great Britain and the United States followed the practice of colonial autonomy, while France in Algeria adopted the principle of assimilation. The world became a laboratory for the natural sciences, and the new data which was accumulated was utilized in geography, cartography, geology, biology, astronomy, zoölogy, botany, forestry, chemistry, and medicine. Men like Darwin and Huxley were enabled to set forth the theory of evolution. The social sciences were advanced by the accumulated information concerning different peoples and their cultures. Anthropology, ethnology, comparative philology and religion, law, sociology, the evolution of politics, and economics were all aided. Philosophy, literature, the drama, music, and art were enriched. Perhaps the greatest single result may be summed up in the increased knowledge of man.

Effect of overseas expansion on European culture

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

L. Woolf, *Economic Imperialism* (1922); J. A. Hobson, *Imperialism: a Study* (1902); S. P. Orth, *The Imperial Impulse* (1916); P. S. Reinsch, *World Politics at the End of the Nineteenth Century* (1900); *Colonial Government* (1902); *Colonial Administration* (1904); A. Zimmerman, *Die europaischen Kolonien*, 5 vols. (1896–1903), V. Chirol, *Orient and Occident* (1924); H. C. Morris, *The History of Colonization*, 2 vols. (1908); P. Leroy-

Beaulieu, *De la colonization chez les peuples modernes*, 6th edition, 2 vols (1908); P. L'E. de la Tramerye, *The World-Struggle for Oil* (1924); J. S. Dennis, *Protestant Missions and Social Progress*, 3 vols. (1897–1906), C. H. Patton, *The Business of Missions* (1924); R. E. Speer, *Missions and Modern History, a Study of Some of the Missionary Aspects of Some of the Great Movements of the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols. (1904), A. Macdonald, *Trade, Politics, and Christianity* (1902); W. Lippmann, *The Stakes of Diplomacy* (1915); I. Bowman, *The New World* (1922); R. Muir, *The Expansion of Europe* (1916), E. A Pratt, *The Rise of Rail-Power in War and Conquest, 1833–1914* (1916), E. M. Earle, *Turkey, the Great Powers and the Bagdad Railway* (1923); F. A. Ogg, *The Economic Development of Modern Europe* (1917); W. K. Wallace, *The Trend of History* (1922), H A. Gibbons, *An Introduction to World Politics* (1922), P. T. Moon, *Imperialism and World Politics* (1925).

CHAPTER XXVIII

THE OLD WORLD IN THE NEW

1. Europe in America

The history of North and South America is merely an expansion and an extension of European history. The American republics are largely nations of immigrants. American civilization is European civilization, transplanted and developed by several centuries of growth under a freer environment. All Europe today is the homeland of white Americans. The early settlements resulted from efforts of six European nations to establish overseas colonial empires. During the sixteenth century the Europeans, who actually colonized the New World, were Spaniards and Portuguese, Catholic in religion and Latin in race. In the seventeenth century came the Teutonic groups from northern Europe — British, Dutch, Swedes, and Germans, who were mostly Protestants; and the Celtic Irish and Latin French, who were largely Catholics. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries saw these earlier colonists increased by the arrival of hundreds of thousands of newcomers from the motherlands. About 1890 there began an influx of immigrants from southern and eastern Europe, which continued until the outbreak of the World War. From first to last the total number of Europeans who settled in the New World approximated 75,000,000 persons.

Colonial empires in the Americas

The following sections of the New World were originally claimed and settled by Old World political groups: (1) Spain held Florida, California, Arizona, New Mexico, Texas, Mexico, Central America, Cuba, Santo Domingo, Porto Rico, and most of the northern, western and southern portions of South America. (2) Portugal restricted her claim to the vast domain of Brazil. (3) France staked off as her portion the St. Lawrence basin, the region of the Great Lakes, and the Mississippi valley. (4) Great Britain took possession of most of the Atlantic coast from Newfoundland to Florida, and laid claim to the regions westward to the Pacific. (5) Sweden seized the Delaware river valley. (6) Holland acquired the site of New York City and the Hudson river region, and Dutch Guiana. (7) Russia secured Alaska.

The great European wars of the seventeenth century, and particularly of the eighteenth, were fought, in part at least, over colonial empires in America. With the sale of Louisiana to the United States in 1803, France lost all her colonies in the New World except Haiti, French Guiana, and a few small islands. In 1867 Russia sold Alaska to the United States. With the independence of the Spanish-American

republics, Spain surrendered control over her vast colonial empire in the New World except in Cuba and Porto Rico, which were also taken from her in the Spanish-American War in 1898. Brazil in 1822 declared her separation from Portugal. Great Britain had to acknowledge the freedom of her Thirteen Colonies in 1783, but she still holds Canada, which was taken from France by war, Newfoundland, and Labrador in North America; British Honduras in Central America; British Guiana in South America; and the islands of Bermuda, Bahamas, Caicos, Turks, Jamaica, Windward, Leeward Trinidad, and Tobago. The American portion of the British Empire covers 4,000,000 square miles, and has a population of 11,000,000 people. Holland still owns Dutch Guiana with 90,000 inhabitants. Denmark sold the Virgin Islands to the United States, which also secured jurisdiction over Florida, Texas, and the southwestern part of the country — all formerly parts of the Spanish colonial empire. Today all of America is composed of free and sovereign states, with the exception of the small holdings of Holland and France, and of the larger possessions of Great Britain. Canada, however, manages her own affairs almost as freely as any other American state.

Cultures of the two Americas

The institutions of America above the Mexican border have come to be predominantly Anglo-Saxon. The early Spanish, Dutch, Swedes, Germans, and French except those about Montreal and Quebec, have been assimilated by the English-speaking colonists, and have taken their institutions and modes of life. The language and customs are chiefly English, the laws and political forms are Anglo-Saxon, and the religion is mostly Protestant. Below the Mexican border, the Central and South American institutions and ideals are predominantly Latin. The language is Spanish, except in Brazil, where it is Portuguese, and in Haiti, where it is French. The laws and machinery of government are mostly Latin, although some of the constitutions are modelled after that of the United States. The religion is Roman Catholic. The music, art, literature, culture, and social usages are copied after the Romance countries of Europe. Although it is quite apparent everywhere that the life and civilization of the New World was transplanted from the Old World, nevertheless a different environment in a new country necessitated many changes and readjustments. Class differences, for instance, tended to disappear, and a more pronounced democratic spirit prevailed. Progress towards a higher civilization for all the people was more rapid. The struggle with the wilderness developed resourcefulness, self-reliance, initiative, and independence, hence it was much easier to break with the old ways and traditions. Left to shift for themselves by the home governments, the first Americans gradually developed a civilization which, while fundamentally European, tended more and more to become characteristically American. If there was less refinement, there was at the same time more earnestness and more self-sufficiency. As a result two new racial groups

appeared — in the north, American Anglo-Saxons; in the south, American Latins. Both groups in some ways resembled Europeans and in other ways differed from the people of the Old World. *Rise of distinct American cultures*

One of the most conspicuous results of the gradual divergence of America from Europe in ideas, institutions, and modes of life was the movement for political independence, first in the north and then in the south. The more progressive English colonies, which enjoyed a measure of self-government from the outset, slowly became conscious of a conflict between their own rights and interests, on the one hand, and the policy of the mother country, on the other. When British statesmen sought to increase their control over the colonies and to force them to bear a just share of the burdens of imperial government, the colonists first boldly protested the invasion of their liberties, then rebelled, and finally declared their complete independence. The Thirteen Colonies organized themselves as the United States with jurisdiction over a region stretching from Canada to Florida and from the Atlantic to the Mississippi. The successful example of the northern Republic, led the Latin-American colonies to revolt against Spain, Portugal, and France. By 1830 ten Latin-American nations were established — Haiti, Mexico, the Central American Federation, Great Colombia, Peru, Bolivia, the Empire of Brazil, Paraguay, Chile, and Argentina.

In spite of the creation of these independent states in the New World, the relationships with the Old World have in a great many ways grown more intimate during the past century than they were before. This fact, which is of much significance in world history, has been due to the following influences: (1) the persistence of sentimental, racial, and cultural ties; (2) the advance in transportation, communication, and the printing-press; (3) the unprecedented development of international trade and finance; (4) the constant stream of immigrants flowing from the Old World into the New; and (5) the numerous travellers coming and going between America and Europe. Through these various processes America was being continually Europeanized, and the change is still going on. *Relations with Europe*

Millions of Europeans brought to the new nations overseas their home ideas, habits, customs, and institutions, and incorporated them into the new Americanized European life, which they found awaiting them. It has been estimated that in 1776 about half of the people of the Thirteen Colonies were non-English, although only 20 per cent of them could not speak the British tongue. Since 1776 possibly 40,000,000 immigrants have come to the United States alone. The number coming each year has increased from 8,000 in 1820 to more than 1,200,000 in 1914. Prior to the Civil War most of the recent arrivals came from northern Europe, driven out by famine or revolution, or seeking better economic opportunities. Most of them were persons with a fairly high degree of intelligence, who brought some wealth with them, and were widely distributed over the *European emigration to America*

nation and hence readily assimilated. They were welcomed in the factories, mines, and forests; and employed to work on the farms, railroads, and canals. After the Civil War, immigration from northern Europe decreased and that from southern and eastern Europe increased. From 1820 to 1920 there had come to the United States alone from: Austria-Hungary, 4,000,000; Belgium, over 100,000; Scandinavia, 2,000,000; France, 524,000; Germany, 6,000,000; Greece, 383,000; Holland, 215,000; Italy, 4,000,000; Poland, 280,000; Portugal, 160,000; Rumania, 76,000; Russia, 3,000,000; Switzerland, 257,000; and Great Britain and Ireland, 8,000,000. In addition to these arrivals directly from Europe, a secondary invasion has come from Canada and Latin America. In 1921–2 there were 6,500 foreign students in the institutions of higher learning in the United States. They came from all parts of the globe and 761 of them were women. These students were widely distributed over the country and were studying all sorts of subjects. As a result of this influx of Europeans, about 15 per cent of the entire population is foreign-born. In some states such as Rhode Island, Connecticut, Massachusetts, and New York, the aliens make up a third or more of the people. In many of the large cities of the north, the foreign-born outnumber the native-born. With the coming of 6,000,000 of the Latin race and 4,000,000 Slavs, the Anglo-Saxon character of the United States is undergoing marked modifications.

While the immigration from Europe to Latin America during the past century has been chiefly from the Latin nations, still the Teutonic and Slavic stocks have found their way into that part of the world and are leaving an impression on Latin-American civilization. To Argentina, for example, between 1857 and 1915 went 4,709,000 foreigners, among whom were 2,300,000 Italians, 1,500,000 Spaniards, 215,000 French, 162,000 Russians, 87,000 Austrians, 62,000 Germans, 56,000 British, 33,000 Swiss, 27,000 Portuguese, 13,000 Greeks, 9,000 Danes, 8,000 Dutch, and 7,000 North Americans. To Brazil between 1820 and 1915 went 3,364,000 immigrants, mostly Portuguese, with a few Spaniards, Italians and Germans. Most of the 26,000 immigrants to Chile from 1904 to 1914 were Spaniards. Of the 117,000 foreigners in Mexico in 1910 about 30,000 were Spaniards, 29,000 North Americans, and 50,000 Latin Americans. In Paraguay of the 60,000 foreigners in 1916 about 29,000 were Argentines, and the rest Italians, Germans, Spaniards, and French in the order named. Uruguay in 1908 had 181,000 foreigners of whom the Italians were the most numerous, and the Spaniards, Brazilians, Argentines, and French coming next in number. Immigration to most of the other Latin-American republics has been comparatively small. For the past century perhaps not over 15,000,000 European immigrants have gone to Latin America.

The invasion of America, from Canada to Argentina, during the past hundred and fifty years by 70,000,000 immigrants from all the

European countries has colored and modified the civilization of the New World in a hundred different ways. During that same period hundreds of thousands of native-born North and South Americans have gone to Europe for business, travel, and study, and have carried back to their homes in America European influences that helped to mould the life and thought of their native countries. At the same time many Europeans have gone to America, not as settlers, but as visitors, sightseers, business agents, students, and lecturers, and thus helped to interpret Europe to Americans. European capitalists have invested billions of dollars in the New World. London, Berlin, Paris, Rome, Madrid, Vienna, and Lisbon have set the standards for dress, art, music, recreation, and education. The printing-press, cheap communication and transportation, and commerce have helped to create a common public opinion and a community of interest on both sides of the Atlantic. The fundamental standards and values of life are today much the same in Europe and America.

As a result of the manifold forces enumerated, it is apparent that in world history America is the offshoot of Europe with the same blood, the same religion, the same general concepts of education, the same kinds of homes and dress, the same industries, the same means of sport and enjoyment, the same legal institutions, and the same customs and modes of living. A Scotchman feels at home in Chile, a Brazilian in Sweden, and a Canadian in Greece. Young ladies from both New York and Rio de Janeiro shop in London and Paris. Artists and medical students from Chicago and Santiago study in Berlin and Rome. American college graduates continue their studies in European universities. America might well be called the New Europe, in some respects more advanced and in others less. Europe is more ancient, on the whole more conservative, more prone to respect blood and privilege, more aristocratic, more imperialistic, more militaristic, with less material prosperity, and fewer opportunities for the common man. America, four and a half times the size of Europe, has only half the number of people. In Europe one state, Russia, is larger than all the others combined; in America three states — Canada, the United States, and Brazil — are each larger than all the other states united. In Europe each state has its own language; in America, English prevails north of the Mexican border, and Spanish and Portuguese south. On the whole life in America is fuller, freer, and less conventional, and material prosperity is more pronounced for a larger proportion of the people.

European and American culture

2. Africa and Asia in America

The coming of the white peoples from Europe to the New World was followed almost immediately by the bringing of Negroes from Africa. As early as 1502 Negro slaves were taken to Haiti by the Spaniards. The Dutch first carried black slaves to Virginia in 1619, while the Spanish and Portuguese took them to Latin America.

Between 1680 and 1786 over 2,130,000 black slaves were imported to British colonies in America. From 1700 to 1786 as many as 610,000 were transported to Jamaica alone. In the single year of 1790 the English, French, Spanish, Dutch, Danes, and Portuguese carried 74,000 slaves to the New World. Of the 700,000 Negroes in the United States in that year all but 40,000 were in the south. In 1838 it was estimated that there were 4,000,000 Negroes in America of whom half were in the United States. During the nineteenth century the Negroes in the United States increased ninefold. Today there are 11,000,000 Negroes in the United States and Canada, and one fourth of them have white blood in their veins. In Mississippi and South Carolina they constitute a majority of the population, while in four other southern states they fall short of the number of whites by only a few hundred thousand. In much of Latin America, where intermarriage of the whites with the blacks is common, the Negroes are so numerous that they have darkened the skin of the entire population. In Cuba, Santo Domingo, Haiti, and some of the states of Central America and Brazil, the Negroes constitute the greater part of the population. In Chile and Argentina the Negro has practically disappeared. Perhaps not less than 6,000,000 Negroes exist today in all Latin America. The total number of persons in all America today with African blood in their veins is around 17,000,000, or nearly one tenth of the entire population.

The Negro in the Americas

It took several centuries for the conviction to grip the Christian whites in Europe and America that the enslavement of the black man was wrong. Early in the eighteenth century the Quakers denounced the practice and later organized a society "for the relief and liberation of the Negro slaves." In 1776 it was moved in the British House of Commons that the "slave trade was contrary to the laws of God and the rights of man," but the motion failed. During the nineteenth century the importation of slaves was gradually prohibited, and finally slavery itself was abolished in all the American states. During the French Revolution "persons of color" born of free parents in the colonies were freed. In 1833 slavery in the British colonies was abolished, and the owners were compensated. The French Assembly in 1848 freed the slaves in the French colonies. In 1865 slavery was abolished in the United States. Most of the Latin-American republics emancipated the slaves upon securing their political independence. In 1870 Spain passed a law for the gradual freedom of 500,000 slaves in her colonies and fifteen years later the institution had disappeared. In 1871 Brazil freed the slaves owned by the government, and in 1888 abolished slavery entirely, some 700,000 being set free.

The African contribution to American civilization was largely in the field of industry as slaves in the rice fields, in cotton growing, on sugar cane and tobacco plantations, and in domestic service. After emancipation they supplied a large part of the paid labor, more particularly in the warmer climates. Their contribution to the cul-

ture of the whites was negligible except in the crude folk songs and tales. They readily adopted the language, religion, habits, and customs of their masters, but in both North and South America, next to the Indian, they form the most illiterate and least progressive part of the population. The Negroes of the United States are the most civilized and most progressive group of the black race in the world. Their rate of increase in number is relatively only two thirds that of the whites. In recent years they have been leaving the south for the industrial centers of the north and west. It has been estimated that the Negroes in the United States own property valued at $300,000,000. Illiteracy is gradually disappearing among them through the various educational agencies established for them, while immorality and crime are slowly receding. In the Latin-American republics where the blacks predominate, there are continual disorders and unstable governments. In some of the states the Indian, Negro, and European have intermarried to such an extent that almost a new race has been created. The presence of such a large group of blacks in a region of the earth which is likely to remain predominantly white presents many grave social, economic, and political problems for the future.

The Mongolian in America

In recent years an Asiatic invasion of America has set in. Geographically North America is more closely connected with Asia than with Europe. With the purchase of Alaska, and the annexation of Hawaii, Samoa, and the Philippines, the United States has become an Asiatic power. Meanwhile about the middle of the last century China and Japan were opened up to trade with the west. Silks, tea, firecrackers, and chinaware found a ready market in the New World. Soon Chinese immigrants began to go to the United States, and between 1850 and 1860 they increased from 10,000 to 40,000. In the next decade or so many additional thousands were employed to build the trans-continental railroads and to work in the western mines. American labor organizations protested against the influx of these Chinese "coolies," and in 1882 Congress excluded Chinese laborers for a period of ten years. The law has been renewed every decade since, but it has not prevented thousands of Chinese merchants, students, and travellers from coming to the United States without molestation. Of the 288,000 Chinese who reached the United States prior to 1883, many of them settled on the Pacific coast, while others were scattered in small groups all over the country. In 1910 there were 72,000 Chinese in the United States, and 46,000 were located in the Pacific states. The census of 1920 showed a decline of about 10,000. This indicates that more than three fourths of the Chinese returned to their native land. In 1908 there were 17,000 Chinese in Canada and three years later the number exceeded 27,000. Following the example of the United States, Canada has also sought to exclude Chinese immigration. Barred from the United States and Canada, the Chinese began to go to Latin America. In 1910 there were 13,000

Chinese

Chinese in Mexico, 3,500 in the Panama Canal Zone, and similar numbers in other states. If to the foreign-born Chinese there be added the American-born, the total number in the New World would probably approximate 200,000.

The Japanese began to come to the United States about 1893, and by 1920 they numbered 111,000, of whom over 93,000 were located on the Pacific coast. By the so-called "gentleman's agreement" in 1908, President Roosevelt sought to check the coming of the Japanese. In 1924 Congress passed an act providing for complete exclusion of the Japanese. They have found a welcome in Latin America. In Peru 2 per cent of the population is Asiatic, and 60,000 Japanese are working on the sugar plantations. Brazil offered to Japan a grant of 122,500 acres of land in San Paulo, with the privilege of buying more, and free transportation to Japanese emigrants. Probably 30,000 Japanese are under contract on the coffee plantations. Mexico and Chile have made overtures to them, and a sprinkling is found in most of the other states. Although the Hindus have been kept out of Canada and the United States, there are more than 100,000 immigrants from India and the East Indies in British and Dutch Guiana. Within the past quarter of a century 311,000 immigrants from Asiatic Turkey, mostly Syrians, Armenians and Turks, have come to the United States; while over 100,000 have found their way to Latin America. Argentina alone has 87,000 Syrians and Turks, Mexico 4,500 Turks and Arabs, and other states many more. All told, probably less than a million Asiatics have gone to the New World during the past seventy-five years, and about half of that number have made their homes in Latin America.

Japanese

Other Asiatics

Like the Negroes, the cultural contributions of the Mongolians and Hindus to America have been slight. In the field of industry they have supplied labor to build the railroads, to work the mines, to raise fruit, coffee and sugar cane, to man the fisheries of the north Pacific, and to do the truck farming. In 1920 the Japanese were tilling 463,000 acres and the Chinese 57,000 acres in the United States alone. Many of these orientals are engaged in business enterprises of their own, and have their own banking institutions. Thrifty and industrious, with a remarkable capacity for imitation, they are slowly being assimilated by western civilization. Japanese steamship lines run to both North and South America and carry on a tremendous commerce between the Orient and America. The western Asiatics, particularly the Syrians and the Armenians, find as little difficulty in adapting themselves to the ways of their new home as do the Europeans. Although the lower classes of the orientals mingle freely with the Indians and Negroes, yet the higher classes cultivate association with the whites, and intermarriages are not uncommon. Despite these contacts of the civilization of the New World with the native Indians, the Africans, and the Negroes, it has remained European in character as in origin, and yet at the same time it has been modified to meet

altered conditions. It has spread over the two continents, and has been adopted largely by the black, red, and yellow races.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

J. R. Commons, *Races and Immigrants in America* (1905); I. Hourwich, *Immigration and Labor* (1913), new edition (1925); E. A. Steiner, *The Immigrant Tide* (1909); P. Davis, *Immigration and Americanization* (1920); P. Berne, *L'immigration Européenne en Argentine* (1915); A. B. Faust, *The German Element in the United States*, 2 vols. (1909); H. J. Ford, *The Scotch-Irish in America* (1915); Grace Abbott, *Immigration: Select Documents and Reading* (1924); H. P. Fairchild, *Greek Immigration to the United States* (1911); G. T. Flom, *A History of Norwegian Immigration to the United States* (1909); J. Davis, *The Russian Immigrant* (1923); T. Capek, *The Cechs (Bohemians) in America* (1920); E. G. Balch, *Our Slavic Fellow Citizens* (1910); E. Lord, J. J. D. Trenor, and S. J. Barrows, *The Italian in America* (1905); W. J. Thomas, *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, 4 vols. (1917–1923); B. G. Brawley, *A Short History of the Negro in America* (1919, 2d ed.); *A Social History of the American Negro* (1921); U. B. Phillips, *American Negro Slavery* (1918); W. E. B. Dubois, *The Suppression of the African Slave Trade* (1896); Scott and Stowe, *Booker T. Washington* (1916); M. R. Coolidge, *Chinese Immigration* (1909); L. Gulick, *The American Japanese Problem* (1914); W. B. Pitkin, *Must We Fight Japan?* (1919); K. K. Kawakami, *Asia at the Door* (1914); H. A. Mills, *The Japanese Problem in the United States* (1915); T. Iyenaga and K. Sato, *Japan and the California Problem* (1921).

CHAPTER XXIX

THE UNITED STATES BECOMES A WORLD POWER

I. Territorial and Industrial Expansion

Industrial expansion

By the time the Civil War broke out in the United States, the territory had doubled two and a half times, making the country one of the largest on earth. Meanwhile the Industrial Revolution brought wealth and prosperity. The patents for mechanical inventions increased from 80 in 1812 to 5,000 in 1860, and included, among others, the reaper, threshing machine, planing mill, revolver, cook-stove, matches, the steam hammer, sewing machine, and rotary printing-press. About 28,000 miles of railroads covered the nation east of Omaha. Ocean liners were crossing the Atlantic in nine days, and the American merchant marine was larger than that of Great Britain. Hundreds of corporations were engaged in shipping, mining, and manufacturing. The exports exceeded the imports by $12,000,000. Many thousands of immigrants were drawn from northern Europe to take their places in industry and to fill the unoccupied lands of the middle west. The war between the North and the South, however, checked industrial progress for a decade or more.

Following the Civil War the South, after the abolition of slave labor, gradually adapted itself to new industrial conditions, and in addition to an improvement in agriculture also developed iron and coal mines, lumbering, fruit growing, and cotton mills. In the north there was a rush to the fertile lands of the west; the lumber industry flourished; and factories of all kinds multiplied with the investment of capital in thousands of new enterprises. In the entire nation the number of manufacturing establishments in 1919 numbered more than 290,000 and were employing over 9,000,000 workers. The value of their products exceeded $62,000,000,000, while the exports rose above $8,000,000,000. The total horsepower used in manufacturing between 1869 and 1919 multiplied fifteen times, and electricity, gasoline, and oil were rapidly replacing water, wind and steam as the sources of power. The total national wealth increased from $16,000,000,000 in 1860 to $350,000,000,000 in 1920. The quantity of coal produced has increased 97 times, pig iron 71, wheat 9, cotton 6, and corn 5. There are around 40,000 patents issued in a single year. The first trans-continental railroad was completed in 1869 and fifty years later the railways in the United States would girdle the globe more than ten times. These evidences of unparalleled material growth help

to explain why the United States has become such a tremendous factor in recent world history.

With the purchase of Alaska from Russia in 1867 there began a new era of national imperialism. Under President Cleveland, the United States assumed for the first time the responsibilities of a protectorate over Samoa jointly with Great Britain and Germany. Later these islands were divided among these three powers. In 1898 Hawaii was annexed and in 1900 it was given the usual territorial form of government. Some smaller islands in the Pacific, such as Midway and Wake, were occupied as coaling and cable stations. As a result of the Spanish-American War, Cuba, which is about as large as Pennsylvania, was given its independence, but has remained under the general supervision of the United States as a semi-protectorate, particularly in questions of finance. Porto Rico was ceded outright to the United States and is governed like a British crown colony. It is nearly twice the size of Delaware and has a population of about 1,300,000 (1920) of whom 75 per cent are white and 25 per cent colored. The organic act of 1900 provided for a governor and an executive council (the upper house of the legislature) to be appointed by the president of the United States, and a lower house to be elected by the voters of the island. The schools are free and attendance is compulsory. The Philippines, numbering 3,141 islands with an area three times that of the state of New York, also passed from Spain to the United States. Their acquisition, against the wishes of the natives, made the United States an Asiatic power with new problems and interests. This was a distinct departure in American history. The people numbered over 11,000,000 in 1923, of whom only about 10,000 are white. All the natives, except 10 per cent, are Christians — the largest group of Christians in Asia. The natives are mostly of the Malay race. Luzon, as large as Ohio, and Mindanao, as big as Indiana, are the two chief islands. Many Americans doubted the wisdom of holding the Philippines, but religious and commercial pressure, coupled with the fear that Germany or Japan might seize them, resulted in their retention. Desiring their independence, the natives, led by Aguinaldo, resisted American authority until the rebellion was put down in 1902. The colony was given self-government with the creation of a native legislature in 1907. In 1916 a legislature of two branches elected by the people was created, but the president of the United States still names the governor-general. It has been repeatedly stated officially that the Filipinos would be granted their complete independence as soon as they prove their capacity to manage their own affairs.

Territorial growth

In addition to these dependencies, the United States secured from Spain in 1898 the island of Guam, which is an important naval and cable station in the Pacific. The Virgin Islands off the coast of South America were purchased from Denmark in 1917. As important as these actual dependencies has been the extension of American in-

vestments and indirect political control in Latin-American countries, particularly in the West Indies, Mexico and a few other Latin-American states.

2. Pan-American Relations

For half a century the United States had been interested in the construction of a canal connecting the Atlantic with the Pacific, thus avoiding the long sea route around Cape Horn. In 1881 the French Panama Company began to work on such a canal, but after eight years of effort and the expenditure of $260,000,000, the enterprise ended in a financial scandal. The acquisition of territory in the Pacific and the Spanish-American War aroused public opinion in the United States to the imperative need of such a project. A new treaty with Great Britain in 1901 waived the joint control agreed upon in 1850, and permitted the United States to build the canal on condition that equal rates should be charged to all nations using the canal. President Roosevelt bought the French claims for $40,000,000. When Columbia refused to cede sovereignty over the strip of territory through which the canal would run, the province of Panama revolted and was promptly recognized as an independent republic. This new Panama Republic at once ceded to the United States a ten-mile strip of land from ocean to ocean, and the construction of the canal began. It was completed at a cost of less than $335,000,000 and in 1914 the first steamer, *Ancon*, of 10,000 tons passed through it. The distance by sea from New York to San Francisco was shortened by 7,800 miles. In 1924 the vessels passing through the canal numbered 4,673. The ownership of the Panama Canal assured to the United States the paramount position in the western world.

The United States and Latin America

President Roosevelt gave a new interpretation to the Monroe Doctrine, when he said that, if European powers were to be prevented from intervening in Latin-American states, the United States must assume "the exercise of an international police power." This policy, it was held, was not a self-denying ordinance; and its aim was not wholly altruistic, but was intended, primarily, to protect the United States. No sooner was this imperialistic tendency of the Monroe Doctrine announced than it called forth a storm of criticism. Some of the later presidents endorsed it, and under it the United States advanced its authority in the Caribbean Sea. In Central America protectorates were virtually established; finances supervised; coaling stations acquired; and disorderly countries policed. Porto Rico and the Panama Canal Zone were annexed; Cuba was brought under American control; the republics of Santo Domingo and Haiti were subjected to American military authority; and the finances of Nicaragua and Honduras were put in order. All available canal routes across the isthmus were secured by the United States to prevent the construction of a rival canal. A naval base was leased from Nicaragua at Fonseca Bay; and the Virgin Islands were acquired.

American imperialism

President Wilson, however, interpreted the Monroe Doctrine as an insurance of the free development of both the United States and the Latin-American republics, which he wished to be as "free from all outside dominion as we ourselves should be." He pointed out "that the United States will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest."

The Mexican Revolution caused President Wilson, immediately after his election in 1912, to announce the policy of the New Pan-Americanism: (1) "To cultivate the friendship and . . . confidence of our sister republics"; (2) to promote common interests; (3) to further free government and trade; and (4) to pledge the friendly hand of peace to all American republics. Pan-American congresses and the establishment at Washington of the International Bureau of the American Republics in 1890 — an organization which was enlarged and renamed the Bureau of the Pan-American Union in 1910 — led to the "Declaration of the Rights of Nations," proclaimed by the American Institute of International Law, in 1916, which set a new standard for international relations. Mexico was the test case of these worthy sentiments. The arbitrary arrest of American marines at Vera Cruz in 1914 resulted in the seizure of that city by the armed forces of the United States and the severance of diplomatic relations. Argentina, Brazil, and Chile tendered their good offices for a peaceful settlement, and President Wilson promptly accepted them. The American forces were withdrawn and General Carranza's government was recognized. Then a series of raids on American citizens across the northern border of Mexico by a bandit named Villa led to the sending of an American punitive expedition into Mexico. Powerful organizations with investments in Mexican lands, mines, and oil fields, clamored for war, and denounced President Wilson's policy of "watchful waiting." But he disregarded the cries of the imperialists, and announced that he intended to give the Mexican people every assistance to reorganize their national life. President Harding in 1921 said that the history of the Monroe Doctrine proved that "we never intended it selfishly; that we had no dream of exploitation"; and that America intended it to protect "these sturdy young democracies from oppression and tyranny."

Mexican policy of the United States

3. The Era of "Big Business"

After 1880 the smaller business enterprises were consolidated into larger concerns known as "trusts." Within a decade the number of independent mills, mines, and factories decreased about 30 per cent through these industrial combinations. For instance, the Standard Oil Company, organized in 1865 with a capital of $100,000, was one of 250 competing companies in 1870. By 1882, under the skilful management of John D. Rockefeller, most of these independent oil companies were brought under one board of control. Then the company began to absorb banks, iron mines, coal mines, transportation

Rise of large-scale business enterprise

lines, and oil fields in the southwest, in Mexico, and in other parts of the world. Other concerns, in like manner, sought to control railroads, mines, steel mills, express companies, food supplies, steamship lines, the textile industry, and wearing apparel. In 1899 there were probably 350 of these "trusts" with a total capital of $3,000,000,000; and by 1905 the number had increased to 1,000 with a total capital of $30,000,000,000. The United States Steel Corporation, formed in 1901, had a capital of $1,100,100,000 and a bonded indebtedness of $3,000,000,000. In 1919, 1,021 industrial plants were each employing over 1,000 persons or a total of 2,400,000 workers, which was 26 per cent of all wage-earners in the nation. At the same time wages increased and the working hours decreased.

As a result of this newer Industrial Revolution, both the output and the profits were increased greatly. To sell the surplus products, new markets had to be secured. The surplus capital was invested abroad — particularly in backward parts of the world — in all sorts of enterprises. Hence the demand arose that the national government should protect foreign trade and investments. This suggestion was denounced as "dollar diplomacy" and became a party issue. Before the Civil War, men of unusual ability entered politics; after that, they went into business as "captains of industry" to reap rewards and honors. They moulded the policy of the nation both at home and abroad. As a rule they favored high protective tariffs and opposed governmental interference with domestic business, while urging an aggressive, imperialistic foreign policy. They believed that American isolation was at an end and were proud of the new status of the nation as one of the great world powers.

Attempt to curb monopoly

So much hostility against the great monopolies came from the small producers, the consumers, and the laborers, that public opinion forced Congress to attempt to regulate them. The Sherman Anti-Trust Act of 1890 forbade "every combination in restraint of interstate commerce." The Supreme Court interpreted this law to apply only to transportation and organizations carrying on trade between states, and defined "every combination" to mean "every unreasonable combination." President Roosevelt drew a line between good trusts and bad trusts, and, by bringing over forty suits against those that were seeking to control the necessities of life, sought to eliminate the evils resulting from the growth of "trusts." He proposed to bring them under governmental regulation, and not to destroy them.

4. Foreign Relations

When Napoleon III, believing that the Southern Confederacy would win in the Civil War, sought to establish an empire in Mexico under the pretext of collecting debts, his project was denounced as a violation of the Monroe Doctrine. Confronted by the victorious North, Napoleon withdrew his army and abandoned his scheme. Serious disputes also arose with Great Britain during the Civil War

over the depredations of the *Alabama* and other cruisers built in the British Isles. The United States insisted upon reparation for the damages done by these vessels, and the British government finally yielded to arbitration before the Geneva Tribunal, which rendered a decision favorable to the American Republic. This successful use of arbitration served as an example for the determination of later international troubles. To settle an old dispute between Great Britain and Venezuela over the boundary of British Guiana, which became acute in 1895, the United States repeatedly suggested arbitration, but the British government refused. Then President Cleveland brusquely announced to Congress that Great Britain sought to control Venezuela in clear violation of the Monroe Doctrine, and made it plain that this might mean war. Secretary of State Olney said: "Today the United States is practically sovereign on this continent." In the end the British government wisely concluded to arbitrate and in 1899 secured most of the territory in dispute. During the Spanish-American War the attitude of Great Britain was uniformly friendly. The Hay-Pauncefote treaty in 1901 gave the United States a free hand in building the Panama Canal, and recognized American naval supremacy in the West Indies and the Caribbean Sea. In like manner the quarrel over tolls for American coast-wise ships passing through the Canal was amicably adjusted by act of Congress. The Alaskan boundary dispute was arbitrated and decided for the most part in favor of the United States. Finally a treaty was signed providing for the arbitration of all differences between the two nations.

Relations with Europe

In 1902 Germany made a test of the Monroe Doctrine to see whether the United States would fight to maintain it. Securing the coöperation of the British and Italian navies, a demonstration was made against Venezuela to force her to recognize the validity of certain debts. Following the advice of the United States, Venezuela admitted the legality of the claims, but asked that the amounts be arbitrated. This offer was accepted by Great Britain and Italy, but refused by Germany. Under President Roosevelt's threat of war, Germany at last agreed to refer the question to the Hague Court.

The policy of the United States not to interfere in the internal policies of European states did not prevent occasional protests in the name of humanity, such as those made against the ill-treatment of the Jews in both Rumania and Russia. When the Moroccan question was discussed at the conference of Algeciras, American delegates participated and supported France against Germany. In ratifying the treaty, however, the Senate declared that it was not the intention of this country to abandon its traditional policy in reference to Europe. Official representatives were also present at the two Hague Peace Conferences, took an active part in the proceedings, and signed the treaties, but with an express provision that the documents would, in nowise, involve a departure from the Monroe Doctrine. In like manner American delegates were sent to the London Naval Conference

The Monroe Doctrine and the problem of isolation

in 1908 to formulate a naval code for peace and war. The United States was also a member of the International Postal Union, the Telegraph Union, the Pan-American Union, the Agricultural Institute, and other international organizations. Thus despite her vaunted isolation, the United States before 1914 had come to coöperate with the states of Europe in treaties, conferences, and world organizations. In the World War, for the first time, she sent an army to fight on European soil and participated in the Peace Conference which followed.

The policy of the United States in the Orient

In dealing with the Orient, the United States pursued a different policy. She helped to break down the exclusion of both Japan and China. To protect her trade with China, which was second only to that of Great Britain, she insisted upon equal privileges with other nations, stood for the integrity of Chinese territority, and advocated the "open door" policy in business. The European powers were asked to give their assent to these proposals. Japan and Great Britain expressed a willingness to sign such a treaty, but the other powers merely professed accord with the suggestions. The United States joined the great states with an armed force in suppressing the "Boxer" rebellion, and kept her troops in Pekin for some time thereafter to protect her citizens. American goodwill towards China was shown in the return of $13,000,000 of the $24,000,000 collected in the Boxer indemnity fund. The acquisition of the Philippine Islands in 1898 made the United States an Asiatic power with a right to speak her mind in the problems of the Far East. The United States was instrumental in inducing China to enter the World War against Germany. Despite the Lansing-Ishii agreement which recognized Japan's "special interests" in China, the United States was disposed to recognize China's plea for the return of Shantung to her by Japan. At the Disarmament Conference held at Washington in 1921 Japan agreed to restore Shantung to China and Great Britain promised to return Wei-hai-wei.

From the time the World's Columbian Exposition was held in Chicago in 1893, it may be said that the United States was taking her place in world affairs, and a new era had dawned in world history. During the past thirty years world politics took on a new meaning in consequence. The United States began to have a large excess in production to sell abroad and a surplus of capital to invest in other portions of the globe. She now commenced to acquire dependencies, to assert the open door for trade in the undeveloped parts of the earth, to build up a huge navy to protect her world interests and a merchant marine to care for her overseas trade, and to intervene in other countries. These advantages were obtained partly by peace and partly by war. With the aid of noisy patriots, shrewd business men, and missionaries, the United States, in successful imitation of the powers of Europe, has played the game of national imperialism in increasing the national domain.

5. Political, Social, and Educational Changes

Since the Civil War the Republican party has controlled the presidency for forty years, or ten presidential terms, while the Democratic party has been in power only sixteen years, or during four presidential terms. Prior to the Spanish-American War, the chief political issues were civil service reform, the tariff, and the currency. After that event came the "trusts," the preservation of natural resources, reforms, imperialism, and foreign policies. Woodrow Wilson was the fifth president born in the south since Andrew Jackson. Under President Wilson the constitution was amended: (1) to elect senators by direct vote; (2) to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors; and (3) to enfranchise women. The Federal Reserve Banking scheme was created to improve the financial system. The Federal Trade Commission was authorized to supervise business corporations, and the Farm Loan Bureau and the Federal Land Banks were created for the benefit of the farmer. The admission of Arizona as a state in 1912 completed the statehood of the nation. The policy of conservation of the natural resources of the nation was adopted. The movement towards more direct popular government resulted in many new state constitutions, in safeguards of the right to vote, in commission government for more than two hundred cities, and in experiments with the direct primary, the initiative and referendum, and the recall. The general tendency has been in the direction of a more responsive, more responsible, and more progressive democracy.

Political progress

Since the Civil War the people trebled in number and spread across the continent; and in 1924 the population was estimated at 117,000,000. During this period about 32,000,000 immigrants came from other lands — sometimes more than a million in a single year. Prior to 1890 most of them were from northern Europe; afterwards, from southern and eastern Europe. Today the United States is the most polyglot nation on earth. Here are found not only representatives from all the countries of Europe, but also hundreds of thousands from Asia, many from Canada and Latin America, the native Indians, and 11,000,000 Negroes. In 1914 there were over 1,300 newspapers and other periodicals in foreign languages. In many of the large cities of the north the foreign population outnumbers the native-born. This situation presented so many grave problems that various "Americanization" movements and severe restrictions on immigration resulted.

Population increases

The general welfare of the people was left, for the most part, to the individual states. Under President Roosevelt and later executives, however, federal legislation began to provide for public well-being. The examples of Germany and Great Britain were followed by the states and national government in protecting the working classes from disease, accident, poverty, unsanitary homes and factories, long hours, low wages, immorality, adulteration of food, and

Federal and state legislation

exploitation. Penal institutions were reformed to reclaim the criminal for useful citizenship. Unfortunates were housed in comfortable institutions. Women were given equal opportunities with men in education, employment, and the professions. Hundreds of organizations of all sorts were formed to aid in the work of social welfare. Wage-earners and employers formed unions to protect their own interests. Socialism increased its vote in the national elections from 21,000 in 1892 to 915,000 in 1920. Communism spread likewise among the discontented, especially the foreign-born.

Education

Unlike most of the European countries, the national government did not concern itself directly with the education of the people. This work was left to the states and local communities. About $600,000,000 was spent in 1920 and 600,000 teachers provided to educate some 23,000,000 children. The income of the colleges and universities in 1924 was over $152,000,000. The illiteracy of those above ten years of age dropped to less than 8 per cent, although it was 13 per cent among the foreign-born, and over 30 per cent among the Negroes. The news of the world was supplied to the people by 2,600 daily newspapers, and 16,000 weeklies, while thousands of free public libraries were scattered over the country.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

A. C. Coolidge, *The U. S. as a World Power* (1914); E. E. Sparks, *National Development* (1907), D. R. Dewey, *National Problems* (1907); *Financial History of the United States* (1903); J. R. Latané, *America as a World Power* (1907); F. A. Ogg, *National Progress* (1917); C. A. Beard, *Contemporary American History* (1914); *American Government and Politics* (1910); P. L. Haworth, *The United States in Our Own Times* (1920); C. R. Lingley, *Since the Civil War* (1920); F. L. Paxson, *Recent History of the United States* (1921); J. F. Rhodes, *History of United States from Hayes to McKinley, 1877–1896* (1919); *The McKinley and Roosevelt Administrations, 1897–1909* (1922); E. Stanwood, *A History of the Presidency*, 2 vols. (1897, 1912); F. W. Taussig, *Tariff History of the United States* (1910); I. Lippincott, *The Economic Development of the United States* (1920); I. M. Tarbell, *History of the Standard Oil Company* (1903); A. H. Walker, *History of the Sherman Law* (1913); O. W. Knauth, *The Policy of the United States towards Industrial Monopolies* (1914); F. H. Dixon, *Railroads and Government: their Relations in the United States, 1910–1921* (1922); J. R. Commons and others, *History of Labour in the United States*, 2 vols. (1918); S. Perlman, *A History of Trade Unionism in The United States* (1922); R. H. Hoxie, *Trade Unionism in the United States* (1919); M. Hillquit, *History of Socialism in the United States* (1905); P. F. Brissenden, *The I.W.W.: a Study of American Syndicalism* (1919); J. Bryce, *The American Commonwealth*, 2 vols. (1888, 1919); *Modern Democracies*, 2 vols. (1920); M. Ostrogorski, *Democracy and the Organization of Political Parties*, 2 vols. (1910); C. E. Merriam, *American Political Ideas: 1865–1917* (1920); *The American Party System* (1922); J. E. Young, *The New American Government and its Work* (1913); F. A. Ogg and P. O. Ray, *An Introduction to American Government* (1922); H. Croly, *The Promise of American Life* (1909); W. Weyl, *The New Democracy* (1912); E. A. Ross, *Changing America* (1912); F. E. Haynes, *Third Party Movements since the Civil War, with Special Reference to Iowa* (1916); B. DeWitt, *The Progressive Movement* (1915); C. R. Fish, *American Diplomacy* (1919); J. R. Latané, *The United States and Latin America* (1920); F. E. Chadwick, *The Relations of the United States and Spain* (1909); *The Relations of the United States and Spain: The Spanish-American War* (1911); D. C. Worcester, *The Philippine Islands* (1914); T. F. Millard, *America and the Far Eastern Question* (1909); C. L. Jones, *The Caribbean Interests of the United States* (1916); J. B. Bishop, *The Panama Gateway* (1913); *Theodore*

Roosevelt and his Time Shown in his own Letters (1920); W. Weyl, *American World Policies* (1917); T. Dennett, *Americans in Eastern Asia* (1923); E. E. Robinson and V. J. West, *The Foreign Policy of Woodrow Wilson* (1917); P. B. Potter, *The Myth of American Isolation* (1922); A. D. White, *Autobiography*, 2 vols. (1905); R. M. McElroy, *Grover Cleveland, the Man and the Statesman* (1924); H. Adams, *The Education of Henry Adams* (1919); H. Croly, *Marcus Alonzo Hanna* (1912); W. R. Thayer, *Life and Letters of John Hay*, 2 vols. (1915); *Theodore Roosevelt: an Intimate Biography* (1919); T. Roosevelt, *Autobiography* (1913); *The New Nationalism* (1910); R. M. La Follette, *Autobiography* (1913); W. E. Dodd, *Woodrow Wilson and His Work* (1920); D. Y. Thomas, *One Hundred Years of the Monroe Doctrine* (1923), P. S. Mowrer, *Our Foreign Affairs* (1924); H. A. Gibbons, *America's Place in the World* (1924); R. B. Mowat, *Diplomatic Relations of Great Britain and the United States* (1925); H. C. Hockett and A. M. Schlesinger, *Political and Social History of the United States*, 2 vols. (1925).

CHAPTER XXX

THE LATIN-AMERICAN REPUBLICS

1. Civilization

Latin America stretches from the southwestern border of the United States to Cape Horn. It consists of eighteen Spanish-American republics, the Portuguese-American republic of Brazil, and the French-American republic of Haiti. These twenty republics have a combined area three times that of the United States, and a total population of 85,000,000. The Amazon River has four times the volume of water of the Mississippi, and steamers of the largest size may go up it over a thousand miles. The population consists of Negroes, Indians, and whites, and their mixed offspring. These races have intermarried until the *mestizo* or half-breed has become the typical Latin American. Indian blood predominates, and Mexico, Peru, Ecuador, Paraguay and Bolivia might be called Indian nations. At no time has the pure European stock exceeded 10 per cent of the population, and most of the great national leaders have been half-breeds.

Race and territory

Latin-American civilization was founded on political absolutism, religious intolerance, and commercial greed. The church and state combined to monopolize the land and business, and to exploit the people. Hence, well into the nineteenth century, in education and industrial progress, Latin America lagged far behind western Europe and Anglo-Saxon North America. This backwardness was due to (1) the scarcity of enterprising Europeans; (2) the division of the land into large plantations under the clergy and the *conquistadores;* (3) the lack of capital to develop the rich natural resources; (4) the unstable character of the governments; and (5) the exploitations by foreigners. With the development of national independence there has been a great improvement. The cultural life is largely that of the Romance countries of Europe. A small class is highly educated, but the vast majority of the people are illiterates. All Latin America spends less for education than the single city of New York. Brooklyn alone has more churches than are found in the whole state of Argentina. In Colombia there is only one physician for every 6,000 people. Along the coast are some modern cities, but most of the interior of South America is as undeveloped as central Africa.

Latin-American origins

2. Political, Social, and Economic Development

The political history of Latin America has been characterized by revolutions, civil wars, and the interference of foreign adventurers. By 1829 revolts against the European motherlands resulted in the

creation of ten new republics in Latin America, and by 1903 this number had multiplied to twenty. The political life of these states has been stormy and full of changes. Revolutions against privilege, corruption, and despotic officials have been frequent. Numerous disputes have occurred over unsettled boundary lines. Venezuela, it is estimated, has had fifty-two revolts within a century; Bolivia, sixty since 1825. Governments changed hands more frequently by *coup d'états* than by ballots. Races, classes, wealth, and business have all been factors in these numerous squabbles, out of which have emerged a better conception of democracy, and a more stable reign of law and order. The constitutions of these republics resemble those of the United States and France, and contain guaranties of jury trial, freedom of speech, press and assembly, universal male franchise, and private property. Latin America has been one of the world's greatest laboratories for the evolution of popular government.

Political development

Of the twenty republics, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile are the most powerful, the most progressive, and the best governed. They have also, with the exception of Mexico, received the most foreign capital, and the largest number of foreign immigrants. Argentina lies in the temperate zone, is as large as the United States east of the Mississippi, and had a population in 1923 of 10,000,000 of whom the foreign-born constituted 18 per cent. The national government is a federal republic. More has been done there for education than in any other Latin-American state, yet 50 per cent of the people are illiterate. Agriculture is the chief occupation, and in 1920 Argentina was the world's largest exporter of linseed and Indian corn, and the third largest of wheat, yet only a quarter of the arable land is under cultivation. Cotton-growing and stock raising are profitable industries. In 1920 Argentina was third among American nations and tenth in the world in respect to her railway mileage, over 4,000 miles being owned by the state. Brazil lies mostly in the torrid zone, is as large as the United States and Germany combined, and contained, in 1920, 30,000,000 people. Vast regions of the interior are still unsettled and some even unexplored, resembling the United States seventy-five years ago. The constitution of 1891 created a federal republic much like that of the United States. Education is free but not compulsory. Agriculture is the chief source of the nation's wealth, and four fifths of the world's supply of coffee is grown. Cotton, rubber and hides are also sold abroad. In 1921 there were 242 cotton mills with 51,000 looms and 1,500,000 spindles in operation. Agassiz predicted that in time the Amazon valley would be the center of the world's civilization. Chile is 2,500 miles long and would extend from Alaska to Mexico. It is three times the size of the state of Washington, and has more than 4,000,000 people of whom only 4 per cent are foreigners. The government is a strongly centralized republic like France. About half of the railways are owned by the state. Agriculture and mining of nitrates, copper and coal are the principal occupations. Under an intelligent

A. B. C. powers

Brazilian centennial celebrated in 1922 at Rio Janeiro

and wealthy middle class the country is one of the most progressive in Latin America.

Bolivia, the only South American country, except Paraguay, without a seaport, is as large as the Pacific coast states in the United States, yet has only 3,000,000 people. There are vast areas as large as Texas still unsettled. Tropical jungles, deserts, and mountains cut Bolivia off from her neighbors. The government is a republic like France, and the state church is Roman Catholic. The civilization is backward and 85 per cent of the people are illiterates. Uruguay, the smallest state in South America, is eight times the size of Massachusetts, with 1,500,000 people, largely foreign-born. The new constitution of 1916 made many experiments in social reforms and political democracy. The government owns the means of transportation and communication, and has a monopoly of all insurance. Montevideo has one of the few colleges for women in Latin America, and is a noted literary center. Primary education is obligatory. Colombia is rich in resources, yet want and suffering abound. It is twice the size of Texas, and has 6,500,000 people. It could be a paradise, but is one of the most backward states on the globe. Its government is a loose and unstable republic. The few small railroads aggregating 800 miles are all owned by foreigners. Venezuela is three times the size of the British Isles with a population half that of London. The people are poor and 85 per cent are illiterate. It is said that a building for the exclusive use of education had never been constructed until the twentieth century. Because of the wretched financial conditions, the United States has had to intervene twice to protect the country from European powers. It has been in almost constant political turmoil. Ecuador is another backward state, intolerant in religion, with a large Indian population, and few Europeans. There are only twelve schools above the sixth grade in the whole land. In 1915 Ecuador spent $600,000 for education, while Nebraska with the same population spent $10,000,000. Peru, the land of romance and legend, is three times as large as Texas, and has a population of 5,000,000 of whom only 14 per cent are white. Of the 900,000 children only 147,000 are in schools, for which $1,000,000 is spent annually — just twice what the city of Detroit expends for night schools and municipal playgrounds. The chief wealth of Peru is found in its minerals. Paraguay has the lowest percentage of whites and the lowest degree of civilization of any state in Latin America. There are (1924) only 225 miles of railway in the whole country, and but $225,000 is appropriated each year for education.

In Central America and the islands of the Antilles, the leading men seem to devote themselves to politics and civil wars, while industry, commerce, and agriculture are neglected. Guatemala, located just south of Mexico, is larger than the state of New York, and has a population of 2,000,000, of whom 60 per cent are Indians and the remainder half-breeds and Negroes, there being few full-blooded

Europeans. There is complete religious freedom, and education is compulsory. A railroad has been built from ocean to ocean, and lateral lines to Panama and to Mexico are projected. Honduras is about the size of Guatemala, has 745,000 people, and is the least developed of the Central American states. The legislature is unique in consisting of a single house. There is religious freedom, and free compulsory education. A railroad 150 miles long is operated by the government. Nicaragua is slightly larger than Honduras, with 700,000 inhabitants, and is somewhat more advanced. Salvador, about as large as New Jersey, with 1,700,000 people, also has a legislature of one chamber. Education is free and obligatory. The country is fairly prosperous. Costa Rica is not quite so extensive as West Virginia, and contains 600,000 people. It has a reputation for peace and stability. There is religious liberty, and education is free. The legislature consists of one body. Before 1920 the project to form a Central American Union was revived, and early in 1921 the pact was signed by Guatemala, Honduras, and Salvador. Nicaragua refused to sign it, and the National Assembly of Costa Rica repudiated the favorable action of her delegates. *Central America*

The only Latin-American republic touching the United States is Mexico, a state as large as Germany, France, Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, Switzerland, and Cuba combined. The population in 1921 was over 14,000,000 of whom 38 per cent were Indians, 43 per cent mixed, and 19 per cent whites. In recent years thousands of foreigners have settled in Mexico. The revolution of 1876 brought General Díaz, a pure-blooded Indian, into power. He built up a powerful paternal despotism without improving the lot of the people. To develop the country industrially, he granted concessions and privileges to foreign capitalists, and thus brought seeming prosperity to the country. He gave the country peace, but did little to democratize or socialize the nation. When in 1911 an uprising consisting mainly of the peons, or farm laborers, forced him to flee to Spain, a long era of civil wars between rival generals followed. At last in 1917 a modern constitution was adopted, and General Carranza was elected president, but it took him three more years to pacify the country. Carranza was succeeded in the presidential office by General Obregón. In natural resources Mexico is one of the richest countries in the world. There are 16,000 miles of railroads, mostly under government control. The school law of 1896 provided for free, compulsory education for all children up to twelve years of age. Commendable efforts were made to improve the secondary and higher education. About 85 per cent of the people are still illiterate. Under President Calles the nation has gradually secured both political and financial stability, and the liberal constitution is going far towards the solution of other vital problems. *Mexico*

The islands known as the Antilles, or West Indies, have a total area of about the same extent as that of Great Britain. The Indians

(Caribs and Arawaks) have almost entirely diasppeared, and have been replaced by Negroes, who constitute a majority of the population, and by Europeans and Asiatics. The Greater Antilles include Cuba, Jamaica, Haiti, and Porto Rico, and are now controlled by either the United States or Great Britain. The Lesser Antilles consist of numerous and comparatively insignificant islands.

3. Economic Penetration and Foreign Relations

Latin America is the land of the future; today it is one of the "backward parts of the earth." It needs capital, brains, capacity for organization, and honest, capable leadership. It contains the most sparsely settled regions of the globe, and yet is capable of accommodating a denser population than either Europe or Asia. Its natural wealth is well-nigh unlimited. The governments grow more stable each year. Streams of foreign capital are flowing into the various countries for railroads, steamship lines, factories, mines, schools, city improvements, and humanitarian institutions. London, Paris, Berlin and New York are heavy creditors. It was said that in 1914 British investors had loaned $3,000,000,000 — an amount larger than that borrowed from any other country. The British held oil concessions in Mexico, railways in Argentina, nitrate mines in Chile, and numerous additional investments. Americans were reported to be in possession of four fifths of the oil in Mexico, railroads, banks, mines, plantations, and the Caribbean Sea was spoken of as an American "sphere of influence." The French, Dutch, Germans and Italians also had valuable holdings. Spanish trade with Latin America has expanded somewhat since 1914. In 1913 the Brazilian government owed London creditors $450,000,000. Honduras allowed the interest on her loans to accumulate until it amounted to $35,000,000. For every loan of foreign money, valuable concessions were granted in lands, minerals, oil fields, transportation lines, financial institutions, and shipping privileges. The wealth of Latin America, therefore, is enriching foreign nations more than the natives.

Industry and imperialism

These foreign loans were used ofttimes to encourage political disorders. These uprisings, in turn, led to demands for more concessions as compensation for the loss of the life and property of foreigners. European nations repeatedly sought to collect their debts by force, and the United States was compelled to intervene to bring about a settlement. Threatened with national bankruptcy, the poorer Latin-American republics have become little more than financial vassals of European and American financiers. The people must develop a higher intelligence, a sense of thrift, and a policy of economy so that they can produce enough to pay off their debts abroad and become economically self-supporting. A few of the most progressive republics, like Argentina, are already doing this. The foreign trade of Latin America, now over $4,000,000,000 annually, is growing by leaps and bounds, since the opening of the Panama Canal.

The Latin Americans express gratitude for the assistance of the Monroe Doctrine in preserving their independence from European despotism, but they say that it has changed "from the defensive to intervention, and thence to the offensive." They speak of "Yankee imperialism" and the "North American peril" as threatening their life. As proofs of the imperialistic intentions of the United States, they point to the annexation of Texas in 1845; the expansion into Mexican provinces in 1848 and 1853; the conquest of Porto Rico in 1898; the control of the Panama Canal Zone in 1903; military intervention in Cuba, Haiti, Santo Domingo, and Mexico; and the purchase of the Virgin Islands in 1917. They resent the assertion of Secretary of State Olney that the United States is "sovereign on this continent," and call attention to the "*big stick*" policy of President Roosevelt. They show how American financiers, through a network of banks, are seeking to establish a monopoly of credit, and to persuade Latin Americans to transfer their foreign loans from Europe to the United States. The meat trust in Argentina; the land syndicate in Guatemala; the oil and copper trusts in Mexico, they declare, all indicate the money invasion of the sister republic of the north. Some alarmists have even asserted that Latin America was saved from European control so that it might be absorbed eventually by the United States.

Attitude of Latin America towards the United States

Notwithstanding these hostile criticisms, the Latin-American republics have joined the United States in the Pan-American Union, which includes twenty-one free states — the whole American continent, except Canada and a few European dependencies. It embraces an area equal to four Europes and 200,000,000 people. This voluntary Union, based on consent, without a constitution, was organized in 1890 by James G. Blaine. It grew out of a series of Pan-American conferences, beginning with that called in 1826 by Bolivar to resist Spain. The name Pan-American Union was adopted in 1910. Its purposes are: to promote mutual interests; to encourage reciprocal trade; to preserve republican ideals; to settle international differences by arbitration; and to strive for peaceable progress. The governing board consists of the diplomatic representatives of the republics at Washington with the American secretary of state acting as president. Each republic has one vote. The affairs of the Union are administered by a director-general, an assistant director, and a staff of experts on language, law, and trade, who seek in every way to promote friendly relations. Thus far, a closer political union has been prevented by jealousies, the inability to agree on representation and voting, and an intense nationalism. The Union is housed in a fine building located at Washington. Its decorations illustrate the history of western civilization, and it contains the Columbus Library of over 40,000 volumes and a fine statue of universal peace. This latter spirit is echoed in South America by a statue of Christ, the Prince of Peace, cast from war cannon, and erected after a war between Argentina and Chile on

Pan-Americanism

the highest peak of the Andes upon the new boundary line between the two republics. On its pedestal is this inscription: "Sooner shall these mountains crumble to dust than Argentinians and Chileans break the peace which at the feet of Christ the Redeemer they have sworn to maintain."

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

F. G. Calderon, *Latin America, its Rise and Progress*, English translation by B. Miall (1913); W. R. Shepherd, *Latin America* (1914), W. S Robertson, *History of the Latin-American Republics* (1922), *Hispanic American Relations with the United States* (1923); C. R. Enock, *The Republics of Central and South America* (1913), D. G. Munro, *The Five Central American Republics* (1918); J. Bryce, *South America: Observations and Impressions* (1912), E. A. Ross, *South of Panama* (1915); G. H. Blakeslee, editor, *Mexico and the Caribbean* (1920); P. Denis, *Brazil in the XX^e Century* (1910); *The Argentine Republic* (1922); P. Berne, *L'immigration européenne en Argentina* (1915); G. F. S. Elliot, *Chile* (1909), P. J. Eder, *Colombia* (1913); P. F Martin, *Mexico of the Twentieth Century* (1907); E. D. Trowbridge, *Mexico Today and Tomorrow* (1919), J. Barrett, *The Pan-American Union* (1911); R. B. Merriman, *The Rise of the Spanish Empire in the Old World and the New*, Vol. III (1925); J. F. Rippy, *The United States and Mexico, 1821-1924* (1926).

CHAPTER XXXI

THE BRITISH EMPIRE

1. Great Extent of the British Empire

Never in the world's history has there been a political organization so great in extent or so large in population as the British Empire at the close of the World War. The English are the most persistent and successful colonial organizers of modern times, and have been the most successful in dealing with native peoples. In 1800 the British Empire included 1,500,000 square miles and 20,000,000 people. By 1850 this Empire had increased to an area of 7,500,000 square miles and had multiplied in population eight times. England, more than any other European country, was compelled to send her surplus population overseas to her "Dominions." In 1919 the Empire had again more than trebled in size over that of 1850 (27,500,000 sq. mi.), while the population had increased to 475,000,000. With the acquisition of the German colonies in Africa and the south Pacific, and of Turkish territory in the Near East, this gigantic Empire includes one fourth of the human race and almost one quarter of the land area of the earth. The British Empire extends throughout both the northern and southern hemispheres, the Old World and the New, and includes portions of the six continents of the globe, chiefly about the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. Within it live peoples of every race, of every degree of progress, and of every great religion, who are governed by a white minority of 67,000,000 in possession of less than half of the Empire. Of the whites, 47,000,000 are in Great Britain, and 20,000,000 in the colonies. About 3,000,000 of the latter are of non-English stock, as for instance the French in Canada and the Dutch in South Africa. According to the character of their government, the British colonies are divided into four kinds: (1) the five autonomous commonwealths of Canada, Newfoundland, Australia, New Zealand, and the Union of South Africa; (2) the numerous crown colonies; (3) the Empire of India, with a crown-colony type of government; and (4) the protectorates and mandates.

Extent of the Empire

The possession of this vast Empire has given Great Britain and her progressive white colonies access to vital raw materials such as antimony, asbestos, borax, copper, cotton, graphite, lead, manganese, nickel, thorium, tin, wood, wool, rubber, zinc, copra, and oils. It has also supplied them with an inexhaustible food supply. The question had often been raised before 1914 whether, in case Great Britain should be involved in a war with the militarist powers of Europe, the self-governing Dominions would go to her aid. In-

fluenced partly by "the call of the blood" but mostly by the belief that free institutions were at stake, they revealed an unparalleled devotion to the Allied cause. This was the first occasion when the younger communities of the Empire combined with the motherland to resist an autocracy that threatened the dissolution of the Empire, although they had rendered military assistance to the mother country for suppressing the Boers at the opening of the century. In doing so these Dominions acted as more than mere provinces, since the support of Great Britain was voluntary. As a result of their action they gained a new status both in the Empire and in the world.

2. The Dominion of Canada

Origins of Canada

Canada was a French colony captured in 1763 by the British. Permitted to retain their own language, laws, and religion, these Frenchmen have been, on the whole, loyal to Great Britain. The English-speaking inhabitants came from: (1) the Loyalists who left the Thirteen Colonies during the Revolution; (2) immigrants from the British Isles; and (3) immigrants from the United States and other countries. The French formed Lower Canada; the English, Upper Canada; and in addition, there were the colonies of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland, as well as the fur-trading regions belonging to the Hudson's Bay Company. These seven colonies had independent governments under the British crown. As early as 1791 the two Canadas received written constitutions, which created legislatures chosen by the people, but gave to a governor, appointed by the king, a veto on all legislation. The American Revolution taught Great Britain not to tax her colonies, but led to a tightening of imperial control in other directions. As a result, quarrels like those in the Thirteen Colonies arose between the popular assemblies and the royal governors and councils, which culminated in the Rebellion of 1837. Unlike the American Revolution, this revolt was readily suppressed. Still the British authorities were so alarmed that Lord Durham was sent over to study the causes of discontent and to recommend changes.

After spending five months in Canada, Lord Durham came to the conclusion that it was necessary to give the colonists complete control over their own domestic affairs, and hence advised: (1) the reunion of Upper and Lower Canada with provisions by which the Maritime Provinces might later unite to form a federation; and (2) that each colony be granted democratic self-government, by making the ministry in each colony responsible to the local legislature. A third recommendation of major importance related to the clear distinction between local and imperial matters. This report has been called the "Magna Charta of British colonial self-government." The two Canadas in 1840 were united under one legislature, with a ministry, and a royal governor. This example of "responsible government" was followed later in other colonies,

where the white population predominated, and insured loyalty and contentment. Thus what George III had surrendered to the people of Great Britain, the British government gave up to the people of each colony. In 1867 most of the colonies except Newfoundland were united into a national government called the Dominion of Canada, which reflected in part the influence of the United States, and in part that of Great Britain. Mistakes which American experience revealed were avoided. Prince Edward Island entered in 1873, and the Hudson's Bay territories were purchased in 1869. The provinces were granted self-government, though not so much as in the American states, for the nation, and not the states, was sovereign. The federal legislature consisted of a Senate appointed for life by the governor-general, and a House of Commons of 72 members chosen by popular vote. The cabinet was subject to the lower house. Thus Canada exercised all the rights of a separate state, save that foreign policies were controlled by the British Parliament. Certain tendencies growing out of the World War show that even this supervision is declining and may be surrendered eventually. The governor-general sent over by the king is the chief official bond of union with the motherland. *Canada levies its own tariffs on British goods as well as on* those from other lands. There is, however, the right of judicial appeal, and the constitution was passed upon by the British Parliament.

The Dominion of Canada

Like the United States, Canada gradually stretched across the continent. Manitoba was admitted to statehood in 1870; British Columbia in 1871; Prince Edward Island in 1873; Alberta and Saskatchewan in 1905. Today the Dominion is larger than either the United States or Europe. Newfoundland, with 263,000 people in 1924, has steadfastly refused to join the Dominion, and manages its own affairs as an independent colony. Western Canada has seen a constant influx of immigrants, often 300,000 in a single year, from Europe and the United States. Four trunk railroads now link the two oceans. The Canadian Pacific Railroad, completed across Canada in 1885, forms a vast network of 12,000 miles and with its steamers on the Atlantic and Pacific is one of the greatest systems of transportation in the world. The Canadian National Railway has absorbed most of the once independent lines. The mineral wealth has brought millions into the country for investment, and lumbering is also a thriving industry. The population of 500,000 in 1815 has grown to nearly 9,000,000 in 1925. Agriculture and manufacturing have kept pace with the growth in wealth and population, and over 39,000 students are in attendance at 23 universities.

Canadian progress

3. The Commonwealth of Australia

The Commonwealth of Australia, which embraces the smallest of the continents and in size approximates the United States or Europe, is a creation of the last century. Captain Cook made a voyage to New Zealand and New South Wales in the same year that Watt

patented his steam engine. From a small penal colony of 750 convicts sent to Botany Bay in 1788 by the advice of Joseph Banks, a member of the Cook party, its population, chiefly British, has gradually grown until in 1921 Australia had a population exceeding 5,500,000. Con-

Settlement

victs continued to be sent out until between 1840 and 1859 the practice was abandoned. Sheep were shipped to the colony as early as 1799, and many free settlers were attracted by the rich farming and grazing lands. The discovery of gold in 1851 drew a large immigration, and within the next fifteen years $700,000,000 in gold was exported, while in 1866 Australia sent abroad 150,000,000 pounds of wool. Six colonies rapidly developed — New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, South Australia, Western Australia, and the near-by island of Tasmania — each of which was given a self-governing parliament and responsible ministry patterned after Canada. The growth in population may be seen in the fact that in 1851 Victoria had 77,000 people, whereas twenty years later the number had multiplied nearly twenty times.

In 1900 the people of Australia formed a new constitution, which was accepted by the British Parliament, creating a federal union much like that of the United States and Canada. The Commonwealth of Australia has six states, each with self-government. The federal

Government

legislature consists of the Senate, with six senators chosen for each state by popular vote, and the House of Representatives elected by popular vote. A cabinet, responsible to the House, administers the laws. The British king appoints a governor-general at the suggestion, however, of the Australian ministry. Like Canada, Australia, since the World War, has what amounts to complete political independence, even in her relation to foreign powers. The High Court, in imitation of the Supreme Court of the United States, is the defender and interpreter of the constitution, which may be amended by a referendum. The new Commonwealth granted to women the right to vote in 1902, and is recognized as one of the most progressive and democratic states

Social progress

in the world. From the outset, the Labor party had the balance of power in both houses of the legislature, and in 1908 secured a prime minister. As a result numerous advanced social measures in the interest of the working classes have been enacted. But as early as 1851 defensive precautions were taken to keep out Chinese and Hindu coolies.

4. The Dominion of New Zealand

The Dominion of New Zealand consists of two large islands and numerous small ones forming an area one fourth larger than Great Britain. In 1814 English missionaries began to Christianize the brown-skinned natives, but the British flag was not hoisted over the islands until 1840. A dozen years later self-government was granted to the few straggling settlements, after which gold and sheep-raising brought wealth and immigrants to the colony. Six provinces were

created in 1876 with their own local legislatures. In 1853 New Zealand was made a self-governing colony like Canada and Australia. In 1907 it was designated a "Dominion." The government consisted of a governor-general named by the king, a council appointed by the governor, and a House of Representatives elected by the people. The native Maori are represented by four members chosen by their own people. A cabinet responsible to the House administers the laws. Suffrage was opened in 1893 to both men and women, an example that affected Australia in 1902 and Great Britain in 1918, thus showing the influences of distant colonies on the mother country.

Government

Like Australia, New Zealand is one of the most democratic parts of the British Empire. A free public school system was established in 1877. Large grants of public lands were set aside for educational purposes. There are about 75,000 landholders, but the government is buying up the large estates for subdivision and leases to the people. The government owns and operates the railroads, the telegraph, telephone, express lines, savings banks, and insurance companies for the benefit of the public. In 1903 some of the coal mines were also taken over by the state. The rich are heavily taxed to equalize wealth. Prior to the World War the most radical social legislation in the world was enacted in New Zealand. Disputes between capital and labor are arbitrated compulsorily, and factory laws safeguard women and children. The Saturday half-holiday is generally observed in the shops. A labor department looks after the welfare of the wage-earners, finds work for those without jobs, and seeks to abolish poverty. The sick, unfortunate, injured, and aged are adequately cared for. In political matters the referendum is in common use. The council, at first chosen for life, is now elected by the people on the basis of proportional representation. So progressive is this little state, off on the other side of the globe, that the eyes of the whole world are centered on the experiments of its 1,220,000 people. It has been designated "the land without strikes."

Social progress

5. Union of South Africa

South Africa, settled by the Dutch and a few French Huguenots, was seized in 1795 by Great Britian and occupied permanently eleven years later. The Congress of Vienna permitted her to retain the colony, which contained 27,000 whites, 30,000 Negro and Malay slaves, and 1,700,000 free native Hottentots, on condition that Holland should be compensated. After 1820 English immigrants began to arrive in large numbers. When the British government sought to force the English language and institutions on the Dutch Boers, or farmers, they naturally resented it. The Boers were further incensed in 1833 by the abolition of slavery. The $15,000,000 alloted them for their losses was only a third of the value of the slaves, and much of this sum went to the British bankers through whom payments were made. Embittered by their treatment at the hands of the

Early development

British, the Boers in 1836 began the "Grand Trek" into the wilderness. On crude carts drawn by oxen, and loaded with their household goods and farming tools, about 10,000 of them journeyed northward into the interior. Some stopped in Natal; others settled in the Orange River valley. When the British caught up with them there, many of them "trekked" northward into the Transvaal, where they set up the South African Republic, whose independence was recognized by Great Britain in 1852. The freedom of the Orange Free State, which had become subordinate to the British in 1848, was acknowledged in 1854. For a quarter of a century thereafter these two frontier Dutch republics existed in security and isolation.

The Natal colony was annexed to the British Empire in 1843. Diamonds were discovered in 1867, and this greatly increased the British interest in that area. Under the imperialistic rule of Lord Beaconsfield in 1877 the Transvaal was seized under the excuse that the Boers had treated the blacks so cruelly that they were incited to rebellion against all the whites. The Boers resisted, with arms, this loss of their freedom, and in 1884 Gladstone recognized their self-government on condition (1) that all whites be permitted to live within the territory without any discriminations, and (2) that foreign treaties be made only with the consent of the British government. Meantime the discovery of gold in 1884 brought thousands of British adventurers into the country. The small village of Johannesburg quickly grew into a busy city of 100,000, and soon the "Uitlanders," or foreigners, outnumbered the Dutch. The sturdy, unprogressive Boers were determined to retain control of their government, and consequently passed a law which made it extremely difficult for a foreigner to gain citizenship. The British residents resented the imposition of taxes and military service, when they were not allowed to vote, and called upon their home government to protect them in their rights.

British intervention

The leader of the British party in South Africa was Cecil Rhodes, who became a multi-millionaire by developing valuable gold and diamond mines. He had gone to South Africa in 1871 and dreamed of bringing under British control all of southern and eastern Africa, which was then to be traversed by a railroad from Cairo to the Cape. A business man of exceptional shrewdness and an adventurous statesman, he awaited a favorable opportunity to overthrow the Boer rule. This empire-builder, as prime minister of the Cape, played the part of a benevolent despot and in 1895 helped to instigate the "Jameson raid." With 500 troopers Dr. Jameson entered the Transvaal to overthrow the Boer government, but the effort failed. Rhodes resigned his premiership and died in 1902 leaving his vast fortune to promote the welfare of the British Empire and through it the peace of the world. Associated with him in his imperial scheme was the British statesman, Joseph Chamberlain, who accused the Boers of treating the British as "helots" and with plotting to destroy Anglo-Saxon

Cecil Rhodes

Jameson raid

institutions in South Africa. The British government, under his influence, insisted that the "Uitlanders" be given a vote and other rights, but the demands were refused by the Boers.

The most conspicuous leader of the Boers was Paul Kruger, president of the Transvaal. As a lad of ten he had gone with his parents on the "Grand Trek," and had grown up as a rough frontiersman with hatred in his heart for the British. As president of the Transvaal, he said to the foreigners: "This is my country; these are my laws. Those who do not like to obey my laws may leave the country." His obstinate, narrow policy, and the greedy imperialism of *Chamberlain*, plunged the little republic into war with the British Empire in 1899, and the Orange Free State took up arms with her sister republic. The war was not popular in Great Britain. Huge mass meetings were held to protest against an attack on an inoffensive people in South Africa in the interest of South African capitalists and British imperialists. At first the British armies met with severe defeats, but larger forces under Lord Roberts and Kitchener brought the war to a victorious end in 1902. The Transvaal Republic and the Orange Free State became British colonies on terms so liberal that they tended to remove the sting of defeat. The liberality was carried a step further when the two recently conquered Dutch states were granted responsible self-government within seven years after the war closed. *Boer War*

In 1909 the four colonies of South Africa drafted a constitution for the Union of South Africa, which was approved by the British Parliament. A federal government patterned after that of Canada was created under which the provinces retained home rule, the national power was placed in the hands of two houses, a cabinet responsible to the popular branch was created, and the governor-general was appointed by the king. To appease both the Dutch and the English, the executive is located at Pretoria in the north, while the legislature sits at Cape Town, and both languages are recognized as legal. Since the Boers were in the majority, General Louis Botha became the first prime minister. Arrangements were made to include Rhodesia as a member of the Union. The population of the Union includes only 1,500,000 whites and about 5,600,000 blacks. In 1914 the same men, who a few years before had struggled so heroically to detach South Africa from the British Empire, now fought to prevent Germany from doing the same thing. In 1921 German South West Africa was put under the mandate of the Union of South Africa. The Union is remarkably prosperous, but is confronted by serious racial problems in connection with the Negroes and the Hindus. There are about four blacks to one white, and the black proportion is increasing, as a result of the higher birth rate among the Negroes. More than 150,000 Indians have located there and in order to prevent their increase an act in 1919 forbade granting licenses to them for new business enterprises. It is said that the number of "poor whites" is increasing. *Union of South Africa*

6. Imperial Federation

The imperial federation of these independent commonwealths with the mother country is a question that has been much discussed during the past generation. The gigantic British Empire was built up partly by accident and partly by intention. For three centuries Englishmen have gone to live in new regions overseas and thus carried the British flag and institutions to every part of the globe. Until towards the close of the eighteenth century, Great Britain followed the common practice of making the colonies add to the wealth and power of the motherland. After the loss of the Thirteen Colonies, there developed a pronounced change in her attitude which culminated in Lord Durham's revolutionary proposals. Thereafter the colonies were left to rule themselves and to develop their own institutions with but slight control from home. The new economics led the British government to develop trade with other countries, rather than with her own colonies, simply because it was more profitable. Indeed colonial possessions were viewed indifferently as more of a liability than an advantage, because the homeland was burdened with the cost of a large army and navy to protect them without receiving any adequate financial return. In short it was believed that imperialism did not pay. Liberal statesmen were wont to say with Turgot that a colony was like a pear, which, when ripe, fell from the tree; and hence it should be permitted to become a sovereign state with the blessing of the parent country. Indeed so self-sufficient did the colonies appear to be and of such small value to Great Britain that the office of colonial secretary in the British cabinet was considered of little consequence. In fact, there was no distinct colonial secretary until 1854. On the other hand, the Conservatives, more interested than the Liberals in welding the Empire together, charged them with being "little Englanders." Fortunately for the British Empire, there was a party that took a sane middle ground. They were led by Edward Gibbon Wakefield, Charles Buller, and Lord Durham. They desired to preserve the Empire, but also to promote local autonomy and self-government. Strange to say, the colonies were more eager than Great Britain to preserve the Empire; for dreading capture by another power, they appreciated the protection she gave them. Thus the bonds of loyalty, affection, and a common civilization helped to preserve the British Empire during the fore part of the nineteenth century.

Anti-colonialism

The new imperialism stimulated a fresh attachment between the colonies and the motherland. Popular statesmen like Disraeli aroused the pride of Englishmen everywhere in the wealth and powers of their overseas possessions. Imperialistic organizations, missionary societies, newspapers, lectures, sermons, and books created a revived interest in the Empire. Poets like Kipling urged Great Britain to "take up the white man's burden" in spreading a higher civilization to the

"lesser breeds" throughout the world. At the "Diamond Jubilee" held in 1897 to celebrate Queen Victoria's sixtieth year of rule, there were present, not only the sons of Britain scattered over the earth, but also Chinese, Hindus, Negroes, Malays, Indians, Egyptians, Frenchmen from Canada, and Dutch from South Africa, to emphasize both the solidarity and the complexity of the mighty Empire, which seemed to be born anew. Statesmen and capitalists invested millions in mines, factories, steamships, railroads, and other facilities for developing the resources of the regions overseas. New markets for British goods were opened, and trade with the colonies began to surpass that with foreign countries. During the thirty years prior to the outbreak of the World War, British colonial exports almost trebled, as did also the food imports from the colonies. Many thousands of persons in both the home country and the colonies, who had come to think and feel in terms of world trade, reaped the benefit of this new era of business prosperity, and posed as ardent champions of the new economic imperialism. Mindful of these opportunities, the British government sent forth a large group of skilled "empire-builders" to hold strategic positions throughout the Empire.

Nationalism, commerce and the new imperialism

Following the Franco-Prussian War, the great powers of continental Europe were divided into two mighty rival alliances, which left Great Britain in a condition of "splendid isolation." This disquieting situation forced her to inquire what aid her colonies might give her in time of war. The answer came in the Boer War, when Canada, Australia, and New Zealand sent their sons to South Africa to die for the unity and expansion of the Empire. Joseph Chamberlain now labored unceasingly to win the support of Britons at home to the plan for a closer imperial federation. He proposed to unite the Dominions to the motherland in a stronger organization for the good of all. After three imperial conferences, covering a period of twenty years, provision was made in 1902 for meetings of the prime ministers of Great Britain and the self-governing colonies every four years to improve imperial relations in general, and ultimately, perhaps, to perfect the project for a federal union with an imperial parliament. Trade, likewise, was to be encouraged throughout the Empire by special tariffs. Hence Canada lowered the duties on British goods a third; Australia 30 per cent, and New Zealand 50 per cent, with the expectation that Great Britain would reciprocate in giving preference to colonial goods. In 1919 an act of Parliament applied new preferential duties to all British Dominions, India, and the protectorates, with the hope that such favoritism would greatly stimulate inter-imperial trade. An army and navy supported by all parts of the Empire was also proposed, and in fact for some years the colonies voted contributions for an imperial navy, but about 1900 Australia and Canada demanded the right to create their own navies.

Movement for imperial federation

The World War revealed the wisdom of the effort to knit the Empire more closely together on the basis of mutual interests. All

The World War and the British Empire

parts of the Empire gave men, money, and materials without stint to the motherland in her hour of need. The war made a Greater British Empire a reality in spirit and common destiny, but it hindered rather than helped imperial federation. A British imperial constitution at present is out of the question. The Dominions seem to prefer the existing "indefinite status," which gives them complete independence in everything but name. They exercise even some control over foreign affairs. Canada can send her own representative to the United States, though she never has seen fit to do so. As self-governing nations they regulate immigration from other lands. Earlier, when Queensland in Australia wanted to take New Guinea and when New Zealand desired to annex an unoccupied island in the Pacific, the British government disallowed the wishes of both. But in the World War Australia and New Zealand were encouraged to seize German possessions in the south Pacific. The right to make war and peace seems to be about the only one of her former imperial rights still retained by the British government. In the Paris Peace Conference and in the League of Nations the British Dominions sat and voted as the equals of Great Britain. The new status won by southern Ireland will give the Irish Free State something of the same standing as the other Dominions now enjoy.

7. Other British Colonies

The other British overseas possessions include (1) the crown colonies, (2) Egypt, and (3) the Empire of India. In population these colonies outnumber the white inhabitants of the rest of the Empire more than sevenfold. The crown colonies, which are scattered over Asia, Africa, America, and the islands of the seas differ from the self-governing Dominions in having (1) a small number of British people; (2) seldom any representative legislatures; and (3) a location near or in the tropics. Some of them, like those in the West Indies, are in the condition of the royal colonies in America prior to the Revolution. The higher type of crown colonies such as the Bermudas, Barbados, and Malta, have representative legislatures. The keynote is responsibility not representation. The prevailing type of government, however, is a legislative council named by the crown in part or altogether. Other colonies are ruled by royal commissioners. The small islands and coaling stations are in the hands of governors with absolute powers. North Borneo is under the jurisdiction of chartered companies. In Africa and Asia some of the protectorates have native rulers advised by a resident British commissioner. Thus Great Britain has wisely adapted her form of rule over these backward peoples to local needs and circumstances.

Egypt, after the Napoleonic invasion, became a semi-independent state under the able pasha, Mehemet Ali, and was subject to Turkey only by the slenderest ties. He sought to introduce European civilization, chiefly French, and made many improvements. His successors

took the title of khedive. With the digging of the Suez Canal between 1859 and 1869, France and Great Britain cast their eyes on Egypt as a field for colonial expansion. The British government had said that for the safety of India it would be forced to seize the canal in case it was built. Its completion greatly stimulated Mediterranean trade. The spendthrift khedive, Ismail I, contracted huge loans from British and French bankers in order to "improve the country" and to purchase complete freedom from Turkey. Sorely pressed by his European creditors, the bankrupt khedive in 1875 sold his 176,000 shares of stock in the canal to the British government. This money was quickly spent, and France and Great Britain had to intervene to straighten out the financial tangle. Financial control led to military occupation and an attempt at internal reforms. But the people revolted against foreign control crying, "Egypt for the Egyptians." France, although strongly urged by Gambetta's party, declined to join Great Britain in suppressing the insurrection, so the British did it alone. The French sought to hinder the British but only succeeded in forcing the neutralization of the canal. The tension engendered between the two countries lasted for fifteen years. Good feeling was not restored until after the Fashoda incident of 1898. *Egypt*

After restoring the khedive to power, the British army remained and British officials assumed control. They paid the debts, reorganized the taxes and courts, abolished forced labor, built railroads along the Nile, constructed the Assuan Dam, and reclaimed millions of acres from the desert by irrigation. Peace, justice, prosperity, and new opportunities were given to the people. But these improvements only increased the demand of the natives for independence. Uprisings and assassinations followed. In the turmoil France and Great Britain almost came to an armed clash at Fashoda on the Upper Nile in 1898, but reason prevailed and Fashoda was rechristened on the map as "Kodok." At last in 1913 a representative government was set up. When Germany was joined by Turkey in the World War in 1914, Egypt was annexed to the British Empire as a protectorate. At the close of the war, a British commission to Egypt reported that the people were unanimous in their desire for independence and advised that it should be granted. This was done in 1920 with a treaty reservation that (1) British troops should be left in control of the Suez Canal; and (2) British interests in Egypt's foreign affairs should be safeguarded. In 1922 the British protectorate came to an end and Fuad I was proclaimed king of Egypt, though events since 1922 have proved that Egypt is still a veiled protectorate. This new kingdom is almost as large as the German Republic and Spain combined and has a population of over 14,000,000.

8. The Empire of India

The Empire of India contains 80 per cent of the inhabitants of the British colonies, and its annual trade with Great Britain exceeds

Size and population of India

$650,000,000. In contrast to the 47,000,000 people in the United Kingdom, India has 319,000,000, which is somewhat less than the total population of all Europe. Less than 10 per cent of the people is urban, and outside of Calcutta and Bombay with over a million each, there are only thirty cities above 100,000. The United States with but a third of the population of India has 68 cities above 100,000. It would take nearly fifteen Great Britains to cover India. The Indian Ocean "has become a British lake." As a result of the grave charges made against the East India Company's rule in India, the government was put into the hands of commissioners selected by the British Parliament (1784–1858). Despite efforts at reform, British dominion in India was threatened in 1857 by the Sepoy Mutiny. The natives, forgetting the blessings that had come to India from British control, were angered at the exploitation of their country by a few Europeans. Among the reforms introduced were some that interfered with the natives' social and religious customs and hence were denounced by the Indians. Deposed princes wanted to recover their independence. The occasion for the outbreak was the use of a bullet encased in greased paper, which had to be torn off with the teeth before it could be put into the rifle. The Sepoys, Hindus and Mohammedans alike, expressed horror at the idea of polluting their lips with the fat of animals, because it was contrary to their religious beliefs. Infuriated by this insult to their faith, 250,000 of these native

Sepoy mutiny 1857

soldiers rose in rebellion. Many white civilians and soldiers at Cawnpore were slain and the British fortress at Lucknow was attacked by a howling mob. The 40,000 British troops, with some loyal natives, held out until fresh troops from Great Britain helped to crush the insurrection. The aged Mogul, who at first directed the uprising from Delhi, was captured and sent as a prisoner to Rangoon; and his sons were shot. Some of the rebels were fired from the mouths of cannon, and hundreds were executed.

As an outcome of this costly experience, the East India Company, after lasting 258 years, was dissolved and its rule of India was transferred entirely to the crown. The secretary of state for India, aided by a council appointed by the government, both residing in Great Britain, took charge. In India a viceroy, and two councils — one executive, the other legislative, but both named in London — administered public affairs. Many of the 600 native princes with resident British counsellors ruled their own provinces. Queen Victoria in 1877 assumed the title of "Empress of India." Later, to appease the native discontent, Indians were appointed to places on both the London and the Indian council. The capital of India was removed in 1912 from Calcutta, a city of 1,263,000 inhabitants to Delhi, a city of 303,000.

Led by young Indians educated in western countries, a strong nationalistic movement has spread over India in recent years. Through newspapers, congresses and secret societies the young

patriots denounced British rule as a travesty on democracy. When the British government restricted the freedom of the press, censored the mails, and prohibited public gatherings, Hindus joined Mohammedans in outbreaks, boycotts, intimidations, and murders to force concessions in self-government. The coronation of George V as Emperor of India in the famous "Durbar" of 1911 took place without accident, but the next year an unsuccessful attempt was made to kill Viceroy Hardinge and his wife. In the World War discontent seemed to be smothered in outbursts of loyal devotion. The native rulers made "prodigal offers of their lives and their resources in the cause of the Realm." The secretary of state for India said that 700 native states offered their resources to defend the empire. Thousands of Hindus and Mohammedans died on the battlefields of France. In the end, however, the war only increased the movement for national independence, and the rebellion which ensued had to be crushed by force. At last Great Britain has seen the wisdom of giving India a national Legislative Assembly and a Council of State to make laws, subject, however, to a British veto. The move for political independence has not abated, but on the contrary has increased under the leadership of Gandhi, who advocates peaceful (non-coöperation) instead of forceful resistance. The country will not be pacified until it has as much political freedom as the other self-governing Dominions. But with 45 races, 2,400 castes and tribes, speaking 170 languages, and differing greatly in religious beliefs, the problem of political freedom is a tremendous one.

Rise of young India

There has been much progress in the last fifteen years. The India Councils Act of 1909 enlarged the council of the viceroy and added many more natives to the administration. In 1917 the British government said it was favorable to the development of gradual self-government in India. In 1919 the India Bill provided: (1) The eight major provinces were to have governors and ministers, the latter with power over local matters. (2) Governors were to be appointed by the viceroy or crown assisted by an executive council, one of whom was to be an Indian. (3) The ministers were to be chosen from elected members of the legislative council of whom only 20 per cent might be British. (4) Three seats on the viceroy's council were to be held by Indians. (5) An Indian Parliament consisting of a Council of State and a Legislative Assembly was created. (6) The Council of State was to be elected by popular vote, about 5,000,000 voters — formerly only 33,000. Still the Indian leaders were as a rule dissatisfied with the progress made towards self-government.

This remarkable land of beautiful temples and palaces, fine rugs and silk shawls, carved ivory and articles of gold and silver, precious stones, fertile valleys and arid plains, poverty and famine, has been transformed by the Industrial Revolution to a greater degree than any other country in Asia except Japan. The factory, foundry, mill, railroad, telegraph, electric light, and automobile have ushered in a

Economic conditions

new régime. A system of 55,000 miles of railroads and 150,000 miles of highways cover the country. In 1923, 333 cotton mills employing 347,000 persons were clothing the people. About 22,000,000 tons of coal are mined yearly and the output in 1919 was valued at $50,000,000. Great systems of irrigation and improved farm machinery have multiplied the products of the soil many fold to relieve famine and to give employment to 70 per cent of the people. Foreign commerce in seventy-five years has increased 500 per cent, and in 1920–1 exports and imports each exceeded a billion dollars. Thus India has been started on the road towards a modernized and industrialized nation. The elimination of widow-suicide ("suttee"), the curtailment of infanticide, the formation of law codes, the lessening of famine, the encouragement of sanitation, and the establishment of schools are positive gains. But the Indian patriots point out that all these improvements are controlled by British capitalists; that native industries have been killed by British goods; that each year $100,000,000 is spent on the army and only $30,000,000 on education; and that 94 per cent of the people are illiterate.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

J. R. Seeley, *The Expansion of England* (edition of 1911); A. F. Pollard, editor, *The British Empire: its Past, its Present, and its Future* (1909); W. H. Woodward, *A Short History of the Expansion of the British Empire, 1500–1911* (1912); J. P. Bulkeley, *The British Empire: A Short History* (1921); H. Robinson, *The Development of the British Empire* (1922); H. E. Egerton, *A Short History of British Colonial Policy* (5th ed. 1919); *The Origin and Growth of Greater Britain* (1920); *British Colonial Policy in the Twentieth Century* (1922); *Federations and Unions within the British Empire* (1911); A. J. Herbertson and O. J. R. Howarth, *The Oxford Survey of the British Empire*, 12 vols. (1914); C. P. Lucas, *Historical Geography of the British Colonies*, 6 vols. (1922); *The British Empire* (1915); W. J. Ashley, editor, *British Dominions: Their Present Commercial and Industrial Conditions* (1911); C. J. Fuchs, *The Trade Policy of Great Britain and Her Colonies since 1860*, English translation by C. Archibald (1905); R. Jebb, *Studies in Colonial Nationalism* (1905); *The Imperial Conference*, 2 vols. (1911); A. B. Keith, *Responsible Government in the Dominions*, 3 vols. (1912); *Imperial Unity and the Dominions* (1916); L. Curtis, *The Commonwealth of Nations* (1916); *The Problem of the Commonwealth* (1916); E. Jenks, *The Government of the British Empire* (1918); *A History of the Australasian Colonies* (1912); H. D. Hall, *The British Commonwealth of Nations* (1920); O. D. Skelton, *The Canadian Dominion* (1919); A. H. V. Colquhon, *The Fathers of Confederation* (1916); E. Porritt, *Evolution of the Dominion of Canada, Its Government and its Policies* (1918); W. P. M. Kennedy, *The Constitution of Canada: an Introduction to its Development and Law* (1922); E. Scott, *A Short History of Australia* (1916); H. G. Turner, *The First Decade of the Australian Commonwealth: a Study in Contemporary Politics, 1901–1910* (1911); V. G. Clark, *The Labor Movement in Australasia: a Study in Social Democracy* (1906); B. Williams, *Cecil Rhodes* (1921); J. A. Hobson, *The War in South Africa, its Cause and its Effects* (1900); R. H. Brand, *The Union of South Africa* (1909); W. B. Worsfold, *The Union of South Africa* (1912); Earl of Cromer, *Modern Egypt*, 2 vols. (new edition 1916); V. Chirol, *The Egyptian Problem* (1920); *Indian Unrest* (1910); *India Old and New* (1921); P. G. Elgood, *Egypt and the Army* (1922); T. W. Holderness, *Peoples and Problems of India* (1912); V. A. Smith, *Oxford History of India* (edition 1920); T. Morison, *The Economic Transition in India* (1911); Lajpait Rai, *Young India, an Interpretation and a History of the Nationalist Movement from Within* (1916); *England's Debt to India* (1917).

CHAPTER XXXII

EUROPE AND AMERICA IN ASIA, AFRICA AND OCEANIA

1. The Intrusion of Western Civilization in the Orient

The civilization of Europe and America originated in western Asia from which was gained a knowledge of the domestic animals and plants, the alphabet and writing, science and art, trade and commerce, and religion and law. The Greeks and Romans, in close touch politically and economically with the peoples of that region, were the first Europeans to impress their institutions on Asia. This close relationship between western Asia and southern Europe continued, with interruptions of course, until during the crusades all western Europe, in several successive waves of invasion, sought in vain to wrest the holy places in the Near East from the Mohammedan Turks. Historians have had much to say about the effects of these contacts with Asia upon European civilization, but less attention has been given to their results which were quite as pronounced in the modification of Asiatic civilization.

Early contacts of Europe and Asia

Spasmodic contacts with India and the Far East were made overland by ardent missionaries, daring merchants, and hardy travellers, among whom was the famous Marco Polo of Venice. From the end of the fifteenth century onward, however, Asia was opened to European *influences by* (1) *explorations, wars, and conquests;* (2) *missionary* efforts; and (3) trade. By 1683 the Russians had planted scattered colonies across Siberia to the Pacific, and had won territory around the Caspian Sea. Then came the contest in the eighteenth century between France and England for the possession of India, in which the British won. About the middle of the nineteetnh century China and Japan were "opened" for more effective commercial and missionary efforts, and for political control. Within the past three quarters of a century, with the exception of Japan, almost the whole of continental and insular Asia has been subjected to an economic or governmental vassalage of the western world.

Just as European civilization overflowed into the two Americas and there left an indelible imprint, so in turn, Europeans and Americans spread their institutions to Asia. The footholds gained on the continent at an earlier time by Russia, Great Britain, and France were used as bases from which to secure more territory. The Portuguese alone neglected their opportunity to create an Asiatic empire, while the Dutch and Spanish were content to exploit their island possessions in the Far East. Among the later claimants to a share in the division

of Asia were Germany, which secured Shantung, and the United States, which took the Philippines from Spain. The scramble for markets, raw materials, concessions, and opportunities for investment, resulted in the partition of Asia into colonies, protectorates, and "spheres of influence" by the nations of the west. They had the energy, machinery, capital, and, above all, military power, with which to impose their authority upon the weak and backward hordes of Asiatics. All sorts of pretexts were used for intervention. Intervention usually meant military occupation. Military occupation was followed by a protectorate. And a protectorate too often ended in annexation as a colony. Bankers, traders, explorers, consuls, diplomats, missionaries, and capitalists were all active in one way or another in creating colonial empires.

European imperialism in Asia

The only independent states remaining in Asia today are the Japanese Empire, the Chinese Republic, the Kingdom of Siam, Turkey and Persia — all together constituting about one third of the continent. Afghanistan, Armenia, Hedjaz, Palestine, Iraq, and Syria are semi-independent states more or less under the control of Great Britain, Russia, or France. Great Britain includes within the Asiatic portion of her Empire, India, the Straits Settlements, the Malay States, Burma, Hong Kong, Wei-hai-wei, Aden, the islands of Cyprus, Ceylon, and the northern part of Borneo. These possessions would make nearly twenty states as large as Great Britain and contain seven times as many inhabitants. The Soviet Republic of Russia owns all of northern Asia, which is four times the size of European Russia with one fifth the number of people. France owns a colonial domain in Asia, which is a third larger than her own extent with over half as many people. Holland has an island empire in the East Indies three times larger than the state of Texas with seven times her own population. Italy has a small concession in China at Tientsin, and also possesses a few islands off the coast of Asia Minor. Portugal owns Goa in India; and Damao, Timor and Macao in China, forming an area as large as Maryland with a million people. Germany and Spain have lost all their Asiatic possessions — the former to Japan, and the latter to the United States which exercises authority over a group of Asiatic islands with a land area as large as Italy and nearly 11,000,000 inhabitants. Thus approximately two thirds of Asia are under either the direct or indirect control of western powers.

2. Western Intervention in Asia

In sharp contrast with the two Americas, few attempts have been made to plant European settlements in Asia. Russia alone of all the western nations has carried out a systematic system of colonization in Siberia, where 10,000,000 Russians have established their homes. Omsk, Tomsk, Irkutsk, and Valadivostok on the Pacific are modern European cities of the frontier type. The civilization of Siberia is

thoroughly Russian already, and has probably set the standards for centuries ahead. To a certain degree the Russians have also penetrated west-central Asia. For a great many years the Greeks have had settlements on the western shores of Asia Minor and have sought in war and peace to project their influence farther into the interior. This ambition met a serious set-back in the Greco-Turkish War of 1922–3. In the rest of the great yellow continent, no serious attempt on a large scale has been made by the western peoples to colonize any regions. The British are fairly numerous in India, Burma, the Malay States, and China. Cities like Hong Kong, Shanghai, Singapore, Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay all have sections that are thoroughly European apart from the Asiatic portions. Indeed one might say that English has become almost the international tongue in Asia, for it is spoken by millions from Constantinople around to Port Arthur. Dozens of English newspapers are printed in China and India. Under the Americans in the Philippines, English is spreading rapidly as the common language of the people. It is taught in schools over much of Asia. To a lesser degree the French, Portuguese, Germans, Spaniards, and Greeks have left their national impress on certain groups of Asiatics. The Dutch have largely moulded the life of the East Indies. It is difficult to estimate the total number of Americans and Europeans, other than Russians, in Asia, but counting soldiers, civil officials, business men, missionaries, educators, and others, it does not exceed half a million. For instance in 1921 there were 176,000 inhabitants from the west in India, 25,000 in Japan in 1916 and 285,000 in China in 1925.

European culture and politics in the Orient

With the exception of Siberia, the western invasion of Asia has been not so much by peoples as by ideas and institutions, which have produced startling changes during the past seventy-five years. Western inventions are transforming the continent. India is as well supplied with railroads as many European countries. One may soon travel by rail across Siberia, through China and India, and back again to Europe. Markets have been opened for thousands of the products of the west, and shops filled with American and European goods are found in all the large cities. Millions of people have accepted Christianity from foreign missionaries. In China alone in 1918 over 130,000 elementary schools were teaching 4,000,000 pupils western learning. Colleges, and schools of law, medicine, and engineering are preparing young men and women with western knowledge for a more useful life. Factories in Japan, China, and India, built on western models, are transforming the industrial life, and show more advance than some of the Latin-American countries. Large numbers of young people go to Europe and America to complete their education, and return home to work for the new life that is slowly creeping over Asia. Political constitutions, military and naval organizations, modern science, and economic systems of the west are being gradually adapted to oriental needs. As a result of all these forces, the

civilization of the west is rolling over the east. Asia, to a considerable degree, has become Europeanized.

Oriental emigration

In recent years a tide of emigration from Japan, China, India, and Turkey has set in to other parts of the world. The population in the first three countries is so dense and the struggle for existense so keen, that the "coolie" class has been encouraged to seek new homes in the less thickly settled areas of the world. With the abolition of slave labor in the western countries, the importation of Asiatic labor began. The British encouraged Hindus to go to South Africa to do the hard work. Today in Natal the Hindus outnumber the whites, and control most of the farms and shops. "Coolies" were early taken to Australia, but when the Commonwealth was formed, among the first laws were two to exclude the immigration of Hindus, Chinese, and Japanese. Canada has attempted, with some success, to exclude the Orientals, who have rushed into British Columbia by the thousands. After the Civil War, Chinese coolies were employed in large numbers in building the first trans-continental railroads in the United States, but strong opposition to this practice soon arose. Since 1882 the United States has tried, by laws and agreements, to keep out undesirable Asiatics. Latin America, on the contrary, has welcomed them. Alarmists in Europe and America speak of the "Yellow Peril" and urge the formation of a Pan-Aryan Association against the 900,000,000 Asiatics. They say that the Orientals should stay in Asia, while the white race exploits the earth, and forget that Europe and America already have political possession of two thirds of the continent of Asia. They proclaim an "open door" in Asia and a "closed door" in the rest of the world. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Asiatics raise the counter-cry of "White Peril" and demand the recognition of racial equality.

3. The Awakening of China

The Empire of China, the oldest state in the world, was larger in size than the United States, or all Europe. Its population was more than three times that of the United States, and somewhat less than that of Europe. For forty centuries these sturdy, black-eyed, good-natured, yellow-skinned people had lived apart from the western world, developing a high and unique civilization of their own. Their cities were numerous, and their industries were carried on by hand in little shops as in the days of Greece and Rome. They had made remarkable progress in science, art, and literature, although their manners and institutions differed widely from the west. There was no caste, and the people were peaceful and industrious. Proud of their own accomplishments, and content with their own ways of living, they despised other peoples as barbarians and had no desire to be contaminated by them. The mass of people, however, were "ignorant and impotent."

The Chinese Empire consisted of China proper, which was divided

into eighteen provinces, and the outlying districts of Manchuria, Mongolia, Tibet, and Sin-Kiang, Korea, Burma, Siam, Cambodia, and Annam formed a still wider outer ring under Chinese suzerainty. The imperial government of the "Celestial Empire" was an absolute monarchy under the rule of the "Sun of Heaven." He was assisted by public officials called *mandarins*, selected after passing a strict examination in the sacred books. They took the place of an hereditary nobility and were divided into nine classes distinguished by the buttons on their caps. In the seventeenth century China had been conquered by the Manchus, a Tartar tribe from the north, who forced the natives to wear a queue, or "pigtail," as a sign of subjugation. Corruption and bribery were common in public service. The laws of China were based on the family as a unit. If a man committed a crime and could not be found, the whole family was punished. If a man became bankrupt, the entire family had to pay his debts. *The old China*

The emperor was the high priest and performed the great religious ceremonies each year at the "Altar of Heaven" in Pekin. Confucianism was the state religion, but it had no priesthood, and consisted in observing the moral precepts of the holy man, Confucius. Buddhism, which had an elaborate ritual and a powerful priesthood, was the faith of the majority of the people. Most of the Chinese, except the Mohammedans, who numbered only 10,000,000, had no difficulty in accepting at the same time Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism, which ranked next to Buddhism in popularity.

The old educational system was confined to a study of the classics, or ancient literature, and training for government service. There were few schools for the common people; and the rich employed private tutors for their children. After memorizing the classics, written in clumsy characters, for several years, writing and easy composition followed. Public examinations, on which great stress was laid, consisted of original poems and essays. Scholars were highly honored and held up as models for the young. From movable type, the Chinese had printed an extensive literature. One of their encyclopædias alone filled over 5,000 volumes. The movements of the heavenly bodies were studied with the use of astronomical instruments; the compass was employed for navigation; huge walls, dykes, canals and bridges were constructed by great engineers; and gunpowder, paper, and other useful articles were invented or discovered long before they were known to the western world. In the cities, colleges were supported at public expense.

To the west, China for centuries was the land of wonders and mysteries. Apparently the first Europeans known to have visited China were some Franciscan missionaries. Marco Polo with his father and uncle, in the thirteenth century, made the route overland. Three centuries later with the advance of navigation, Portuguese merchants in 1557 opened a trading station at Macao just south of Canton. Then followed Dutch and British traders. Meanwhile the Russians, cross- *European intrusion in China*

ing Siberia, came into contact with the Chinese on the north. But all these "foreign devils" were suspected of evil designs, subjected to heavy taxes, and their lives often endangered. In 1815 Japan was still inaccessible to the westerners, while the Chinese door had been opened only by a crack. Foreign ships might touch only at the one port of Canton. There was no travel inland, the trade with China was relatively unimportant, and there was no thought of intervening by force. For the period 1830–40 only 23 British ships cleared for China, and only 44 ships of all nationalities entered British ports from China. Indeed it seems unbelievable that only within the past seventy-five years have China and Japan been opened up to western influences by merchants, missionaries, diplomats, and travellers. Perhaps credit should be given to Russia for first coming into closer contact with the Far East. But it was the British, who first used force to secure trading privileges with China. In 1823 Burma was separated from China, and in 1886 it became a full British dependency. The East India Company had developed a trade with the Chinese through the port of Canton which by 1829 was bringing an annual profit of $5,000,000 by exchanging opium for teas and silks. The Chinese government, seeing the evils of opium smoking, forbade the importation of opium, and thus threatened to ruin the lucrative trade of the East India Company. By evading the laws through smuggling and connivance with avaricious Chinese merchants, the British merchants continued to develop the opium trade and by 1839 were selling 30,000 chests to the natives. Considerable wrangling ensued, and finally the British government in 1840–2 waged war against China and forced five ports to be opened for trade. Hong Kong was ceded to Great Britain and a war indemnity of $21,000,000 paid. But the Chinese government itself permitted the opium traffic to continue under certain regulations. The United States, France, Holland, Belgium, and Prussia then rushed in to secure similar privileges.

Opium War 1840–42

For several centuries prior to this, Roman Catholic missionaries had established mission posts in China and had won many converts. Protestant missions began in 1807, when a field of work was opened at Canton. American missionaries arrived first in 1830, and Russian missionaries were at work in the north. Russia was the first nation to force China to sign a treaty guaranteeing the toleration of Christian missions and forbidding the persecution of native converts, and the United States, Great Britain and France obtained similar promises in 1858. Nevertheless the missionaries encountered great difficulties in carrying on their labors, which supplied the western powers with excuses for intervention. The death of a French missionary and the seizure of a British ship by Chinese pirates, led these two powers to make war on China in which Tientsin and Pekin were captured and the Imperial Summer Palace was burned. As a result six more ports were opened for trade, protection to missionaries was further guaranteed, the opium trade was legalized, and another large

Missions in China

indemnity paid (1860). France, Great Britain, and Russia established permanent legations at Pekin in 1861, and the United States the next year. These concessions to the foreigners led to the Taiping Rebellion (1856–64) against the Manchu ruler, but with the aid of a British officer, Charles George Gordon, it was put down.

4. Threatened Partition of China

Not content with opening China for peaceable trade and missionary work, the European powers, incited by "greed and cupidity," now began to seize territory and to force special concessions by diplomacy, subtle intrigue, bribery, threats of war, and actual combat. The rival world policies have been potent influences for evil in China. Russia annexed the coast south of the Amur River (1863). France took Cambodia (1863), and added Annam and Tonkin (1885). Burma was appropriated by Great Britain (1886). By this time Japan was sufficiently "Europeanized" to take part in the game of partition, and by war against China secured the island of Formosa, and the Liao-tung peninsula. The military impotence of China was demonstrated. Russia, however, secured the aid of France and Germany to force Japan to relinquish control of the Liao-tung peninsula. The European governments stumbled over each others heels in professing friendship for China. Russia loaned her money to pay a war indemnity to Japan, and in return secured permission to build the Trans-Siberian railroad across Manchuria, and the secret promise of Port Arthur. France obtained the Mekong valley together with railway and mining privileges. Great Britain protested, and was appeased by the extension of the boundaries of Burma. To "avenge" the murder of two Catholic missionaries in 1897, Germany obtained a lease of Kiao-chau and certain transportation and mining rights in Shantung. To offset the German treaty, Russia in 1898 was given a lease of Port Arthur for twenty-five years, and at once connected it with the Trans-Siberian railroad. She now regarded Manchuria, Korea, and the Liao-tung peninsula as her "sphere of influence." France in like manner obtained possession of Kwang-chow-wan. Not to be outdone in this race for spoils by her rivals, Great Britain demanded the port of Wei-hai-wei and got it. The Russo-Japanese War enabled Japan to replace Russia in her "sphere of influence," although Manchuria was nominally returned to China. Japan annexed Korea (1910) and Outer Mongolia was virtually seized by Russia (1913). France extended her "sphere" northward into Indo-China, while Great Britain claimed as her "sphere" the rich Yangtze valley and extended the boundaries of India until they included Tibet. In 1921 seventy-five "treaty ports" were open in China. Such was the sad story of how China became the victim of western imperialism.

Economic partition of China

Following the scramble for territory, went hordes of capitalists, promoters, business agents, and engineers from the west to secure

railway, mining, and factory concessions; to open up markets for European and American goods; and to exploit the immense wealth and efficient labor of China. The first steam railroad at Woosung, built in 1875–6, was torn up by the enraged people. But within a decade another was constructed, and by 1925 over 7,500 miles — mostly government-owned — were in use and 2,300 miles more under development. About 55,000 miles of telegraph lines covered the country. The law of 1911 provided that eventually all the railways and telegraph lines would revert to the state. Modern steamers ply up and down the great waterways. Mills grind wheat and rice; factories make cotton, silk, and steel. Coal, tin, and copper mines are in operation. The total foreign trade increased fivefold within thirty years and in 1920 amounted to $1,000,000,000, with imports somewhat higher than exports. The Industrial Revolution is slowly transforming the nation, and China may become one of the greatest industrial states on the earth. A few provinces, including Shantung, are already highly industrialized. Unfortunately there are no great wagon roads covering the whole country, but the system of canals is excellent. One cable connects China with the United States, but excellent wireless stations supplement the cable.

5. Reforms and Political Changes in China

A patriotic secret society of the "Harmonious Fists" stirred up anti-foreign outbreaks to drive out the Christian missionaries, who were winning the people away from their ancient beliefs, and to get rid of the business men, who were running railroads through their sacred cemeteries and "lacerating China like tigers." This "Boxer" uprising was encouraged by the dowager empress, Tzu-hsi (1898–1908), who proclaimed "war to the knife" against all foreigners. Over 250 missionaries, teachers, and business men in the country districts lost their lives. Others fled to their legations in Pekin, where they were besieged for several months by infuriated mobs. The German ambassador was assassinated in Pekin. China became the center of world interest. An international army of Europeans, Americans, and Japanese, was rushed to Pekin, and the imperial court fled from the capital. After relieving the legations, the temples and imperial palaces were looted, many of the natives killed, and shameful outrages committed by soldiers who acted without authority. China was penalized by being forced (1) to grant further commercial concessions, (2) to suppress the "Boxers" and punish their leaders, and (3) to pay within 39 years an indemnity of $337,500,000. An imperial prince went to Berlin to apologize for the slaying of Baron von Ketteler. Leaving guards to protect the legations, Pekin was evacuated in 1901, and the next year the imperial court returned.

"Boxer" Revolt

The Christian powers took advantage of the situation to press their individual interests in China and to thwart each other's plans. When Russia secured exclusive rights in Manchuria, Great Britain pro-

tested. When Great Britain enlarged her advantages in the Yangtze valley, Germany protested. As creditors for large war indemnities, Japan and the European states sought further economic concessions. The United States by 1925 had returned $24,168,000 or about three fourths of her portion of the indemnity, which, out of gratitude, was set aside by China to send students to be educated in America. Other countries have followed the example of the United States. Meanwhile in 1899 John Hay, the American secretary of state, invited the other nations to join the United States in assuring China that they had no designs on her territorial integrity, but desired only an "open door" and equality of treatment for all in business. After becoming an Asiatic power through the acquisition of the Philippines, American statesmen sought to save China from partition at the hands of European and Japanese imperialism. The principle of the "open door," set forth in a treaty with China in 1903, was advocated thereafter as an American policy.

Recent reforms in China

Contact with the west, and the example of Japan, opened the way for reforms in China. The young men who had studied abroad were convinced that China must either imitate the civilization of the western peoples, or fall a prey to the foreigners. Hence they organized the "Reform Party." English was eagerly studied, and foreign books widely read. *China's Only Hope*, a book by a writer who advocated radical changes, was sold to the number of a million copies in a short time. The young emperor was persuaded to study western ideas, and in 1898 he issued a series of reform edicts, which were intended (1) to modernize the educational system; (2) to encourage the Industrial Revolution; and (3) to improve the system of government. The defeat of the "Boxers" accelerated the awakening of China.

Education

The Chinese educational system, which was flourishing when the culture of Greece and Rome was just beginning, survived until 1905. The mission schools had been gradually undermining the ancient practices until an imperial decree abolished the old examinations and introduced modern methods of teaching. Later laws provided for primary schools with compulsory attendance under the supervision of the local governments, and for higher schools under a national board of education with a minister at its head. Plans were laid for four great universities, and for professional, technical, and normal schools. While some of the institutions of higher learning have been created, the lack of funds has held back the project for primary schools. In 1924 there were 167,000 elementary schools with 5,800,000 pupils, and about 500 high schools. In the 7,000 primary schools of the Protestant missions there were 1,200 foreign teachers, 11,000 native teachers, and 205,000 pupils; and the Catholics were teaching 145,000 pupils in 3,000 schools. The national University of Pekin in 1925 had 2,000 students. In 1924 there were over 1,000 daily, weekly and monthly newspapers printed. But the colossal task still before

China may be seen in the fact that perhaps 90 per cent of the people are classed as illiterate. It must be remembered, however, that illiteracy is not a fair test of the intelligence and abilities of a people who are backward but not decadent.

These educational reforms were not sweeping enough to satisfy the "Reform Party," which now reorganized itself as the "Young China Party," and sought to replace the autocratic Manchu dynasty with a democratic republic. The Manchus had failed to prevent the

Army

decay of China before the onslaughts of western forces, and now "Young China" hoped to arouse a national consciousness that would save China from European imperialism. The first evidence of a change came with the introduction of the European military system into China. Military drill was required in the schools, and the sons of princes and nobles were encouraged to enlist in the large army that was recruited in 1906. The Chinese army numbered 360,000 men in 1912 and in 1925 was reported to include five times that number. Then followed, the same year, administrative, financial, and social reforms. Confucius was raised to the same rank as "heaven" and

Government

"earth." A friendly "China for Chinese" movement arose and it was felt that only a representative, constitutional government could carry out that policy. The most conspicuous leader of the reform party was Sun Yat-sen, a Christian physician, who inspired his followers with a hatred of the corrupt and inefficient Manchus. To head off the threatened revolution, the Manchu government called an imperial assembly in 1910 and, on its advice, promised a constitution and a national parliament by 1913. Angered at this procrastination, and at the signing of new concessions to Russia and Great Britain, the reform party broke out in an armed revolt, set up a provisional republic at Nanking with Dr. Sun Yat-sen as president, and in 1912 forced the boy emperor, Pu-yi, to abdicate.

Before surrendering his authority the youthful monarch signed a decree creating a constitutional Republic. The premier Yuan-Shih-Kai was ordered to create a provisional government by the representatives

Chinese Republic

of seventeen provinces, and, at the same time, the western calendar was adopted. In March, 1912, Yuan-Shih-Kai was inaugurated as the first president of China, and several weeks later Dr. Sun Yat-sen acknowledged him as the executive of all China. While the public opinion of the world applauded the transformation of the oldest monarchy into the newest Republic of the world, yet European diplomats in the Far East opposed the change because they knew it meant the curtailment of their exploitation of China. With the exception of the United States, the great powers refused to recognize the new Republic. They sought to force China to make her foreign loans through a banking group of six powers, and to prevent her from organizing a large army to defend her rights. The first republican parliament of 596 members met at Pekin in April, 1913. With the aid of an American adviser, a constitution was framed, but only that

portion relating to the presidency became law. A new flag was adopted and the first trial by jury took place.

Meanwhile the republican revolutionists of the Yangtze valley, led by Dr. Sun Yat-sen, rebelled against the Pekin government. To get money to run the government, Yuan-Shih-Kai was forced to accept a loan from a consortium of banks of the western powers on humiliating conditions. The new revolt was suppressed, and a national election chose him for president for a term of five years. When the parliament attempted to limit his powers as president, he declared vacant the seats of the southern revolutionary party, and on January 11, 1914, he dissolved parliament. Then he named a committee to complete the constitution, and it proposed a one-chamber parliament and a secretary of state responsible to the president alone. When the World War broke out Yuan-Shih-Kai was virtual dictator of China. He had to resist the machinations of the imperialistic European nations, and the famous twenty-one demands of Japan after she had taken the Shantung peninsula from Germany. In 1915, in the face of the disapproval of the western Allies, the council of state, after a farcical referendum to the provinces, asked Yuan-Shih-Kai to become emperor. This was an excuse for a new revolt in the south, and seven provinces seceded from the Pekin government. Before Yuan-Shih-Kai could be inaugurated as emperor, he conveniently died in the summer of 1916, and thus saved the Republic but did not bring peace to the nation. The vice-president, Li Yuan Hung, succeeded to the presidency, recalled the old parliament, and temporarily restored unity.

Chinese Sectionalism

The north and south remained divided on national policies. The southern leaders were liberals and wanted a federalized republic. The northern leaders were militarists, who wanted a large army and a strongly centralized republic, or constitutional monarchy. The Chinese, who felt themselves sacrificed to the imperialistic greed of all the European powers, were indifferent to the issues of the World War. Japan and Russia were violating the same principles in China that they were combating Germany for violating in Europe. France and Great Britain were known to have one standard of morality for Europe and another for Asia. Although China declared neutrality, she was ready to join the Entente in order to thwart Japanese designs in Shantung. Japan knew this and consequently tried to keep China out of the war. But President Wilson's words seemed to speak for the wrongs of China as well as for Europe, and hence when China was formally invited by the United States to enter the war, she broke off diplomatic relations with Germany at once. The actual declaration of war was delayed by the outbreak of war in south China in August, 1917, and the secession of the southern provinces. This condition, however, did not prevent the two sections from presenting a united front in the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 and in the Washington Conference in 1921. Since 1924 China has been in a serious state of internal disorder and civil war.

If the Chinese Republic is to endure, there must be built up a national consciousness, a solidarity of interests, and a common patriotism. There is no language spoken and understood by all the people. Ofttimes those of one province cannot talk with those of another, although the written language is the same over all China and the Mandarin dialect is spoken by the educated classes and about three fifths of the people. Plans are on foot to have it taught in all the schools. An intelligent citizenship alone will insure stability to the Republic. The people must be freed from the grip of superstition, which dominates their social and family life. They must be imbued with both the desire and the determination to outgrow their old life and institutions, not by slavishly adopting foreign ways but by adapting them to their own modes of life. With an abundance of natural resources and cheap labor, China must create her own wealth and make herself financially and economically independent of other states.

6. The First Western Visitors to Japan

To the east of Asia lies the fair-sized island Empire of Japan, whose modernization, nationalization, and democratization have startled the world. Japan proper, is somewhat larger than the state of Montana or Great Britain, and has 60,000,000 people. This race of wide-awake, polite, small-statured Mongolians rapidly awoke to a realization of the advantages of European civilization, easily and quickly adapted the strong points of the west to their own life, and became a rival and an eagerly sought ally, instead of the victim, like China, of European powers. In intimate touch with the Chinese for centuries, the Japanese borrowed much of their art, literature, industries, and ways of living from them and the Koreans. Their progress, intelligence, and civilization have won the admiration of western scholars. The Buddhist religion became the predominant faith among them, and filled the country with beautiful temples.

European contacts with Japan

The government was an absolute monarchy like China under a mikado, but the shogun, or tycoon, — sort of an hereditary prime minister, — had usurped royal authority and ruled the country in the mikado's name. The land was divided among feudal princes, called *daimios*, and the masses of the people lived as serfs. The warriors, called *samurai*, formed a professional class numbering about 400,000. Like China, Japan was a hermit nation, and regarded the western peoples as inferior barbarians with whom she had no wish to have dealings.

In 1542 three Portuguese navigators were accidentally blown ashore on one of the small Japanese islands. They were hospitably received, and two of their arquebuses were purchased by the feudal lords. A brisk trade with the Portuguese followed, and within seven years Francis Xavier and a small company of Jesuits began to convert the natives. After a generation or so, seventy-five Jesuit fathers were

ministering to the needs of 150,000 converts and several hundred churches were built. In 1582 four Japanese boys were sent to be educated in Spain and Rome. About this time the mikado ordered all missionaries to leave Japan under "pain of death." Soon the profession of Christianity was made a capital offense and thousands of converts were slain. By the year 1638 Christianity was almost blotted out in Japan. The Portuguese and Spanish traders were expelled in the seventeenth century, and an imperial edict forbade Japanese going abroad. For two centuries this policy of exclusion was followed by the "Empire of the Rising Sun," although an exception was made in the case of the Dutch.

Commodore Perry, 1853

About the middle of the nineteenth century, American whaling ships began to visit the waters of Japan, but all efforts to reopen trade were refused. In 1853 Commodore Perry, with four warships and 560 men, was sent to secure a commercial treaty with Japan, because the United States was thinking of establishing a line of steamers between America and China and wanted to include Japan on the route. He took with him numerous gifts, including a sewing machine and a miniature railroad. The Japanese were greatly astonished by these wonders of the west. When he returned the next year with six men-of-war and 2,000 soldiers, a treaty was concluded, which provided for American sailors shipwrecked on the Japanese coast and allowed American ships to trade in two ports. Russia, Holland, France, and Great Britain soon secured similar treaties from the shogun. An American consul was sent out, a new and more favorable commercial treaty was signed, and a brisk trade between the two countries followed. The conservative party in Japan opposed these relations with the foreigners. The murder of a British subject led to the bombardment of Kagoshima by British warships. When in 1864 one of the nobles fired on some foreign vessels, a combined British, French, Dutch, and American fleet bombarded Shimonoseki and levied a fine of $3,000,000 on the nobleman. This resulted in the compulsion of still more favorable treaties.

7. The Political and Industrial Revolutions

Political and military changes

Meanwhile a nationalistic party, composed of the feudal lords and advocates of progress, overthrew the shogunate for assuming authority to treat with foreigners, and restored the puppet mikado to imperial power. This is known in Japanese history as the Revolution of 1868. The feudal lords then surrendered their political power to the mikado, for compensation in money and government offices, and feudalism was abolished. The peasants now became the owners of the land and paid taxes to the state. Shintoism was revived as the state religion in 1868 but disestablished a decade later. Compulsory military service was established to take the place of the *samurai*, and soon Japan had an army and navy based on western models. At Tokio the mikado now received the representatives of foreign powers,

and made treaties with them. Hundreds of students were sent to the western countries to learn their institutions and new ways. Official commissions were dispatched to other nations to report on advisable changes. A university was founded, and English was taught in the schools. In 1918 about 98 per cent of the children were in schools. Religious freedom was granted in 1871. Foreigners were called in to revise the law codes, to build railroads, to supervise education, and to improve agriculture. Beefsteak, shoes, soda water, knives and forks, and silk hats came into use, although the old customs and habits were not abandoned. The institutions and inventions, which made the western nations superior, were merely adapted to the Japanese needs.

Constitutional monarchy

Just a century after the United States adopted the federal constitution, Japan framed a constitution, patterned after that of Prussia, transforming the absolute state into a limited monarchy. The mikado was left in possession of large powers, resembling those exercised by the German emperor. With the consent of parliament he made law, and of course executed it. The cabinet was appointed by him and responsible to him alone. A privy council of "elder statesmen" advised him on important matters. The national parliament consisted of the Peers and the Representatives — an aristocratic and a popular house. The franchise was restricted to males above twenty-four years who paid a land tax of about $7.50 and in 1925 property qualifications for males over thirty were removed. Local government was centralized and bureaucratic like that of France. The national government was neither parliamentary nor democratic, but in control of the old conservative forces. Yet when one remembers that ancient Japan believed that the mikado was descended from the gods, and that feudalism had endured so long, the revolution must be regarded as remarkably significant. Public opinion gained more and more power, however, and was soon strong enough to secure some liberal reforms.

Industrial Revolution

The Industrial Revolution made greater headway in Japan than the democratic political revolution. Nature has surrounded Japan with the ocean, like Great Britain, and she has an ample supply of coal though but little iron. There is an abundance of energetic laborers willing to work for a low wage. The industrial leaders are resourceful, self-reliant, and possess a high capacity for organization. With these favorable conditions, factories were quickly established, and in 1920 were employing nearly two and a half million persons of whom 800,000 were women and children. Large quantities of cottons, silks, paper, matches, earthenware, lacquered ware, matting, leather, trinkets, and oil products are made for sale abroad. The exports in 1918 exceeded the imports by about $150,000,000. Since 1872, when the first railroad was built, more than 9,000 miles have been constructed and are mostly state-controlled. Subsidized steamship lines run to all parts of the earth. The land of which only

14 per cent is arable, is carefully cultivated in little farms; and the masses of the poor people (74 per cent) are dependent upon the crops of rice, barley, wheat, and tea which they grow. The Industrial Revolution has produced only a small wealthy middle class, as compared with the western countries. Militarism and industrialism have raised the cost of living greatly, and the discontented, over-worked wage-earners have resorted to strikes, boycotts, trade-unions, and socialism, as in other industrial states. Slum districts, unknown to old Japan, have appeared in the factory centers. These attempts to force the government to provide social legislation to improve the lot of the workers have as yet produced few results. Since the Great War there have been repeated attempts, some of which have reached the point of threatening revolution, to liberalize the franchise.

8. Japanese Imperialism

Modernized by contacts with the west, with a population almost as overcrowded as that of Holland and Belgium — nearly 400 to the square mile — with a wealth that has trebled in the last decade, and with capitalists clamoring for raw materials and markets, Japan has become aggressively imperialistic like her European teachers. Korea, China, and Siberia offered near-by opportunities. The first step was to create a powerful army and a formidable navy. With a large noble class to supply officers and with enforced universal military service, these weapons of modern imperialism were soon equal to those of any other land. Since the European powers were carving out "spheres of influence in the Far East," Japan saw no reason why she should not make a similar experiment in Korea. First Korea was recognized as independent; then an effort was made to subject her to Japanese influence. China, however, claimed Korea as a part of her Empire and sent 2,000 soldiers to protect the Koreans. To safeguard her "interests" Japan rushed 12,000 soldiers to Korea, and on August 1, 1894, the Chino-Japanese War, which opened a new era in the Far East, commenced. With her Europeanized army and navy, Japan won a brilliant victory. China acknowledged the independence of Korea under Japanese suzerainty. Japan secured Formosa, the Pescadores, and the Liao-tung peninsula, together with commercial privileges and an indemnity of $158,000,000. With comparative ease Japan had demonstrated that she was a modern military power.

Defeat of China, 1894

Alarmed at Japan's success, Russia asked the great powers to join her in preserving the balance of power in the Far East. France and Germany expressed a willingness, but Great Britain was too suspicious of Russia's intentions. Hence the three powers, as defenders of Chinese integrity, by threat of war, forced Japan to surrender the conquests on the mainland and content herself with the islands and an additional war indemnity of $22,000,000. The real motive of Russia was evident, when she secured possession of the Liao-tung peninsula for herself on a ninety-nine year lease and fortified Port

Arthur, and also gained railroad concessions in Manchuria. At the same time Russia helped China float a foreign loan to pay off the first installment of the Japanese indemnity. The next decade was devoted by Japan to a deliberate preparation for the inevitable struggle with Russia for primacy in northeastern China. When the war came in 1904, it looked like a fight between a giant and a pigmy, but the Japanese soldiers won victory after victory. Port Arthur surrendered with 40,000 men, and the Russian navy was annihilated. Both countries agreed to evacuate Manchuria and return it to China. Japan obtained Port Arthur and the Liao-tung peninsula, and was recognized as having a paramount influence in Korea. No war indemnity was paid. Japan emerged from the war as one of the eight great world powers, and the dominant influence in the Far East. In 1910 Korea was annexed to Japan and renamed Chosen. The Koreans appealed in vain to the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 and to the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921 for a restoration of their independence. Korea is about twice the size of New York state and has a population of 18,000,000. It has proven to be a rich field for Japanese commercial expansion. The whole Japanese Empire was now about the size of the state of Texas and embraced over 80,000,000 people in 1925.

Great Britain and Japan

Great Britain was the first among the strong nations to welcome this newcomer among the world powers, and in 1902 formed the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, which (1) promised the integrity and independence of China, and (2) declared for equal trading opportunities for all. It was extended in 1905 and 1911 to include guarantees of peace in eastern Asia and in India, and continued in force until 1921. The easy triumph of Japan over Russia led to an "awakening" among the orientals who began to say that if they were armed and trained like the westerners, European control in the Far East might be thrown off entirely. As a result, the term "yellow peril" was coined, and men began to speculate as to what would happen in case the yellow race, militarized and led by Japan, should inaugurate a world war against the white nations of the west.

Japan and the World War

The World War furnished Japan with an opportunity to secure another piece of Chinese territory. After declaring war on Germany, at Great Britain's invitation, Japan seized Kiao-chau and the province of Shantung with a promise of the eventual restoration of the same to China. Shortly after this conquest Japan presented China with her twenty-one demands, which would have virtually reduced China to a Japanese dependency. China protested and appealed to the powers, but receiving no support was forced to sign an agreement to "employ Japanese advisers in political, financial and military affairs"; to permit the Japanese to police certain important places in China; to give Japan the right to construct certain railroads; and to consult Japan about foreign loans. In secret treaties Russia, Great Britain, France, and Italy agreed to give Shantung and the German Islands

in the Pacific north of the equator to Japan. At the same time Russia and Japan in 1916 secretly formed an offensive and defensive alliance against "any third power" that might attack their vested positions in China. In 1922, in accordance with the agreement at the Washington Disarmament Conference of 1921, Japan made good her promise to restore the Shantung province to China.

In recent years Japan has gradually developed what has been called an "Asiatic Monroe Doctrine." In the face of the aggressions of the white man's world, the Japanese feel themselves justified in making provisions for their future security and prosperity. To them China and Japan form a single economic unit. Hence their foreign policy aims to establish: (1) the primacy of Japan in eastern Asia; (2) the exclusion of the western powers from positions in the Far East which threaten Japanese supremacy; (3) the recognition of Japan's right to an equitable opportunity in the colonizing parts of the globe; and (4) the absolute equality of Asiatics with Europeans not only in Asia, but also in Africa and elsewhere.

9. Europe and America in Africa

The huge Dark Continent of Africa, three times the size of either the United States or Europe with 11,462,000 square miles, still remains the most backward of all the grand divisions of the earth. Until comparatively recently, this vast area, except the northern and southern extremities, was peopled by savage tribes of blacks living amidst the most primitive conditions, and almost wholly cut off from the outside world. The backwardness of Africa was due, in part, to geographical conditions. The long, regular coast line is inhospitable, has few good harbors to encourage trade, is swampy and excessively hot, and breeds disease. Tall mountain ranges form a vast rim about the coast and thus make communication between the sea and the high and healthier interior difficult. A mighty desert stretches across the northern portion; the central part under the equator is a dense jungle burnt by the direct rays of the sun; and a rainless tableland covers the south. Four great rivers drain the continent, but until recently navigation has been impeded by rapids and waterfalls near their mouths. It is not surprising, in consequence, that until the middle of the last century the word "Unknown" was marked across the interior of the maps of Africa.

"Darkest Africa"

Although this continent was the first after Europe to be mapped by Europeans, it was the last to be brought under their civilization. The northern coast has a history running back into antiquity. Egypt and Carthage played a conspicuous part in the rise of civilization. The study of human society begins in the Nile valley. From the seventh century onward Mohammedans from Asia overran northern Africa, and sent missionaries, traders, and slave-hunters into the interior. From the close of the fifteenth century to the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, British, and

French established trading posts along the coasts of Africa and did a thriving business in ivory, gold, gum, and human slaves. But with the exception of the Dutch in South Africa, Europeans made no effort to establish settlements in Africa. In 1815 Egypt, Tripoli, Tunis, and Algeria were ruled by tribal chiefs subject to the sultan of Turkey. Morocco had its own sultan as an independent state. The Dutch colony of 12,000 farmers in Cape Colony had passed to Great Britain. Until about 1865, only the French in Algeria and the British in Cape Colony, and the Boers, who had fled northward, had extended their rule into the interior.

The darkest and most cruel chapter in African history was the capture and sale of the black peoples as slaves by the Christian nations of Europe and the New England Puritan sailors. These brutal white bullies seized the Negroes, packed them in the holds of ships, and sold them in North and South America. Millions of them were the victims of this inhuman, though lucrative, traffic. The Americans, instead of opposing this wicked business, welcomed the opportunity to secure cheap labor and so increase their wealth and comfort. Christians justified slavery as a divinely sanctioned institution, and argued that the slaves were being civilized and Christianized. In 1775 Great Britain alone had 192 ships with a capacity of 47,000 slaves engaged in this business. In 1791 there were 40 slave stations on the African coast — 15 Dutch, 14 British, 4 Portuguese, 4 Danish, and 3 French. With the American and French Revolution, the conviction grew that human slavery was contrary to "the laws of God and the rights of man." Lord Mansfield ruled that as soon as a slave set foot on the British Isles, he became a free man. The Quakers began an active campaign against slavery. Wilberforce and others persuaded the British Parliament in 1807 to prohibit the slave trade. The Congress of Vienna in 1814 decreed the abolition of this traffic, but left the details of the execution of the decree to each individual nation. The exportation of slaves to America stopped the forepart of the nineteenth century, but the trade in African slaves flourished both in Asia and within Africa until through international agreements it has practically disappeared. The League of Nations has sought to end it completely in regions like Abyssinia.

The slave trade

Agitation for the abolition of Negro slavery served likewise as a stimulus for missionary work among the black peoples of Africa. Roman Catholic and Protestant missions began in the seventeenth century and became especially active in the nineteenth century. The marvelous reports of the traders and missionaries about the odd wild animals, the unusual plants, and the tribes of strange people, aroused the curiosity of the explorer, adventurer, and scientist. As early as 1788 a society was established in London to encourage "men of enterprise to explore the African continent." After numerous attempts to reach the interior, Mungo Park with government aid and 36 European companions in 1805 reached Timbuktu but was killed on the Niger

river. An expedition sent out by the British government in 1816 to explore the Congo, under the erroneous belief that the Niger and Congo were "the same river," ascended the latter 280 miles until stopped by the rapids which bar the way to the interior. A Swiss explorer named Burckhardt, after devoting several years to learning the language and customs of the natives, explored the Abyssinian countries and died in Cairo in 1817. In 1823 three Englishmen reached Lake Chad from Tripoli and were the first to report flourishing cities of semi-civilized natives in the inner regions. For the next quarter of a century the French and British were quite active in explorations; and in 1848–9 two German missionaries discovered the snow-clad peaks of Kilimanjaro.

The most famous man connected with the opening up of Africa was David Livingstone, a Scotch missionary. From 1840 until his death in 1873, he spent almost all his time in the dangerous and difficult task of investigating the interior of Africa. He worked north of the Orange river, crossed the Kalahari desert to Lake Ngami, and in 1851–6 traversed the continent from east to west discovering the Upper Zambezi and the famous Victoria Falls. Then he explored the lower Zambezi and Lake Nyassa. In 1866 he began his last great tour of the Upper Congo from Zanzibar. Seven years later this brave man died a lonely death in the heart of Africa, and his devoted followers carried his body and papers back to Zanzibar from which his remains were borne to England and there deposited in Westminster Abbey. No explorer did so much as Livingstone, through his travels and writings, to acquaint the outside world with the Dark Continent. His activities aroused a tremendous interest among Europeans and Americans in the peoples and resources of Africa. *Livingstone*

Next to Livingstone, Henry M. Stanley deserved most credit for his work in Africa. Born in Wales, at the age of seventeen he went to the United States, where he saw service in the Civil War, and subsequently became a newspaper reporter. After some exciting adventures in Asia, in the Indian wars of the western part of the United States, in Abyssinia, and in Europe, he was commissioned by the New York *Herald* in 1871 to discover Livingstone, who was generally believed to have died in central Africa. Leaving Zanzibar, after a forced march of nine months, he found Livingstone at Ujiji, supplied him with food and medicines, and spent several months with him exploring Lake Tanganyika. In 1872 he carried Livingstone's journal to England and wrote a picturesque book, *How I Found Livingstone*. The next year he accompanied British troops to Ashanti as a war correspondent. In 1874 the New York *Herald* and London *Daily Telegraph* financed an Anglo-American expedition to Africa under Stanley's command. Starting from the east coast, he spent three years in crossing the continent and reached the ocean at the mouth of the Congo. His experiences were told in *Through the Dark Continent* *Stanley*

in 1878 and showed that he had accomplished more than any other single expedition. Politically his journey laid the foundations for the Congo State, and for the scramble of the western nations of Europe for the partition of the untaken parts of Africa. His call for missionaries met with an immediate response, which served as the first step in placing the headwaters of the Nile under British control. Commercially, he made known the rich natural resources of the interior of the continent. Failing to interest British merchants in the wealth of the Congo, Stanley coöperated with Leopold II, king of Belgium, in organizing the International Association of the Congo. In 1879 Stanley went to the Congo as an agent of the Association, made treaties with the natives, established trading stations along the Congo as far as Stanley Falls, built a road around the cataracts, and over it carried four small steamers to the river above them. After five years devoted to these projects, Stanley returned to Europe, but in 1887 in the employ of the British East Africa Company he spent two more years in Africa, chiefly around Albert Nyanza, gaining valuable concessions for his employers. His account of this adventure was given in 1890 in his *Darkest Africa*. No other explorer accomplished more in geographical discoveries than this remarkable man, whose name was honored throughout the world. Henceforth the African map ceased to be marked "Unknown," but was filled in with charted rivers, lakes, and mountains.

Prior to 1878 only three European powers — Great Britain, France, and Portugal — held large colonies in Africa. Although a tide of British immigration began after South Africa was seized from the Dutch, yet so annoying were the troubles with the Boers and the natives that in 1865 the British House of Commons unanimously voted "that all further extension of territory . . . would be inexpedient." Nevertheless Great Britain, in addition to South Africa, staked out vague claims on the Gold Coast, on Zanzibar, and at a few other points. Portugal claimed portions of the coast of both east and west Africa, and in 1875 secured possession of Delagoa Bay. France had annexed Algeria in 1830, had a settlement on the Senegal river, held some posts on the upper Guinea coast, used the estuary of the Gabun for a naval station, and in 1862 secured Obok at the southern entrance to the Red Sea. The French had constructed the Suez Canal, which was opened to traffic in 1869. Thus by 1878 European powers owned roughly, only one tenth of the whole continent. The Orange River State and the Transvaal were free Dutch republics. Sierra Leone and Liberia had been established as communities of freed slaves.

After 1878, following the remarkable explorations of Livingstone, Stanley and others, Africa became the theater for European expansion. The causes were found in the economic and political rivalries of the nations of western Europe, and in the advance made in science. The partition of the entire continent soon followed. Railroads penetrated

the interior; vast regions were opened for exploitation; and Africa began to take its place in world history. The Industrial Revolution, with its quest for raw materials and new markets, led the powers to lay greedy hands on the territory. Bankers, manufacturers, capitalists, traders, and missionaries saw new El Dorados in the Dark Continent and encouraged their governments to take part in the appropriation of the territory. Private individuals and corporations joined in the mad scramble. It has been seen how King Leopold II of Belgium with Cardinal Lavigerie of Africa organized an association to exploit the wealth of the Congo and to suppress the slave trade, and sent out Stanley to supervise the work. A conference of the powers in Berlin in 1884–5 dissolved the association, agreed to suppress the slave trade, and recognized the "Congo Free State" under the personal ownership of Leopold II. The United States and twelve European states gave their consent to this arrangement on condition that the "open door" policy be guaranteed to all nations. The Congo was at once occupied with troops, and the natives, reduced to a condition of slavery, were kept at work gathering rubber, ivory, and gums to enrich the owner. The public opinion of the world was aroused by this cruel exploitation, reforms were adopted, and in 1908 the Belgian government annexed the Congo Free State. It is now a model colony, eighty times larger than Belgium, with 10,000,000 blacks and 10,000 Europeans. About 600 missionaries are working in that region alone. The exports amount to nearly $60,000,000; steamers run up and down the Congo; telegraph lines and wireless stations cover the country; and 1,200 miles of railroads and 650 miles of roads are in operation. The deposits of copper, which are reported to be the richest in the world, are worked by the most modern machinery, and tin, gold and diamonds are found.

European intrusion

About 1890 began the "Great African Hunt" for colonies, which lasted until the end of the World War. As a result Turkey lost all her African dependencies, and the two Dutch republics ceased to be independent states. The rest of the continent, except Abyssinia and little Liberia, was carved up into European colonies without regard to the rights or wishes of the natives. At the outbreak of the World War in 1914, Africa was divided among the western powers as follows:

Europe in Africa, 1914

1. Portugal, the earliest colonizer in Africa, owned an empire twenty-one times her own size with 8,000,000 people. Although a possible source of great wealth, Portugal, not being an industrial state, had found her colonies to be a liability rather than an asset. It was reported in 1913 that Great Britain and Germany offered to purchase them, and Belgium and South Africa were eager to secure at least portions of them. In 1919 a greater degree of autonomy was granted the colonies and administrative reforms were promised to allay local discontent. The colonies consisted of Angola, Mozambique, Guinea and the Cape Verde and a few other islands.

2. France had built up a colonial empire in Africa rivalling that lost in America. It covered an area larger than all Europe and had a population of 31,000,000. It was made up of Algeria, four times the size of France, with a population of 4,750,000 natives, and 800,000 whites, and exports valued at $250,000,000; Tunis, larger than Portugal with over two million inhabitants, and quite backward; Morocco, larger than France with 6,000,000 people and rich in resources; the huge Sahara, which some day may be a paradise; Senegal, Niger, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Dahomey, Mauritania, Congo, Reunion, part of Somaliland, and the island of Madagascar.

3. Great Britain's African possessions constituted a third of the continent with 56,000,000 inhabitants. They included the Sudan, British Somaliland, East Africa, Uganda and the islands off the coast, the South African Union, Rhodesia, Becuanaland, Basutoland, Nyassaland, Nigeria, Gold Coast, Sierra Leone, and Gambia. A considerable hold over Egypt also continued. The British colonies were the most favorably located, the wealthiest, and the most thickly populated with whites. The civilization of South Africa compared favorably with that of any other portion of the globe.

4. Germany, a later rival for an African empire, secured the third largest area, consisting of territory almost five times her own size with 12,000,000 subjects. It comprised Togoland, Cameroon, Southwest Africa, and East Africa, which were won in the face of active British, French, and Portuguese opposition. The best colony was East Africa with 8,000,000 natives, 15,000 Indians, and 5,300 whites, and rich in natural resources.

5. Italy, the latest candidate for territory on the Dark Continent, obtained within a dozen years an empire five times her own size with 1,600,000 people. It embraced Eritrea, a portion of Somaliland, and Lybia, all in northeastern Africa. Thus far these colonies have not proved to be sources of profit.

6. Spain controlled Rio de Oro, Adrar, Guinea, and the Rif in northern Morocco, with an area less than half her own, and 250,000 inhabitants.

7. The United States exercised a friendly protectorate over the Negro Republic of Liberia, a colony that was founded in 1816 for freed American slaves. In 1847 they declared their independence and drew up a constitution. The state is about as large as Ohio, and has a population of 2,000,000 of whom only 12,000 are of American origin and 50,000 civilized. Not until 1893 were the boundaries fixed. In 1910 with the consent of Great Britain, Germany and France, the United States took control of the finances, the military organization, and the economic development of this black Republic.

In 1914 every foot of Africa, except Abyssinia, a native independent state as large as two Germanies with 8,000,000 people, was preëmpted by some foreign power. About three fourths of the continent was possessed by two powers — Great Britain and France.

The remainder was controlled by six others — Germany, Belgium, Italy, Portugal, Spain, and the United States. As a result of the World War, Great Britain seized German East and Southwest Africa, which almost doubled her holdings and gave her a continuous stretch of territory from the Cape to Cairo over which to complete the continuous route by rail and water now lacking only a few links. Ruanda, the northwestern corner of German East Africa was ceded to Belgium and added to the Congo Free State. The Cameroon was divided between France and Great Britain, the former gaining the major portion. Togoland was likewise divided between these two powers by a line running north and south. In a secret treaty France and Great Britain in 1915 promised Italy "compensation" in Africa in case they should obtain the German colonies. She has set claim to an extension of Libya southward to Lake Chad and of Somaliland westward. The boundaries were fixed definitely in January 1924. During the World War the black men of Africa fought loyally for their white masters both at home and in Europe. In 1920 Great Britain owned 38 per cent of Africa; France 37 per cent; Portugal 7 per cent; Belgium 8 per cent; Italy 5½ per cent; Spain 1½ per cent; and only 3 per cent was independent.

Through many different agencies the institutions and ideals of Europe and the United States have spread rapidly over Africa. The whole of South Africa is dominated by European whites, and every other section of the continent has felt their influence. Famines have been relieved; tribal wars have been stopped; huge irrigation plants have been erected; western wares flood the continent; roads and railroads thread the country; steamships navigate the rivers and lakes; machines have been installed in mines and factories; and communication has been improved. Thousands of missionaries are teaching the natives Christianity, the languages, science, mechanical arts, and ways of the whites. Slowly in some parts and rapidly in others, the whole civilization is changing to the European type. The idea of "self-determination" has awakened a sense of nationalism and "race consciousness," which has produced revolts in Egypt, Libya, Portuguese East Africa and South Africa. Every year, thousands of Europeans pour into Africa which now has a white population, chiefly in the north and south, of 2,500,000. Efforts have been made to curtail the liquor traffic and to abolish slavery. The 120,000,000 of the black race are gradually adopting the civilization of their conquerors. The next century will undoubtedly see undreamed-of developments in Africa.

European civilization in Africa

10. The Europeanization of Australasia and Oceania

The civilization of Australia, the smallest of the six continents, is, like that of America, merely the overflow of Europe. It is chiefly British, moulded and modified by local conditions. Of the 5,000,000 whites all but a little over 3 per cent are either British or of British

Population of Australia

descent. It is estimated that the 50,000 aborigines are less numerous than when the country was first colonized. So far as they have been civilized, they have adopted the institutions and customs of the whites. The blood and culture of the island of Tasmania reflect the influence of Australia. The population of New Zealand is predominantly British. The natives number 62,000, the Chinese 3,000, the half-castes about the same, and the non-British whites 12,000. In recent years more than 40,000 immigrants, principally from the British Isles, have gone annually to that land. At the same time there has been an exodus of 35,000 yearly. The language, institutions, and ideals of New Zealand, like those of Australia, were transplanted from Great Britain. These newer portions of the British Empire have been more progressive in making social, economic, educational, and political experiments, consequently their civilization is of a most advanced type.

Oceania

Oceania is a term applied to the islands of the Pacific Ocean. Most of those south of the equator now belong to Great Britain. Among them are the Solomon, Santa Cruz, Fiji, Ellice, Phoenix, Tokelau, Tonga, Manihiki, Cook, Kermadec, Avon, Chatham, and the eastern portion of New Guinea. North of the equator North Borneo, the Gilbert, Palmyra, Washington, Fanning, Christmas, and Hong Kong belong to the British Empire. Germany in 1914 owned in the south Pacific Wilhelmsland in New Guinea, the Admiralty, Bismarck, New Mecklenburg, and part of the Samoan group; and in the north Pacific, the Pelew, the Caroline, and the Marshall islands. These were lost in the World War, however, the former going to the British Empire and the latter to Japan. France controls the New Hebrides, New Caledonia, Loyalty, Society, Faumotu, Tuhai, and Marquesas islands — all below the equator. In addition to the islands captured from Germany, Japan holds Formosa, the Liu-Kiu-Luchu, and Kurile islands, and the southern part of Sakhalin. The United States has secured possession of the Philippines, Guam, Howland, Hawaii, and Aleutian islands in the north Pacific, and some of the Samoan group in the south Pacific. Holland owns most of the East Indies forming a connecting link between Asia and Australia. The total population of Oceania approximates 70,000,000 of whom the brown and yellow races constitute the vast majority. The whites, who are the owners and rulers, number only a few hundred thousand. Many of the natives are still in a state of savagry and barbarism. Through trade relations, the work of missionaries and teachers, and political control, western civilization is slowly penetrating these out-of-the-way places either directly, or indirectly through Europeanized powers like Japan.

In the Indian Ocean, France owns Madagascar and Reunion, and all the rest of the islands belong to Great Britain. In the south Atlantic, St. Helena, Ascension, Tristran, Gough, Sandwich, South Georgia, South Orkney, South Shetland, and Falkland islands are

parts of the British Empire. In the north Atlantic control of the islands is more widely distributed, although Great Britain possesses the Orkney, Shetland, Newfoundland, Bahamas, Jamaica, Bermudas, and the Lesser Antilles. Portugal owns the Azores, Cape Verde, Madeira, St. Thomas, and Prince. Spain retains the Canary and Annobon islands. Denmark rules Greenland, Iceland, and the Faroe islands. The United States owns Porto Rico, the Virgin islands, and exercises a protectorate over Cuba, Santo Domingo, and Haiti. In all these island regions western civilization has been firmly planted. The native population is much smaller than in the Pacific, and the white population larger.

II. General Conclusions

Looking at the world as a whole today, it is astonishing to see to what extent the civilization of Europe has spread over the six continents and the islands of the seas. This remarkable result has been accomplished in many different ways during the past four centuries. Early explorers, navigators, adventurers, traders, missionaries, and military leaders laid the first foundations. Then colonists went forth of their own accord, or were sent out by their governments or by corporations, to settle along the coasts or up the navigable streams. In this manner European political, religious, social, educational, and economic institutions and ideals were planted in North and South America; in Siberia; in South Africa; and in Australia and New Zealand. This process of the direct expansion of European influences to other parts of the world has continued down to the present day. During the past century, particularly, there has been an unprecedented movement of European peoples into every quarter of the globe. With the doubling of the population of Europe in the nineteenth century, and the consequent overcrowding and competition at home, millions of emigrants have crossed the seas to new regions, where land was cheap, wages high, opportunities for advancement greater, and the government more democratic. This new "Migration of the nations" still continues. To the United States alone since 1776 have gone 40,000,000 people from European lands. Other millions have found homes in Canada, Latin America, Australasia, Asia, and the islands of the seas. While some have returned home, the vast majority have remained in their adopted countries. These recent waves of emigration have carried European civilization to all corners of the earth.

End of European and American isolation

These direct settlements of Europeans, in turn, set in motion secondary immigration movements that spread European civilization over the more backward parts of the world. Thus the settlers of the eastern coast of North America gradually forged their way westward until they crossed the continent to the Pacific. The Latin Americans penetrated the interior of the continent. South Africans worked their way northward; the Russians eastward across Asia; the Australians took possession of a continent. In this way the natives of

Migrations of peoples

America, Africa, Asia, and Australasia were brought into touch with European influences. The millions of blacks who were carried to the New World from Africa soon forgot their own language and customs and adopted those of their white masters. The hundreds of thousands of Asiatics, who have gone to other parts of the world ruled by the whites, have imitated their clothes, foods, speech, manner of living, and ways of doing things. The thousands of students, who have gone from Asia and Africa to Europe and America for a higher education, have carried home with them a knowledge of western history, inventions, government, art, industry, literature, and religion. Numerous missionaries, teachers, and physicians have given western civilization to the non-Christian peoples. Western civil and military officials have produced similar results. Business men have opened up all parts of the world to the products of western mills and factories. Countries like Turkey, Persia, China, Japan, and Liberia have invited specialists from the west to give advice about finance, politics, education and industry. In all these ways non-European countries have been modernized and westernized.

Effect of the World War

As a result of the World War, distant peoples were brought into closer touch with Europe. Hundreds of thousands of colonial troops from Asia and Africa saw military service under the banners of Great Britain and France. Large numbers of Chinese "coolies" were employed as laborers in France and Belgium and Russia. The Filipinos raised regiments to serve under the stars and stripes. Japan for the first time joined her western allies in a great international conflict in Europe. Thus a knowledge of Europe was spread more deeply among the non-European peoples. Even in America, through the millions of soldiers and civilians sent to France, Belgium and Italy, new contacts were established between the Old World and the New, and a different set of ideas and impressions of the European peoples was carried back to America. The colonials from the self-governing colonies of Great Britain had the same experience.

European ascendancy in the world today

No fact in world history stands out more clearly today than the general predominance of Europeans and their descendants throughout the earth. Their steamships carry the world's freight and passengers across all the seas. Their railroads girdle the globe. Their airships fly across the oceans and continents. Their telegraph lines, cables, wireless stations, and telephones bring all parts of the world into communication. Their electrical inventions light the cities and supply heat and power. Their agricultural implements, household utensils, and machinery are used in Africa and Asia. The products of their factories supply the needs of distant peoples. Their type of houses and public buildings is found in India, China, Japan, and Egypt. Their kerosene lamps, gasoline engines, sewing machines, the phonograph, the radio, moving pictures, photography, matches, watches, firearms, typewriter, fountain pen, clothing, tobacco, alcoholic drinks, and patent medicines are used among the blacks,

reds, yellows and browns of every land and clime. China is remodelling her political institutions after those of the United States. Japan and Turkey fashion their governments and train their armies after the example of European states. India is copying the laws and industries of Great Britain. The English tongue has become almost a world language, although French, German, Spanish and Italian are also widely diffused. The Christian faith has spread among the Eskimos of the frozen north, the Negroes of equatorial Africa, the Indians of America, Mohammedans, Buddhists, and Confucians. Western schools planted in Asia and Africa teach the arts, sciences, languages, morals, and manners. Physicians and surgeons from the west are giving their lives to cure the sick and crippled in distant lands. Millions of dollars are contributed by western peoples for these worthy purposes. In all these ways the blessings of western civilization are spreading around the globe.

12. The World of 1800 and Today Compared

At the beginning of the past century, half of the landed surface of the earth was still unmapped. Canada, Alaska, and the region west of the Mississippi were so little known that a geography of that date omitted all indication of the Rocky Mountains. The vast interior of Asia was unknown, and Africa was labelled "The Unexplored Continent." Only a few settlements were made on the coast of Australia. The Arctic regions had scarcely been discovered, and the Antarctic realm had barely been touched. The known world was restricted to Europe, the eastern part of North America, and the coastal borders of Latin America, Africa, and Asia. The expedition of Lewis and Clark in 1804–5 opened up the Louisiana territory. Alexander von Humbolt in 1799–1804 began the systematic exploration of South America, but it was not until 1913 that Roosevelt went up the Amazon to its headwaters.

Completion of explorations

The past century has seen the geographical conquest of the globe by many hardy and heroic explorers and scientists. Africa was penetrated by brave men, who traced the great rivers, located the mountains, mapped the interior, and described the people, and animal and plant life. In Asia the headwaters of the Indus and Ganges were reached, the high peaks of the Himalayas climbed and measured, the mysteries of Tibet and central Asia photographed, and the veil of ignorance shrouding Farther India, China, Korea, and Japan lifted. Inner Australia was crossed from north to south. Many fruitless efforts were made to discover the northwest passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific, but the task was finally accomplished in 1903–6 by Amundsen. To reach the North Pole, Nansen, a Norwegian scientist, in 1892–5, drifted across the polar sea in his ship, the *Fram*, and reached a point 272 miles from the Pole. A few years later an Italian expedition attained a point still farther north. The honor of actually discovering the North Pole belongs to Robert E. Peary, an American,

who on April 7, 1909, reached it over rough ice after months of hardships with a dog-sledge, a Negro servant, and several Eskimos. Nansen and Perry proved that there is no land in the north polar basin, but only ice over a sea of great but unknown depth. On the contrary, the south polar region is a continent of vast dimensions, which many brave men from Captain Cook onward have attempted to explore. A British expedition under the leadership of Shackleton in 1907–9 proceeded to a point 97 miles from the South Pole. The honor of discovering it belongs to Amundsen, a Norwegian, who reached it on December 16, 1911. Captain Scott, an Englishman, found it on January 18, 1912, only to discover that Amundsen had won the prize. On their return, Scott and his companions perished from exposure in the terrific cold. Although the entire surface of the earth is now known, yet large areas remain to be investigated more scientifically.

The expansion of European civilization brought an impact with two distinct areas: one inhabited by uncivilized peoples such as the Indians of America and the Negroes of Africa; the other peopled by civilized groups such as the Hindus, Chinese, and Japanese. As a result the entire world has become largely Europeanized, and Europe is now only a part of this "Greater Europe." The east and west, so long separated, have been united, and each has come to appreciate the other. Names from Europe and the United States have been sprinkled all over the earth, and those of Asia and Africa are found in Europe and America. Action and reaction have been going on for over four hundred years, and yet one may say that the process has just begun. The next century will witness a more pronounced interdependence of Europe on the rest of the world, and of other peoples on Europeans than has yet appeared. Already there has developed on the globe an economic unity, which is the basis of material prosperity in all nations. The needs of the industrialized powers have led them to attempt to organize the world politically. Much has been written about the effect of the expansion of Europe upon other portions of the earth, but entirely too little attention has been given to the reaction of this expansion upon European ideas, institutions, and modes of living. Perhaps it would not be too much to say that Europe has been revolutionized in revolutionizing the rest of the world.

13. Results of the New Age of Imperialism

A general survey of the fifty years following the Franco-Prussian War reveals certain striking characteristics and results:

1. It was an era of benevolent *bourgeois* rule. The leading statesmen, with some exceptions such as Bismarck and Cavour, came from the middle class. Rich traders, big merchants, wealthy manufacturers, and "captain of industry" generally belonged to this group. Their triumph was due as much to the Industrial Revolution as to the series

of political revolutions, by which power and privilege passed from the hands of the land-owning aristocracy and the clergy into the hands of the business and professional men. Noblemen now found it profitable to enter finance and industry; they sat with the *bourgeoisie* on boards of directors of banks, factories, railroads, steamship lines, and mines; and they joined the middle class in politics. Thus it was that the lawyers, doctors, bankers, teachers, engineers, journalists, and capitalists absorbed the nobility, on the one hand, and the men of genius and ability, who rose from the common people, on the other, until they became the ruling political power throughout the world. Here was a factor of great significance in world history.

2. A new type of nationalism, based on an intense patriotism, grew up during this period. Ten continental European states — the German Empire, the Third French Republic, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the Kingdom of Italy, the five Balkan states, and Norway — emerged as sovereign powers. At the same time the "submerged nationalities" like the Finns, Poles, Czechs, and Irish, were clamoring for free self-determination. The national unity of the American Republic had just been decided by a bloody civil conflict. Japan was modernized, and China awakened. Everywhere an intense nationalism revealed itself in more democratic institutions and social reforms. The franchise was extended in most nations. Slaves and serfs were freed. The "pan" movement attempted to build up a closer political and cultural union of the various groups having the same blood and origin, and it met with general acceptance. There was an increase in national order and security, and in national wealth and prosperity. National laws protected private property, favored business, and even subsidized commercial undertakings. Tariffs were revised to protect industries as well as to secure more revenues for the state. In Great Britain, however, the policy of free trade was regarded as most favorable to the industrial class. National taxation was changed so as to weigh as lightly as possible on big business. Most of the nations began to develop merchant marines to carry their imports and exports. For national protection, this new nationalism led to the building of larger navies and the organization of stronger armies. Patriotic support was given to militarism. Free public schools were provided, and attendance made compulsory. Higher institutions of learning were endowed by the rich, or supported by the state. Applied science was fostered in a hundred different fields. And, finally, the well-being of the working classes was cared for by unprecedented social and economic legislation.

3. All over the world constitutions became the basis for the modernized states. Those of an earlier period were amended to meet new needs. Many fresh constitutions were framed by both republics and monarchies to guarantee individual rights and to subject all the processes of government to law. Many acts of Parliament

altered the British constitution. The United States after the Civil War adopted seven amendments. Austria-Hungary drew up a new constitution in 1867, which lasted until the end of the World War. The Italian constitution adopted in 1848 is still in operation. The German constitution of 1871 lasted till dissolved in the Revolution of 1918. Switzerland revised her constitution in 1874, France formulated hers in 1875, and the next year those of Spain and Turkey appeared. The constitution of Rumania was secured in 1884, Holland in 1887, and Japan in 1889. Serbia framed a constitution in 1903, Sweden in 1909, Portugal, Bulgaria and Greece in 1911, Denmark in 1915, and Russia in 1917. Between 1866 and 1917 all the Latin-American republics, except Peru, Uruguay, and Chile, obtained new constitutions. Out of the World War came at least a dozen new constitutions in Europe. Thus it will be seen that the period of national imperialism was one of continued progress in constitutionalism.

4. The type of government which prevails today throughout the world is the republican. Excluding the few European dependencies, all the states in North and South America are republics — twenty-two of them counting Canada. In Europe before 1914 France, Switzerland, and Portugal were republics; and since the World War eight more have been added to the list. The vast Chinese Empire was transformed into a republic, thus with Russia, Germany, France and the United States, completing the mighty belt of republics around the globe. Of course Australia, South Africa, and New Zealand should be added to the list. In addition, it should be remembered, that most of the monarchies like Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, Denmark, and Norway, are almost as truly democratic as the republics. Everywhere royal power is declining and popular government increasing. About two thirds of the people of the earth now live under republics.

5. The peasants, artisans, and day laborers, who constitute the bulk of the population of all nations, were, for the most part, willing to accept the leadership and ideals of the middle class. Since the *bourgeoisie* posed as the champions of "liberty," which guaranteed private property, individual rights, and democratic government; of "equality" of opportunity and legal protection; and of "fraternity" in a vigorous national patriotism, the *proletariat* was persuaded to follow them. The thrifty workers invested their savings in stocks and bonds and thus, like the nobles, identified their interests with the capitalistic system. They favored any state policy that increased their dividends. Peasants were lured from the farms to the cities by better economic inducements. The wage-earners were taught to believe that their employment, wages, and livelihood depended upon the perpetuity and prosperity of the captains of industry. A healthy business condition was set forth as one of the fundamental aims of national patriotism, and the working classes were

impressed with the necessity of promoting industry and trade as their primary duty. The growing number who refused to accept the "divine right" of middle-class rule, formed labor unions, and incited strikes and lockouts, or became the champions of socialism and syndicalism.

6. Out of these conditions arose the new national imperialism, which sought colonies, raw materials, markets, new fields for investments, concessions in backward countries, and virgin areas for missionary and educational work. There was much talk about "manifest destiny," and the "white man's burden." In the mad scramble for the partition of Africa, Asia, and the islands of the seas, the European countries took the lead. The United States and Japan followed with a policy of expansion. World history took on a new meaning. Between 1871 and 1925 more was done to spread the civilization of Europe and America over the globe than had been done in all previous centuries. This new imperialism grew out of the new nationalism, and rested upon a new patriotism backed up by industrialism and militarism. These were the modern forces that were moulding the destiny of the human race.

7. Under these conditions, as the nations were organized and guided, a clash of rival imperialistic and commercial interests over the earth was inevitable. As a result, nations sought to gain advantages through favorable treaties and alliances. Secret diplomacy was employed to secure agreements. Reciprocal understandings were used to obtain advantages. This keen rivalry was intensified by the advance in transportation and communication. Capable business promoters were sent over the earth to get concessions, contracts, and material bargains for the various national groups. Serious international crises arose. Most of them were settled by diplomacy and compromise, but again and again war was narrowly averted. Between 1871 and 1918 imperialism was either directly or indirectly responsible for the Russo-Turkish War of 1878, the Chino-Japanese War of 1894–5, the Spanish-American War of 1898, the Boer War of 1899, the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5, the Italo-Turkish War of 1911, the Balkan Wars of 1912–13, and the World War of 1914–18.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

V. Chirol, *The Occident and the Orient* (1924); H. Webster, *History of the Far East* (1923); E. Driault, *La question d'extrême Orient* (1908); P. Reinsch, *Intellectual and Political Currents in the Far East* (1911); L. Lawton, *Empires of the Far East*, 2 vols. (1912); R. K. Douglas, *Europe and the Far East, 1506–1912* (1913); S. K. Hornbeck, *Contemporary Politics in the Far East* (1916); H. A. Gibbons, *The New Map of Asia* (1919); *The New Map of Africa* (1916); H. M. Hyndman, *The Awakening of Asia* (1919); K. S. Latourette, *The Development of China* (1918); *The Development of Japan* (1916); H. A. Giles, *China and the Chinese* (1902); *The Civilization of China* (1911); *China and the Manchus* (1912); G. Maspero, *La Chine* (1918); P. H. Clements, *The Boxer Rebellion* (1915); P. H. Kent, *The Passing of the Manchus* (1912); B. L. Putnam-Weale, *The Fight for the Republic in China* (1918); H. M. Vinacke, *Modern Constitutional Development in China* (1920); H. Cordier, *Histoire des relations de la Chine avec les Puissances occidentales, 1860–1902* (1902);

M. T. Z. Tyau, *Treaty Relations between China and other States* (1917); H. B. Morse, *The International Relations of the Chinese Empire*, 3 vols. (1910–1918); N. J. Bau, *The Foreign Relations of China* (1921); *The Open Door Doctrine in Relation to China* (1923); T. W. Overlach, *Foreign Financial Control in China* (1919); G. Z. Wood, *The Shantung Question* (1922); Sun Yat-sen, *The International Development of China* (1922); Paul Linebarger, *Sun Yat-Sen and the Chinese Republic* (1925); F. Brinkley and Baron Kikuchi, *A History of the Japanese People from the Earliest Times to the End of the Meiji Era* (1915); Count Okuma, editor, *Fifty Years of New Japan*, 2 vols. (1909), English translation by M. B. Huish; G. E. Uyehara, *The Political Development of Japan: 1867–1909* (1910); W. W. McLaren, *A Political History of Japan* (1916); R. K. Porter, *Japan, the Rise of a Modern Power* (1918); J. H. Longford, *Japan* (1924); T. Gollier, *Essai sur les institutions politiques du Japon* (1903); K. Kawakami, *Japan in World Politics* (1917); *The Recent Aims and Political Development of Japan* (1923); P. J. Treat, *Japan and the United States, 1853–1921* (1921); A. S. Hershey, *Modern Japan* (1919); T. F. Millard, *The Conflict of Policies in Asia* (1924); T. Dennett, *Americans in Eastern Asia* (1924); *Americans in Eastern Asia* (1922); R. L. Buell, *The Washington Conference* (1922); F. M. Anderson and A. S. Hershey, *Handbook for the Diplomatic History of Europe, Asia, and Africa, 1870–1914* (1918); I. Bowman, *The New World — Problems in Political Geography* (1921); L. Stoddard, *The Rising Tide of Color* (1920); *The New World of Islam* (1922); D. G. Hogarth, *The Nearer East* (1902); E. M. Earle, *Turkey, the Great Powers and the Bagdad Railway* (1923); W. M. Shuster, *The Strangling of Persia* (1912); P. M. Sykes, *A History of Persia*, 2 vols. (1915); E. G. Browne, *The Persian Revolution of 1905–1909* (1910); A. Vambery, *Western Culture in Eastern Lands* (1906); M. J. Price, *Siberia* (1912); J. F. Abbott, *Japanese Expansion and American Policies* (1916); A. Ireland, *The Far Eastern Tropics* (1905); A. Cabaton, *Java and the Dutch East Indies* (1911); G. H. Scholefield, *The Pacific: Its Past and Its Future* (1919); M. Kalaw, *Self Government in the Philippine Islands* (1919); E. Hertslet, *The Map of Africa by Treaty*, 3 vols. (edition 1909); J. S. Keltie, *The Partition of Africa* (2d ed. 1895); N. D. Harris, *Intervention and Colonization in Africa* (1914); L. Woolf, *Empire and Commerce in Africa* (1920); H. H. Johnston, *British Central Africa* (1897); *Liberia*, 2 vols. (1906); *George Grenfell and the Congo*, 2 vols. (1908); *The Opening Up of Africa* (1911); *A History of the Colonization of Africa by Alien Races* (1913); C. H. Stigand, *Administration in Tropical Africa* (1914); H. Queneuil, *La Conference de Bruxelles et ses Resultats* (1907); D. Livingstone, *Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa* (1860); *Last Journals in Central Africa* (1875); H. M. Stanley, *How I Found Livingstone* (1872); *Autobiography* (1909, edited by D. Stanley); E. Vandervelde, *La Belgique et la Congo* (1911); W. C. Willoughby, *Race Problems in New Africa* (1923); A. B. Keith; *The Belgian Congo and the Berlin Act* (1918); A. F. Calvert, *The German African Empire* (1916); Wm Eveleigh, *Southwest Africa* (1915); A. B. Wylde, *Modern Abyssinia* (1901); T. Barclay, *The Turco-Italian War and its Problems* (1912); W. K. McClure, *Italy in North Africa* (1913); V. Piquet, *La colonization française dans l'Afrique du nord* (1912); G. W. Ellis, *Negro Culture in West Africa* (1914); A. Gaisman, *L'œuvre de la France au Tonkin* (1906); F. Starr, *Liberia* (1913); G. L. Beer, *African Problems at the Paris Peace Conference* (1923).

PART VIII

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND THE WORLD WAR

CHAPTER XXXIII

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

1. International Relations and Diplomacy to the Retirement of Bismarck

Although from the earliest times treaties of alliance were made between peoples, it may be said that international relations, in the sense in which the term is applied at present, date from the period of the rise of modern states like Spain, France and England. The existence of a "Society of Nations" was recognized by the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 and Grotius, the "Father of International Law," among others, laid the foundations of the modern rules which regulate the conclusion of treaties and alliances, the conduct of war and the making of peace. In the eighteenth century, amid the "din of arms," men like Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Rousseau in France, Adam Smith and the younger Pitt in England, Franklin in America, and Lessing and Kant in Germany preached "pacific aspirations" and a cosmopolitan humanitarianism. Economists urged the transformation of the European States into friendly economic *units under a comity of nations.*

International relations in early modern Europe

The American and French Revolutions marked a new epoch in international relations. The former created a new state, composed of thirteen independent colonies bound together by a federal constitution. The latter at first renounced all "wars of conquest" but offered "aid to all peoples who wished to recover their liberty" and soon found itself on the defensive against a coalition of monarchical powers who regarded the Revolution as a menace to the European order. The period of the revolutionary and Napoleonic wars saw the formation of one alliance after another, to which France and especially Napoleon, replied by other alliances, until in the end, most of the European powers joined the league which finally led to his overthrow.

The "Concert of Europe" after 1815

In the period between 1815 and 1848 numerous attempts were made to effect a "concert of Europe" to prevent a recrudescence of revolution and to reconstruct Europe. The backbone of this system was the Quadruple Alliance, consisting of the four great powers which had defeated Napoleon, France herself being informally admitted as a fifth in 1818. The powers held periodic conferences to settle problems arising from the peace treaties and to take action against incipient revolutions. But in a few years the concert split on the doctrine of intervention, England and France refusing to admit that the powers had the right to interfere in the domestic affairs of

other states. Nevertheless the concert continued as a shadowy European organization, and at times accomplished useful work, notably in the questions of Greek and Belgian independence and in the Near Eastern crisis of 1839–1841.

After 1848 the growing spirit of nationalism made it increasingly difficult for the powers to act in unison on any question. The divergent interests of the various nations rather than the community of European states were emphasized. It was a period of war following an era of peace, and, as in the past, numerous alliances were formed for the duration of armed conflicts — the league of England, France and Piedmont to oppose Russia in 1854–1856, the alliance between France and Piedmont to drive Austria out of Italy in 1859, the Austro-Prussian coalition to defeat Denmark in 1864, and the Prussian-Italian agreement to drive Austria out of Germany and Venetia in 1866.

Nationalism and the system of alliances

From this time on the system of alliances became permanent. The concert of Europe continued to function periodically to settle questions of common interest or to give its approval to changes in agreements concluded by the powers jointly on earlier occasions. The most notable cases of such international action between 1870 and 1914 were the Pontus Conference of 1871 which recognized the abrogation of the Black Sea clauses of the Treaty of Paris (1856), the Congress of Berlin which settled the questions arising from the Russo-Turkish War of 1877–1878, the Berlin conference of 1885 which established the Congo Free State and regulated other African problems, the Algeciras Conference of 1906 which decided disputed questions concerning Morocco, and the London Conference of 1913 which attempted to bring about peace between the Balkan states and Turkey. In this same category belong the two Hague Peace Conferences (1899, 1907), summoned at the instance of Russia. The first of these established a Permanent Court of Arbitration, while the second discussed the introduction of compulsory arbitration and the limitation of armaments.

These spasmodic attempts to establish international coöperation were, however, of secondary importance as compared with great systems of alliance which originated after 1870 and which were of a semi-permanent nature, differing radically in this respect from the earlier war treaties.

Bismarckian diplomacy

These systems originated in the bulwark of alliances erected by Bismarck to safeguard the position of Germany and to isolate France. Germany was, to be sure, the dominant power on the continent after her victory over France in 1870–1871, but the unification of Italy followed closely by that of Germany had badly shaken the balance of power in Europe. The whole central belt, hitherto a congeries of weak little states, had been consolidated into two new national states, one of which was the strongest military power on the continent. This far-reaching change had been brought about at the

expense of Austria and France, and it was to be expected that both these powers would seek to undo the events of the preceding decade. France especially was noted for her national pride, and the Germans regarded the spirit of revenge as a standing menace to their new Empire. But the other powers also realized that their position had been shaken. The Germanophil sentiment in England had begun to turn even before the war was over, and England, though she maintained her "splendid isolation" for many years more, felt forced to take a keener interest in continental affairs in order to retain her position. In the east was Russia, which had also pursued a policy friendly to Germany prior to 1870. The Russians were not slow to realize that they had not gained by the substitution of a strong German Empire for the weak German Confederation on their borders, and they were even then determined to oppose any further dislocation of the balance in Germany's favor.

In order to prevent France from finding supporters for her schemes of revenge Bismarck determined to draw as many of the powers as possible to his side and to exploit international rivalries for the advantage of Germany. Austria and Italy were both weak, and of secondary importance, but an alliance between France and England and especially between France and Russia would have been an almost intolerable menace. Of course these powers were all rivals, one of the other, but there was no knowing when they might find it profitable to liquidate their differences and conclude an agreement directed against Germany. Bismarck's object, then, was to maintain friendly relations with both England and Russia and thus to hold the balance between these two traditional antagonists, the "Whale" and the "Elephant." In the first years of the Empire he made no attempt to conclude hard and fast agreements. There was little prospect of close friendship with England so long as the liberal Gladstone ministry was in power, and consequently the German chancellor contented himself with the revival of the Quadruple Alliance in the shape of an informal League of the Three Emperors (Germany, Russia, and Austria) concluded in 1872–1873, the chief object of which was to erect a "triangular rampart" against "revolutionary" France and prevent her from finding allies on the continent. *Three Emperors' League*

But the acute tension subsisting between Germany and France which ended in the "War-Scare" of 1875 and led to the intervention of both Russia and England in behalf of France brought Bismarck to a realization of the dangers, while the severe Near Eastern crisis of 1875–1878 reopened the antagonism between Russia and Austria in the Balkans and led to the collapse of the Three Emperors' League. Bismarck, whose primary aim after 1870 was always to maintain the peace and to avoid jeopardizing the gains made in 1864–1870, attempted to mediate between the two rivals, but the Russians considered this inadequate remuneration for their benevolent neutrality in the 1860's and became more and more hostile to Germany. A

Bismarck and Russia

group of ultra-nationalists, known as Pan-Slavs, believed that Russia must act as the protector of the Slavic states of the Balkans and must take up the struggle with all those who opposed her. Where previously the slogan had been: "The road to Constantinople leads through Vienna," it soon became: "The road to Constantinople lies through Berlin." It was this hostile attitude on the part of the Russians that drove Bismarck further and further into coöperation with Austria and with England, whose interests largely coincided with those of Austria. To be sure Bismarck did not openly espouse the Austrian cause; indeed, it was only through his mediation that a conflict between England and Austria on the one hand and Russia on the other, was avoided in the spring of 1878. Nevertheless it was during these years that he cultivated friendly relations with Austria and even suggested to England the conclusion of an alliance. It can hardly be doubted that he would have openly joined Russia's enemies had they been able to reach a definite agreement between themselves and had there been a definite assurance that England would do her share. The Russians were, in a sense, right when they spoke of the Berlin Congress as a "European coalition under Bismarck's leadership to oppose Russia."

The ill-feeling in Russia continued unabated after the Congress of Berlin and the tsar himself fell entirely under the influence of the Pan-Slav group, which advocated, among other things an alliance with France. By the summer of 1879 Bismarck regarded it expedient to take protective measures. His idea appears to have been to effect a coalition between England, Germany, and Austria. Lord Beaconsfield, however, showed little inclination to commit his country to the policy of meddling in continental affairs, and Bismarck contented himself with the conclusion of an alliance with Austria in October, 1879. Each of the two powers promised to support the other with all its forces in case either were attacked by Russia. This agreement became the corner-stone of Bismarck's system, and continued in force until the general collapse in 1918. It will be noted that it was strictly defensive, and that it did not officially involve German support of Austrian policy in the Balkans.

But Bismarck was not content with this one "insurance policy." He did not intend to antagonize Russia, especially as he saw no possible gain for Germany even in a victorious war against her eastern neighbor. When the Russians realized the mistake they had made and reopened friendly negotiations with Berlin, Bismarck welcomed them and expressed his readiness to conclude an agreement, provided, however, that Austria be included. These discussions resulted in the conclusion of a second and more formal Three Emperors' League in June, 1881. Under its terms the three powers each promised to maintain neutrality if any one of them were attacked by a fourth power. It was provided that this clause should apply to a war with Turkey only after previous agreement as to the peace terms. Besides,

there was to be no change in the existing situation in European Turkey without common agreement. The principle that the Straits at Constantinople should be closed to foreign warships was to be maintained. Austria reserved the right to annex Bosnia and Herzegovina, which she had been administering since 1878, and all three of the contracting powers promised not to oppose the union of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia if this question should come up "by force of circumstances." The treaty was to last three years, but was renewed in 1884 for another three years. It was an extremely profitable arrangement for all three powers. Austria secured important advantages in the Balkans, while Russia was assured of protection on the German and Austrian frontiers in case she became involved in war with England in Asia. Germany, finally, received a tacit guarantee that Russia would not seek an alliance with France.

In the following year the Bismarckian system was enlarged by the addition of Italy. This development was as much the result of accident as of calculation. Neither Bismarck nor his Austrian friends had any sympathy for the Italians, who were constantly flirting with France and carrying on a vigorous anti-Austrian agitation aiming at the acquisition of *Italia Irredenta*, the provinces of Trentino and Trieste which were largely Italian-speaking. Bismarck, consequently, had purposely crossed the Italians, going so far as to support French colonial policy at their expense. His theory was that the French Republic, which had become firmly established in 1879, must be encouraged by some success in foreign policy. If France were involved in colonial conflicts her position in Europe would be weakened and her attention diverted from "the hole in the Vosges" (Alsace-Lorraine). He therefore encouraged the English to occupy Egypt, knowing that this would lead to a permanent conflict with France. At the same time he assured the French of his sympathy and support if they were to take Tunis, on which Italy had long cast her eyes. The French finally took the decisive step in May, 1881, much to the chagrin and anger of Italians.

The Triple Alliance, 1882

The government at Rome soon realized that its policy had been a mistaken one. The acute tension in Franco-Italian relations made the Italian government fear an attack at any moment. Entirely isolated, it began to look about for friends. The English showed little inclination to champion the part of Italy, and the other powers were all members of the Bismarckian group. Bismarck himself refused to consider an alliance unless Austria were also a member, so that finally the Italians were forced to make an agreement with their arch-enemy. The Triple Alliance, signed in May, 1882, was also a defensive agreement, though it was not so specifically directed against any one power as was the Austro-German Treaty of 1879. Germany and Austria promised to aid Italy if she were attacked by France, and Italy agreed to aid Germany if the latter were so assailed. If any one member were menaced by two or more powers, the other two

members were likewise to give full support. Each member was to remain neutral if one of the others "became involved" in war with (that is, attacked) a fourth power. The term was fixed at five years, and the treaty was renewed four times, coming to an end only with the defection of Italy in 1915. It should be particularly noted that the Triple Alliance was not an extension of the Austro-German Alliance. Both existed side by side until after 1914.

So far as Germany and Italy were concerned the Triple Alliance was meant as a protective measure against France. But it must not be supposed that Bismarck entertained plans of aggression against that power. Indeed, relations were more friendly during the period from 1878–1885 than they were at any other time between 1870 and 1914. Bismarck utilized the antagonism between France and England and the friendship with France to bring pressure on England to compel her to make concessions to Germany in the colonial field. It was by this adroit method of playing off one power against the other that Bismarck was able to acquire South-West Africa, the Cameroons, East Africa, German New Guinea and other possessions in spite of English opposition and of the fact that Germany possessed no sea power.

It may be said that from 1883–1885 Bismarck was at the zenith of his power. Russia, Austria, and Italy were his allies, with agreements criss-crossing among them. Austria had, in addition, concluded an alliance with Serbia in 1881 which made the latter power practically a vassal of the Danubian monarchy. In 1883 Austria had concluded a protective alliance with Rumania directed, like the Austro-German Treaty, against Russia. To this Germany acceded. In addition good relations existed with France, and England, at odds with both France and Russia, was dependent on German goodwill. Her isolation could hardly be called "splendid," nor could it be said that she still held the balance of power.

Bismarck's diplomacy at its zenith

The favorable situation came to an abrupt end in 1885. In France Clemenceau led a revolt against the prime minister, Ferry, who had coöperated with Bismarck in the colonial field. There followed a decade of instability and a recrudescence of the *revanche* movement which threatened the peace of western Europe and became personified in General Boulanger. Immediately after, the Near Eastern question once more entered a critical phase as a result of the Bulgarian Revolution and the union of Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia. This led to a new period of Austro-Russian antagonism in the Balkans and resulted in the disruption of the Second League of the Three Emperors. The year 1887 may be said to mark the most acute stage in the crisis. It seemed that Russia might at any moment invade Bulgaria and that war would be the inevitable outcome. At the same time the anti-German movement in France reached its peak, and in the famous Schnaebele incident war was barely avoided. If the conflagration were to break out in the east and the west it would be

impossible for Germany to prevent a union of Russia and France or a war on two fronts. Bismarck did not desire war with France and Bulgaria did not seem to him to be worth "the bones of a Pomeranian Grenadier." He was determined to maintain the peace if possible, but to take preventive measures for every emergency. A new army bill increased the German forces very considerably, but this was a precaution intended as a warning. Bismarck hoped that the German army would not need to march, and that the international situation could be so manipulated that the disturbing elements would be checkmated.

Diplomatic issues and problems, 1885–1890

Not having any direct interest in the Near Eastern question, and yet realizing that Austria must be maintained as a great power in the interests of the European balance, the German chancellor had once more turned to England, with the object of enlisting her support for Austria. It was due to his intercession and encouragement that the so-called First Mediterranean Agreement was concluded between England and Italy on February 12, 1887, and joined by Austria on March 24. It aimed at the maintenance of the existing situation in the Mediterranean and Black Seas, and enlisted English support for Italy in her north African policy. Not only was it the first stone in the construction of a coalition to hold Russia in check; it was also the first step in a policy which aimed at drawing England into the Triple Alliance. The latter alliance was just about to expire, and in its renewed form (February 20, 1887) it secured for Italy the support of Germany against French aggression in North Africa. This concession on Germany's part was, of course, largely illusory, since it was unlikely that France would undertake any active policy so long as England was on the side of Italy. But to make doubly sure Bismarck encouraged negotiations to draw Spain into the great league, the discussions finally resulting in an exchange of notes between Italy and Spain on May 4, 1887. Austria acceded shortly after and England expressed sympathy. At the same time discussions were carried on with Turkey, which at this period stood very close to the Triple Alliance. In this way Bismarck had surrounded France with a network of agreements designed to preserve the existing situation. France was never more effectively isolated.

There was, of course, still danger that Russia might seek an alliance with France. The Three Emperors' League was about to expire in June, 1887 and the Russians had indicated their determination not to reënter any agreement with Austria. They were, however, ready to make a separate agreement with Germany. In Berlin there was no inclination to estrange Russia and drive her into the arms of France merely on account of the Austro-Russian conflict. Indeed, Bismarck felt that he would be serving Austria herself if he maintained an influence over Russian policy. In any case, on June 18, 1887 he concluded a separate and very secret agreement with Russia, known as the Reinsurance Treaty. Each party agreed to maintain

The Reinsurance Treaty, 1887

neutrality if the other became involved in war with a third party, but this clause was not to apply to a conflict resulting from a Russian attack on Austria or a German attack on France. Germany further recognized Russia's historical rights in the Balkans and her claim to a preponderant and decisive influence in Bulgaria. The principle of closure of the Straits was to be maintained and a secret protocol stated that Germany would help Russia establish a legal government in Bulgaria as well as lend support in any measures the tsar might find it necessary to take to guard the "Key to his Empire" (the Straits). The treaty was concluded for three years and served as reinsurance for Russia against German attack, should Russia become involved in war with England. At the same time it reassured Bismarck that no Franco-Russian alliance would be concluded and that in any case Russia would remain neutral if France attacked Germany.

Ostensibly Germany had made great concessions to Russia, and had almost betrayed the interests of Austria in the Near East. As a matter of fact, Bismarck never expected to fulfil his promises, because he believed that England, Austria, and Italy would make it impossible for the Russians to realize their ambitions. The Second Mediterranean Agreement of December 12, 1887, also sponsored by the German chancellor, bound England, Austria, and Italy to oppose any disturbance of the situation in the Near East, to defend the independence of Turkey against all preponderating influence, and to prevent Turkey from ceding her rights in Bulgaria or the Straits to any other power. Russia was as effectively checkmated as was France, and therewith Bismarck's great alliance system reached its utmost extent. Austria, Italy, Russia, England, Rumania, Serbia, Spain and to all intents and purposes Turkey, were in one way or another, directly or indirectly, formally or informally connected with Germany. No statesman had ever constructed so formidable and imposing a coalition to preserve the general peace and to assure the security of his country. No nation could create a disturbance without finding itself blocked. It is natural that under these conditions the situation in western as in eastern Europe should gradually have calmed down. When Bismarck was dismissed in March, 1890 there seemed to be no cloud on the political horizon. Every eventuality had been provided for.

Apparent success of Bismarckian diplomacy

2. International Relations after Bismarck's Dismissal

Bismarck's successor, General von Caprivi, (1890–1894), was a man entirely inexperienced in foreign policy. Apparently he was never meant to be more than a stop-gap. The young kaiser hoped to direct foreign affairs himself. As a matter of fact the real control lay in the hands of one of the counsellors of the foreign office, Baron Fritz von Holstein, long a collaborator of Bismarck, but one who had

The diplomacy of William II and Caprivi

turned against him. Holstein's position was practically undisputed until the time of his dismissal in 1906.

For some time before March, 1890 the kaiser had been dissatisfied with Bismarck's policy. Apparently he never fully understood the working of the chancellor's system. He suspected the Russians of aggressive schemes and felt that Bismarck, by the Reinsurance Treaty, had taken the first step in abandoning Austria and the Triple Alliance in favor of the tsarist Empire. In his opinion, and he was strengthened in it by the military men, war was inevitable, and it was Germany's duty to stand loyally by her ally, Austria. A Russian advance in the Near East would lead to a conflict in which Germany would be compelled to take sides. It was in her interest to protect Austria's position as a great power and not to support Russia at the expense of the friendship of Austria, England, and Italy. These considerations, urged by Holstein, led to the rejection of the Reinsurance Treaty, which was due to expire in June, 1890, and the renewal of which the Russians had suggested. It was the first and perhaps the most fatal step taken in the field of foreign policy during the reign of William II.

The tsar was naturally very much surprised at this change in Germany's attitude. He had long since realized that the concessions made to Russia in the protocol of the famous treaty were hardly worth the paper they were written on, but the agreement had at least given him a guarantee that the Germans would not attack him in the rear if he became involved in war with England, and had seemed like an assurance that Germany would not openly join the Mediterranean coalition in an aggressive policy towards Russia. The Russians would have been willing to renew the treaty even without the protocol, and finally they almost begged for a mere scrap of paper saying that the Germans would not alter their past attitude. But the Germans not only refused to consider any written promises, they went even further and increased the tsar's suspicions by attempting to draw more closely to England. In June, 1890, they concluded the famous Heligoland Treaty, in which they made extensive concessions to England in the colonial field in return for the island of Heligoland, off the mouths of the Weser and the Elbe. At that time the island was hardly more than a sand-bank and it appeared that the Germans had given away a new pair of breeches for an old suspender button, as the explorer Stanley put it. The kaiser then paid a visit to England, a custom which he followed in the succeeding years. In the spring of 1891 the Triple Alliance was renewed far ahead of time and there was much discussion in the European press of England's joining the continental group. As a matter of fact, the Germans and Austrians had promised the Italians to do their utmost to draw England into the combination.

Germany and England

Though these hopes were never realized it appeared to the tsar that attempts were being made to isolate Russia. The French, who

had reorganized their army and who felt less timid since the disappearance of Bismarck from the scene, had for some time been making advances to the Russians. These had been rejected, because the tsar had no sympathy for republican France and because the Russians were in dread lest they be drawn into a war of revenge waged for Alsace and Lorraine, in which they had no interest. Indeed, their enemy was not Germany, but England, the leader of the anti-Russian coalition in the Near East and the rival of Russia in central and eastern Asia. Only the renewal of the Triple Alliance and the apparent accession of England to the German group finally convinced the tsar that an alliance must be made with France for defensive purposes. In July, 1891, a French squadron visited Cronstadt and was accorded a very hearty reception. Immediately after an agreement was reached between the two powers. They promised to coöperate in all questions which threatened the peace and to take counsel as to military measures to be taken in case either were menaced. It was a very vague agreement and did not by any means satisfy the French statesmen. What they desired was a concrete military agreement which would take effect immediately after any hostile move were made by the central powers. Negotiations were opened for the conclusion of such an engagement, but because Germany had identified herself with the anti-Russian group the Russians refused to consider it until they were convinced that improved relations with Germany were impossible. The military convention was finally concluded in December, 1893, and provided that both powers would mobilize immediately and simultaneously as soon as the Triple Alliance or one of its members mobilized. Therewith the Franco-Russian Alliance became a reality. The period of Germany's hegemony in Europe had already come to an end, and the kaiser, who had hoped to draw England into the Triple Alliance found that he had exchanged the sparrow in the hand for the pigeon on the roof. His desertion of Russia had not brought him any nearer to England; it had only led to the formation of an alliance which, though defensive, was to serve as the foundation of an anti-German coalition hemming Germany in on both sides. The great Bismarckian system had been replaced by two systems of alliance rivalling one another. The preponderance of Germany had ended in the reëstablishment of a balance of power in Europe.

The Franco-Russian Alliance, 1893

For many years the Franco-Russian Alliance hardly functioned, and Germany's position did not appear worse than it had been. This was due in part to the determination of the Russians not to lend their support to a French policy of revenge, but even more to the diversion of the European powers to colonial fields. The war between China and Japan over Korea had broken out in 1894 and had led to the complete victory of Japan in the spring of 1895. The result came as a total surprise to the great powers, who nevertheless realized that Japan must henceforth be reckoned with in Far Eastern affairs.

Hitherto the Russians had been the aggressors in Eastern Asia, while the English had been the champions of China's integrity. Now the leading nations were all compelled to revise their policies. England, appreciating the weakness of China, suddenly deserted her and drew closer to Japan, which had the same interest in blocking the Russian advance. Russia, on the other hand, began to regard Japan as the chief obstacle to expansion, while Germany, which up to this time had played but an insignificant part in Asian affairs, began to take an interest and to hope for some acquisition if China went to pieces. It was a great turning point in European foreign politics, and marks the transition from the strictly European phase to the World phase. For many years things remained quiet on the continent while the powers were buffeting each other in Asia, Africa, and the Pacific.

German commerce had been expanding at an unprecedented rate and the dearth of markets and of sources for raw materials was very keenly felt. It was in the hope of acquiring an influence in the Far East and a foothold for further action that Germany joined Russia in protesting against the Treaty of Shimonoseki, concluded by Japan and China in April, 1895. The French likewise took part, but by their participation the Germans had prevented the new Dual Alliance from common action, while by supporting Russia the Germans encouraged them in their Far Eastern policy and so diverted them from Europe. Japan was compelled to yield and to retrocede to China all territory which they had claimed on the mainland. During the following ten years the Far Eastern question passed through an acute phase, until brought to a temporary end by the defeat of Russia by Japan in 1905. The Germans consistently supported the tsar's government and shared in the spoils. In 1897 the port of Kiao-chau was acquired and with it came economic control of the rich Shantung province. The Russians seized Port Arthur, and the English took Wei-hai-wei. During the famous Boxer rebellion the powers intervened jointly against the rebels and for a moment it seemed as though the Chinese Empire was about to be partitioned. Only the coöperation of England and the United States saved the situation. The proclamation of the open door policy in China set up the principle of equal opportunity for all and the integrity of the Chinese Empire.

Germany and Russia

Germany's support of Russia against England in the Far East necessarily led to an estrangement of the two powers which had been on such good terms ever since 1885. Indeed, the kaiser returned to Bismarck's policy with a vengeance. He went further than Bismarck had ever gone in antagonizing England, just as he had gone far beyond Bismarck in his attempts to court England. The source of friction here, too, lay in colonial rivalry, and the Germans went so far as to coöperate with the French in opposing English policy in Africa. At times the kaiser even dreamed of constructing an entirely new coalition, a continental combination including France and

German estrangement of England

opposed to England. There is no evidence that he ever considered war against England, but he hoped to be able to bring sufficient pressure to force the English to make large concessions in Africa and the Pacific. This was the plan which underlay the new German policy in South Africa, where England was in conflict with the Boer republics. At the time of the famous Jameson raid in 1896 an attempt was made to mobilize the continental powers against England, and the Germans came out openly on the side of the Boers in the Kruger telegram congratulating the president of the Transvaal on having turned back the raid without the assistance of a foreign power. From this time dates the estrangement between England and Germany, which had begun in a mild form a year or two before. Germany, to be sure, failed to carry out her scheme and practically was compelled to desert the Boers, but the kaiser and his advisers had become convinced that in order to follow a firm policy abroad Germany must have a strong fleet — one sufficiently strong not only to protect German commerce and colonies, but also to make an attack by England unadvisable if not impossible. The basis for this new departure was laid by the appointment of Admiral von Tirpitz as secretary of the navy in 1897 and by the first and second navy bills of 1898 and 1900. The second provided a building program extending over the years 1900 to 1917 and for the construction of a battle fleet as well as of cruisers and other light vessels.

For a few years at the turn of the century it seemed as though Germany had recovered the balance of power. The Triple Alliance no longer played an important role since the activities of the powers were centering in places outside of Europe. Italy had been badly defeated by the Abyssinians at Adowa in 1896 and the Austro-Hungarian Empire was passing through so acute a domestic crisis that the government had welcomed the opportunity of concluding with Russia an agreement which assured the maintenance of the existing conditions in the Balkans at least for the time being (1897). But in spite of the weakness of the Triple Alliance and Germany's impotence at sea, she was able not only to hold her own in Europe, but to make positive gains abroad. This advantageous position was almost entirely due to the international situation, not to the brilliance of German diplomacy. For England was hardly able to offer effective opposition to Russia in the Middle and Far East; she was also embroiled with France in Africa, and relations were so tense that when the two powers came into conflict on the upper Nile (Fashoda crisis, 1898) war was barely avoided. Had France been able to depend on Russian aid it is hardly likely that peace could have been maintained. At the same time England was tied up in South Africa, where the dispute with the Boers resulted in war (1899–1902). Russia, on the other hand, was so deeply involved in the Far East that she had, for the time being, at least, given up all thought of antagonizing the Germans to please the French; she was,

indeed, dependent on German goodwill in order to further her own policy against England and Japan. As for France, she too had diverted her attention to extra-European fields and was engrossed in extending her colonial empire in Africa. There could be no idea of pursuing an anti-German policy; the desire for revenge had, in fact, almost entirely died out.

Germany and the balance of power

The German policy during these years was to keep two irons in the fire, to support now the Russians against the English, or the French against the English, and at another time to stand by the English against their enemies, in the expectation that either side could be made to pay dearly for German support. It was a natural policy, a policy of systematic exploitation which had been initiated by Bismarck. The only difference was that Bismarck had known where to draw the line. He had always avoided driving any power to despair and had always offered at least something substantial in return for concessions. Besides, he had always taken the precaution of keeping the road open for a definite agreement and had clearly stipulated the terms of his support. His successors on the other hand, acted in the belief that the favorable situation of the moment was unalterable. They failed to consider the feelings of the others and switched from one side to the other with a levity that soon gained them the reputation of being undependable. They felt so confident in the strength of their position that their demands went beyond all bounds, and soon they were spoken of as incurable land-grabbers.

Time and again during this period approaches were made by both sides. The Russians suggested that Germany join in intervention against England during the Boer War. It was a rare opportunity for the realization of the Continental Coalition of which the kaiser dreamed, for France would have been willing to take part. But the Germans believed it more advantageous to sell their neutrality to England. When the British repeatedly made advances and even proposed an alliance the Germans assumed the same attitude towards them. The price they asked was so high that the English could not consider it, and the kaiser, who in previous years had worked so hard to bring England into the Triple Alliance, now allowed the opportunity to pass, firm in the conviction that England would eventually be forced to pay the price. Meanwhile in smaller matters, the Germans sided now with the one, now with the other, the result being that they managed to acquire various extensions of their colonial empire. But most of these acquisitions were isolated and scattered. Not one of them could compare in value with the colonies originally obtained by Bismarck. In reality they only added more territory which would be difficult to defend in time of war.

The English had warned the Germans that isolation was no longer practicable, and that in case of rejection of their offers they would be forced to seek an arrangement with their enemies. This had been

regarded as mere talk in Berlin. Holstein especially declared an agreement between England on the one hand and France or Russia on the other as absolutely inconceivable and impossible. These nations had been rivals for too long a time and the points of conflict between them were too numerous. But very soon the Germans were to learn that they had badly miscalculated. In January, 1902, England concluded with Japan an alliance obviously directed against Russia. Each party was to support the other if it were attacked by two or more powers and each was to maintain neutrality in case either were attacked by one power. In this way England enlisted the help of Japan in holding Russia in check in the Far East. Even more important was the famous colonial settlement effected between England and France in April, 1904. This was in no sense an alliance, but by clearing away all sources of conflict it paved the way for real friendship. Long standing disputes, like those in Madagascar, Newfoundland, Siam, and central Africa were settled by compromise. But above all, the fundamental Egyptian question, which had poisoned the relations between the two nations ever since 1882, was finally adjusted. France acknowledged England's position in Egypt, and in return England agreed to recognize France's special interests in Morocco, and to lend France diplomatic support in furthering those interests.

England and France draw together

The Germans began to see that the situation was once more changing to their disadvantage. Not only had England established friendly relations with Germany's arch-enemy, France, but Italy had already shown the way. In 1900 and in 1902 she had made agreements with France which amounted to an exchange of promises of support in Tripoli and Morocco respectively. Spain followed suit, and in November, 1904, signed a treaty with France by which Morocco was divided into a French and a Spanish sphere of influence. In the question of Morocco, at least, the Germans, who had believed that no question could be settled without consulting them, had been almost ostentatiously ignored. The powers were finding it more profitable to make agreements which were expensive but at least netted some gain, than to pay Germany for support which could not be relied upon.

Such was the situation when the war between Russia and Japan broke out in February, 1904. The Germans had encouraged the Russians in their forward policy in China and they now believed that, with England and Japan unfriendly, their own position in the Far East would be endangered if Russia were to be defeated. They consistently aided the Russians, and their neutrality went beyond what is generally known as benevolent. The Russian Baltic fleet, which was sent to the Far East in the autumn of 1904 was coaled by German companies. To this the Japanese objected, and the English supported their ally. It was at this time that the English were beginning to feel alarm at the growth of the German fleet and for

the first time the danger of an actual armed conflict between the two powers appeared on the political horizon. In Berlin it seemed clear that something must be done to prevent Germany's position from becoming worse. The kaiser hoped that Russia, in her hour of need, would be willing to make an agreement with Germany such as he himself had dropped in 1890. This alliance, it was thought, the French would be compelled to join if placed squarely before the alternatives of English friendship and isolation on the continent. A draft for a continental coalition was drawn up by the kaiser in November, 1904, but the Russians refused to sign unless France should first be invited to accede. To this procedure the Germans objected, because they knew that to bring France in would be hopeless unless Germany and Russia reached an agreement first. The negotiations therefore lapsed, and the Germans began to consider other means of breaking up the new friendship between England and France.

The Morocco crises

In order to accomplish their purpose the Germans raised the Moroccan question. They had no interests there, excepting commercial ones, but they had not been consulted in the settlements made among England, France, and Spain, and legally they could insist that nothing should be done to impair the sovereignty or infringe the integrity of Morocco, the status of which had been fixed by the Madrid Conference in 1880. It must be remembered that the Germans were less intent on obtaining a share in Morocco than in breaking up the Anglo-French Entente and showing France that she was dependent on Germany's goodwill; the desire for compensation was of secondary importance.

The first Moroccan crisis, which initiated the series of crises between 1905 and 1914, began in March, 1905 when the kaiser landed at Tangiers and declared his adherence to the principles of the Madrid Convention. It was hoped that in this way the French, realizing the weakness of their position legally and militarily, would yield to the German demand for an international conference at which France could be outvoted and shown that English friendship was of no value. As a matter of fact the French were badly frightened. Rouvier, the prime minister, immediately offered to make compensation and soon after dismissed Delcassé, who had concluded the agreement with England and who was responsible for not having consulted Germany. Had the statesmen in Berlin merely wanted compensation they could have had it and the crisis would have developed no further. But they insisted that France agree to an international conference and in that way admit her error.

Meanwhile negotiations between France and Germany were still in progress, the kaiser made a second attempt to effect an agreement with the tsar to detach France from her connection with England by bringing her into the continental group. Russia had been defeated by Japan and was very angry at England. At Björkö, off the Finnish coast, the kaiser met the tsar and on July 24, 1905 induced him to

German advances to Russia

sign a treaty under the terms of which each power promised the other its support in case it were attacked by any other European state. The treaty was to become effective upon the conclusion of peace between Russia and Japan, and Russia was to make its terms known to France and to invite her to join as an ally. There can be no doubt that the tsar really believed the pact desirable, but the Russian statesmen appreciated the fact that, since their country's defeat in the Far East, Germany's friendship was no longer of supreme importance. Soundings taken in Paris made it perfectly clear that there was no prospect whatsoever of France joining the coalition after the unfriendly policy pursued by Germany in the Moroccan question. The Russian statesmen therefore bent their energies to evading their obligations under the pact, and refused to recognize it unless France agreed to join. In the end the treaty died a natural death. It had been an utopian idea from the beginning, and one which was so entirely in contradiction to Germany's attitude on the Moroccan question that there could be no hope of success.

The French had finally agreed to an international conference after they were practically assured that England, Russia, and the United States would side with them. Italy and Spain were bound to support the French view by the agreements of 1902 and 1904. At the Congress held at Algeciras in the early months of 1906 the Germans, instead of isolating France, found themselves isolated. Only Austria voted on their side, and that but half-heartedly. It was obvious that the whole Moroccan policy had been an egregious blunder. Far from forcing the French to give compensation and far from breaking up the entente between France and England, it had led to a French victory and had driven the English to support the French even beyond the point to which they had originally intended to go. Just before the opening of the conference the French had asked for a definite promise of support if matters should result in a conflict, and though the new English foreign minister, Sir Edward Grey, had refused to give so binding an assurance he did say that in his opinion the English people would, in a crisis, demand that the government stand by France even to the extent of lending military support. The entente of 1904, originally hardly more than a colonial agreement, had assumed some of the characteristics of an alliance.

Algeciras Conference

Now that Russia had been defeated in Asia she was no longer so dangerous a rival for England. The Russian statesmen realized that they must once more concentrate their attention on European affairs and attempt to expand in central Asia and in the Near East. It would be impossible to accomplish anything against the opposition of England, especially as Russia was just emerging from revolution and was entirely unfitted to embark on military adventures. It was obviously the part of wisdom to reach an agreement with England, something which the French had urged for some time and for

Anglo-Russian Agreement, 1907

English themselves had expressed a desire. After prolonged negotiations a partial agreement was reached in August, 1907. It was by no means as extensive as the settlement between England and France in 1904, and really eliminated only one group of disputes, those in central Asia. England recognized northern Persia as a Russian sphere of influence, while Russia recognized England's preponderant interests in southeastern Persia. Central Persia was left a neutral zone, and the integrity and independence of Persia as a whole was recognized as a principle. Russia furthermore declared Afghanistan to be outside her sphere and recognized England's special position in the Persian Gulf. Tibet was asserted to be part of the Chinese Empire, and neither side was to attempt to seize control there.

Like the Anglo-French agreement this treaty was neither one of alliance, nor was it directed against Germany. But it did remove one more of the antagonisms which Germany had been exploiting in the past and it did lay the basis for a coalition surrounding Germany on three sides. Germany was, in a way, encircled, though the new league, rivalling the Triple Alliance, was a very loose one, the members of which still had many divergent interests.

The Triple Entente

The one aspect of the so-called Triple Entente which disturbed the Germans most was its extra-European aspect. Japan had been drawn in by special agreements concluded with France and with Russia in 1907. These agreements all aimed at the maintenance of the existing situation in the Far East. The central Asian questions had been settled by England and Russia on the basis of a partition of spheres of influence. In Africa it was unlikely that Germany could make any gains in the face of the opposition of England and France. South America was protected by the Monroe Doctrine. There was only one remaining field in which Germany could hope to find her share in the scramble for colonies, and that was in the Near East. German policy had been very active in Turkey for the preceding decade and had, to all intents and purposes, attained a decisive influence there. Following the kaiser's second visit to the sultan in 1898, the Germans had obtained the concession for the Bagdad railway, which was the essential condition for the economic exploitation of Asia Minor. The construction of the railway, however, soon became an international question, for England felt her position on the Persian Gulf menaced and believed that India would be endangered if the shortest road to the East were under the control of some other power. In the same way, the French were anxious for their position in Syria, and the Russians regarded their prospects in northern Persia threatened. All three powers had offered opposition to the German project and progress had been slow. But it is obvious that the Germans had now acquired a real interest in the Near East, and particularly in the future of Turkey. With the conclusion of the Anglo-Russian agreement in August, 1907, they became more and more anxious to develop their position in this part of the world.

The Bagdad Railway and the Near Eastern problem

Bismarck had always taken the stand that Germany had no immediate interest in the Near East, and that she must support Austria only to the extent necessary to protect the latter's position as a great power. The new orientation of German policy, however, made it natural that she should desire an active Austrian policy in the Near East, even though this involved entanglement in the Austro-Russian rivalry. From 1908 on, the Balkans became the center of interest in European politics. The decade of greatest colonial activity and conflict was over, and most of the world was divided among the powers. Rivalries once more focused on the continent. Austria, under the leadership of Baron Aehrenthal (foreign minister from 1906–1912), emerged from her apathy and embarked on new schemes of expansion which aimed at bringing the western Balkans under her economic domination and at placing a check on the Serbian plans of aggrandizement. The first indication of this new departure was the announcement that Austria would build a railway from Bosnia through the Sanjak Novibazar, down the valley of the Vardar river to Saloniki. This project was not illegal under International Law and Austria had secured the consent of the Turkish government. Nevertheless the announcement of the plan led to great anxiety, not only in Serbia, but in Russia, where it was felt that the new railway was meant as the first link in a great system connected with the Constantinople-Bagdad-Persian Gulf trunk line which would cut across central Europe and Asia Minor and bar Serbia and the other Slavic states from the sea. The apprehensions of the Russians were increased by the fact that the Germans gave the Austrians unquestioning support in defending their position. A crisis was avoided, but it had become evident to the Russians that something must be done to protect Russian interests in the Near East.

Isvolski's diplomacy

Russian policy was at this time directed by Alexander Isvolski, a man of moderate liberal tendencies who had advocated the agreement with England and who was convinced that the immediate aim of Russia must be to secure free passage of the Straits at Constantinople for her warships. There was reason to suppose that not only England, but even France, would object to such a radical change in the existing arrangements, and no support was to be expected from the Central Powers unless suitable concessions were made. Consequently, when Aehrenthal suggested that the Young Turk Revolution which had broken out in July, 1908, made consultation desirable, Isvolski immediately paid a visit to the Austrian foreign minister at Buchlau in Moravia (September 16, 1908). There it was agreed that Russia would not object to the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria and that Austria would lend her support should Russia apply to the powers for a modification of the Straits agreements. It cannot be said that the Russians showed much consideration for the Serbs in this matter, but Isvolski felt that freedom

of passage through the Straits was of such supreme importance that all other arguments were secondary. It was still necessary for him to obtain the consent of the other powers to his project. The Germans hinted that they would not oppose him if Germany were offered suitable concessions elsewhere. He then went on to Italy, France, and England. Meanwhile, on October 5, the annexation of the two provinces by Austria was announced. The decisive step had been taken somewhat earlier because the Bulgarians had declared their independence. The Serbians thereupon broke out in open protest. They had themselves hoped to obtain Bosnia and Herzegovina, and now they saw their prospects of expansion in this direction thwarted. The annexation was certainly illegal, in so far as it was a violation of the Treaty of Berlin, which had been signed by all the powers, although it should be remembered that Austria insisted that in 1878 it was understood that "occupation" meant eventual annexation. But it does not follow that the action of Austria necessarily precipitated a crisis. Had Isvolski been able to obtain the consent of France and England to his Straits project he would very likely have lived up to his agreement with Aehrenthal, despite the outcry in Serbia and Serbia's appeal to Russia for support. But it so happened that Isvolski found both the French and the English exceedingly irritated at the thought that he had made such a far-reaching agreement with Austria without consulting his friends. England declared that the moment was inopportune for raising the question of the Straits, and this was tantamount to a refusal to give consent or support.

It was from this moment that Isvolski changed his tactics. He realized that he had miscalculated in the Bosnian strategy and that there was no prospect of gaining his end by this line of attack. He began to maintain that he had been deceived by Aehrenthal and began to encourage the Serbs in their attitude of hostility. Together with England, the Russians demanded that a European congress be summoned to examine Austria's action. This suggestion the Austrians rejected. They refused to attend a congress unless the powers would promise in advance to approve Austria's action. In this stand they were fortified by the Germans, who not only believed that the Austrians were justified, but felt the expediency of winning a diplomatic victory and so regaining their place in Europe. The crisis dragged on all through the winter of 1908–1909 and at times it seemed as though war were inevitable. In reality the general peace was not seriously threatened, because Russia was in no condition to fight and her ally, France, showed no inclination to take part in a conflict arising from a question in which she was not directly interested and in which she had not been consulted. Indeed, when the Germans suggested a new agreement regarding Morocco the French welcomed the proposal and promptly concluded the treaty of February, 1909, by which France recognized the independence and integ-

rity of Morocco and guaranteed equal economic opportunity for all nations, while the Germans recognized France's special position in the country.

But while there was no serious danger of a general European war in the winter of 1908–1909 there was constant danger of an Austro-Serbian conflict. The military men in Vienna believed that the moment of Russia's weakness was most auspicious for an attack on Serbia which would once and for all remove the danger of hostile propaganda on that side. Had the crisis been further prolonged it is hard to see how the Austrian government could have resisted this argument. But in the last minute the Germans stepped into the breach and in a famous note to Russia (March 21, 1909) demanded that Russia give her promise to recognize the annexation if Austria requested the approval of the powers. In case of Russian refusal, Germany would allow matters to take their course, which was the same as saying that Germany would not oppose an Austrian ultimatum and war on Serbia. There was nothing the Russians could do but to yield, and therewith the crisis was brought to a close. The Serbians were obliged not only to recognize the annexation, but to declare that it was not detrimental to their interests. They furthermore promised not to carry on propaganda hostile to Austria.

Aftermath of the Bosnian crisis

The so-called Bosnian annexation crisis had ended in a resounding victory for the Austro-German group. It was perfectly evident that on the continent, at least, they were the stronger, even if only for the moment. And yet the whole incident left a heritage of ill-feeling and hate. Austria and Serbia were implacable foes, and the antagonism between Austria and Russia had reached a stage where it could hardly be patched over for long. Austria had appeared before the world as the violator of international agreements, and the Germans, by supporting Austria, had drawn upon themselves the hostility of the rival powers. It was perfectly obvious that Russia and Serbia at least would not forget their humiliation and that they would bend every effort to preparation for the struggle which they regarded as inevitable.

On the other hand, the crisis had not served to strengthen the Entente Cordiale. Both France and England had been estranged by Isvolski's inconsiderate action and neither government was willing to shed the blood of its people in a Balkan War by which there was nothing to gain. In the following years the members of the Entente went their own ways. Russia attempted, in the Potsdam Agreement of November 5, 1910, to detach Germany from Austria by giving up opposition to the Bagdad railway, while England, further estranged from Russia by the latter's agressive policy in Persia, attempted to negotiate an agreement with Germany. It was hoped that some arrangement could be made by which the German naval program could be reduced or at least postponed, and by which the question of the Bagdad railway could be satisfactorily settled. The Germans

were unwilling to consider any change of their navy plans unless England would consent to a far-reaching political agreement which would have substituted an Anglo-German combination for the Entente Cordiale. The English were naturally hesitant about taking so radical a step, but negotiations were still in progress when the comparative calm was broken by the third and last Moroccan crisis, the so-called Agadir incident.

Third Moroccan crisis — Agadir incident

Ever since 1906, and especially since 1909, the French had been trying to gain control of Morocco. They had taken advantage of every local disorder to send more troops, and in the spring of 1911 they decided to send a column up to the capital, Fez. It seemed to the Germans that this would mean the end of Moroccan independence as agreed to by the Algeciras Conference and by the special agreement of February, 1909. They therefore determined to take advantage of the favorable international situation to obtain compensation before they gave up all their rights under the previous agreements. It was expected that France would be only to glad to buy them off and would not make trouble about ceding some of her colonies in Africa. In any case, it was decided from the beginning that if the French raised objections a gunboat should be sent to Morocco in order to impress them with the seriousness of Germany's purpose.

As a matter of fact, the French recognized Germany's right to compensation, but expected that Germany would make definite demands. This the Germans refused to do. They insisted that it was France's business to make the offers. When negotiations made no progress the gunboat *Panther* was sent to Agadir on the Atlantic coast of southern Morocco. There is no evidence that the German government hoped to acquire part of Morocco, though the imperialistic Pan-Germans made such demands, and it cannot be denied that the government's action encouraged such hopes. In any case the step was a fatal one, for England, which had up to this time expressed satisfaction at the prospect of a definite settlement of the Moroccan question and which raised no objection to an enlargement of the German colonial empire in central Africa, now took alarm, and, having no knowledge of Germany's intentions, feared that her object was to acquire southwestern Morocco, a development which would endanger English communication with South Africa. On July 21, 1911, Lloyd George made his famous speech at the Mansion House, in which he declared that England could not allow herself to be excluded from discussions on subjects which touched her vital interests. Peace at that price would be an intolerable humiliation.

British support of France

This famous address cannot be said to have conduced to a satisfactory agreement between France and Germany. The French regarded it as an assurance of English sympathy and support, and consequently became less ready to make concessions. The Germans, on the other hand, regarded the speech as a threat before which they

could not yield without suffering humiliation. Fortunately there was a real desire to reach a settlement on both sides, and after long negotiations a treaty was signed on November 4, 1911. Germany definitely gave up all claims in Morocco and in return received a large part of the French Congo, which was added to her Cameroon colony.

Failure of Haldane Mission (1912) German suspicion of England

The Agadir crisis was even more unfortunate in its results than the first Moroccan crisis in 1905. The French felt that Germany had been trying to pick a quarrel, and that it might have been better to adopt a stronger attitude. Many began to regard war as inevitable, and the general feeling that France had given in led to the overthrow of Caillaux in March, 1912. In Germany the dissatisfaction was equally great. The expansionists were disappointed that Morocco had been entirely abandoned in return for a stretch of jungle swamp. They too demanded that the government take a stronger stand, and that the navy be still further increased, so that in the future England would not dare to intervene and compel Germany to back down. It was decided to lay before the Reichstag an additional naval bill, which provided for the establishment of a third battle squadron, the construction of three new ships and the enlargement of the personnel. An attempt was made by the English to forestall this further accentuation of the naval question, and in February, 1912, Lord Haldane was sent to Berlin to discuss the situation. But the kaiser had lost all faith in the sincerity of the English. He was convinced that at the opportune moment the English would launch an unprovoked attack and destroy the German fleet before war could be declared: He declared that no arrangement would be possible unless the English were willing to enter what amounted to a defensive alliance with Germany. Sir Edward Grey expressed his readiness to state that England would not attack Germany and that she had not and would not enter any combination of powers whose object was to attack Germany. Further than this he would not go. Under no conditions would he promise to remain neutral in case Germany became involved in war. It was obvious that he could not sacrifice the friendship of France so long as the Germans showed so little inclination to come to a satisfactory arrangement regarding the navy. The negotiations lapsed, and though England and Germany remained on fairly cordial terms from 1912 to the outbreak of the World War in 1914, it was a friendship based on expediency, not on sincere goodwill. The Germans could not help but feel that the English were blocking them in the entire colonial field, while the English were convinced that the Germans did not desire an agreement, and that they were constructing a fleet with which, some day, to threaten England's control of the seas.

Even more serious than the general increase of mutual suspicion and the growth of the feeling that war was inevitable, was the further complication of the international situation resulting from the Mo-

roccan crisis. Italy, fearing that France, now that she had Morocco, would seek to evade her obligation to support the Italian policy in Tripoli, determined to seize the territory while the situation was still favorable. On September 29, 1911, she declared war on Turkey, after seizing on the flimsiest sort of pretext to present a twenty-four hour ultimatum, which the Turks rejected. Russia, on the other hand, decided to utilize the opportunity offered by the signature of the Moroccan treaty to demand French support for her policy in the Straits question. This was an idea advanced by Isvolski, who had, in 1910, become ambassador in Paris, and was still bent on securing a solution of this all-important question. Here again the Russians were not over-solicitous of the feelings of their Balkan co-religionists. They offered to protect Turkey against attack by the Balkan states if only the Turks would consent to the Russian demands.

The Russians were, however, obliged to drop the matter once more. Not only did the Turks object, but neither France nor England showed any hospitality. They knew that the Russian policy would reopen the whole Eastern question and they also knew that public opinion would not tolerate a war resulting from a conflict in which they had no interest. Nevertheless, the Russians had been brought to realize that all efforts to obtain the support of the powers were vain. They were compelled to adopt the other method, namely, to encourage a Balkan League and an attack on Turkey. There were, of course, many obstacles to such a combination. Especially Bulgaria and Serbia were long-standing rivals in Macedonia, and the Greeks also expected a share of that province. But at the same time they realized that if anything were to be accomplished action must be taken and differences settled before the war between Turkey and Italy was over. Russia had been preparing the way for some time past, and it was under her auspices that the Balkan League was finally completed in March, 1912. Bulgaria and Serbia guaranteed each other's independence and integrity and promised each other mutual support against any power which should attempt to annex or occupy Balkan territory under Turkish rule. A secret protocol provided for common action against Turkey if disturbances should break out there. The spoils were divided in advance, and the tsar was named as the arbiter in all disputes that might arise. Greece joined the alliance in May, 1912, and military conventions were added to specify the amount of aid to be furnished by each. The whole league was ostensibly directed against Turkey, but the negotiations between Bulgaria and Serbia show that the latter, at least, expected Austria to be drawn in and hoped to get the bulk of her gains in Austrian territory.

The Balkan Wars

Hostilities were opened on October 8, 1912, after the Macedonian question had been taken as a pretext. The powers were by no means pleased. Even the Russians, who had done so much to engineer the

league, felt that the Balkan states should have waited until Turkey took the aggressive. The Austrians were naturally alarmed, while the French felt instinctively that Russia might be drawn in and that in the end France might find herself before the alternatives of entering on the side of Russia or giving up her alliance. Poincaré, who had succeeded Caillaux as prime minister in March, 1912, was a Lorrainer by birth and an ardent patriot. He was quite convinced that a war between France and Germany was inevitable and he meant to prepare for it, especially in a diplomatic way. England and Russia must both be maneuvered into position, and a situation created where France might count on their support. Isvolski proved an eager collaborator, and the two devoted their efforts to strengthening the Entente. But even Poincaré appreciated the fact that French public opinion could not be mobilized on a Balkan question, and he gladly joined the other powers in an initial declaration that no change of the existing conditions in the Balkans would be tolerated.

Austro-Russian alarms

As a matter of fact all such declarations were superfluous, for the situation changed with kaleidoscopic rapidity. The allies were immediately successful, the Bulgarians in Thrace, and the Serbs and Greeks in Macedonia. The Russians now openly espoused the cause of the Serbs, who, in November, had reached the Adriatic after a spectacular march through the Albanian mountains. But the Austrians regarded this as a particular menace to their interests, and the Italians also were intent on shutting off Serbia from the sea. The Austrians and the Russians both began to carry out partial mobilization. The Germans announced that they would support Austria if she were attacked, and the French assured the Russians of assistance in case Austria attacked and was supported by Germany. The stage was set for a world conflict, but fortunately England, Germany and France were equally unwilling to start a conflagration on a Balkan issue. Russia, too, was not sufficiently prepared and feared that if the struggle continued the Bulgarians might attempt to seize and hold Constantinople. This they determined to prevent at any cost. Sazonov, the Russian foreign minister, even considered sending the Black Sea Fleet into the Bosporus. In any case it seemed wise to accept the suggestion for an international conference to be held at London, and to bring pressure to bear on Serbia to induce her to be moderate. In spite of the efforts of the powers the crisis continued all through the winter, and on one occasion the war was renewed. But finally a peace was patched up at the expense of Turkey (May 30, 1913). A month later the Second Balkan War broke out between the victorious allies. Serbia was dissatisfied with what she had received, and the Bulgarians felt that they had been maneuvered out of position in Macedonia, although they had won the decisive victories elsewhere. Greece joined Serbia, and Rumania and Turkey also came in. The issue of the conflict could not be in doubt. The

Bulgarians were totally defeated and compelled to sign the Treaty of Bucharest on August 10, 1913. The Bulgarians lost almost all territory they had conquered from the Turks in the first war, and in addition the Serbs and Greeks were left in possession of Macedonia. Rumania received a large slice of the Dobrudja for her trouble. Taken by and large the treaty was a parody on nationalism, for which the conflict had originally been started. It left Bulgaria profoundly dissatisfied and burning for revenge.

A general European catastrophe had been avoided during the Balkan crises, but all the powers realized that the fatal day had drawn nearer than ever. The Austrians were very much alarmed by the aggrandizement of Serbia, even though they had managed to shut her off from the sea and to erect Albania as a bulwark. The Serbians, on the other hand, were elated by their victories, and more than ever determined to have a reckoning with Austria, the power which had held them back in the moment of victory. It was natural that the Serbs should look more and more to their champion, Russia. The Russians, too, were disappointed by the outcome of the struggle. The Balkan League, the great hope of Russia, had fallen apart, and Russia had been forced to acquiesce in the terms laid down for Serbia by Austria. When she had stretched out her hand towards the Straits even England had objected. Gradually the Russians realized that they would never get possession of the Straits excepting in a general European war. There was general agreement on this matter in the famous Crown Council of February, 1914. It was obviously necessary to prepare, militarily and diplomatically, for the coming conflict. Large shipments of rifles and ammunition were sent to the Serbs, who were told that they had reached only the first stage. They must work for the future struggle with Austria-Hungary.

Russian anticipation of a European War

The other powers had also come to the realization that peace would be ever more difficult to maintain. The Germans introduced an important military bill in 1913, and the French paralleled this increase in military preparations. The English had concentrated their fleet in the North Sea and had morally undertaken to protect the French coast while the French despatched their naval forces to the Mediterranean. The greatest efforts were made by Isvolski and Poincaré to strengthen the Entente. Large sums were lent to Russia with the understanding that they would be employed in the construction of strategic railways in Poland leading to the German frontier. Similar loans were made to such Balkan states as could be influenced. There followed negotiations between England and Russia looking to a naval agreement. It was perfectly apparent that war was merely a matter of time. In all countries preparations were rushed and public opinion was sensitive and suspicious. Almost unknowingly the European powers had slipped into the position where they would fight even if the cause of conflict were a Balkan dispute. No one was in a mood to yield again, and in every country

The European situation on the eve of the World War

the military men were expounding the necessity of acting promptly and firmly.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

J. Lepsius, A. Mendelssohn Bartholdy, and F. Thimme, *Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette, 1871–1914*, Vols. I–XVIII, 1871–1890 (1922–4); W. M. Fullerton, *Problems of Power* (1911, 1915); A. Bullard, *The Diplomacy of the Great War* (1916); C. Seymour, *The Diplomatic Background of the War, 1871–1914* (1916); A. F. Pribram, *The Secret Treaties of Austria-Hungary, 1879–1914*, 2 vols. (1914, English translation, edited by A. C. Coolidge 1920–1921); A. C. Coolidge, *The Origins of the Triple Alliance* (1917); A. Singer, *Geschichte des Dreibundes* (1904); A. N. Stiglitz, *L'Italie et la Triple Alliance* (1906); H. M. Munro, *The Berlin Congress* (1918); E. von Wertheimer, *Graf Julius Andrassy*, 3 vols. (1910–1913); E. M. Earle, *Turkey, the Great Powers and the Bagdad Railway* (1923); V. de Gorloff, *Origines et bases de l'Alliance Franco-Russe* (1913); C. de S. de Freycinet, *Souvenirs, 1878–1893* (1913); T. Barclay, *Thirty Years of Anglo-French Reminiscences* (1914); G. L. Jaray, *La politique france-anglaise et l'arbitrage international* (1904); E. Lemonon, *L'Europe et la politique britannique, 1882–1910* (1910); G. Dibrcks, *Die Marokkofrage und die Konferenz von Algeciras* (1906); G. Morel, *Morocco in Diplomacy (Ten Years of Secret Diplomacy)* (1912); A. Tardieu, *La conference d'Algeciras* (ed. 1917); *La mystère d'Agadir* (1912); G. P. Gooch, *Franco-German Relations* (1923); J. V. Fuller, *Bismarck's Diplomacy at its Zenith* (1922); M. Smith, *Militarism and Statecraft* (1918); E. Reventlow, *Deutschlands Auswärtige Politik, 1888–1913* (1914, 1918); G. W. Prothero, *German Policy before the War* (1916); F. Naumann, *Central Europe* (1917); C. Andler, *Pan-Germanism* (1915); B. E. Schmitt, *England and Germany, 1740–1914* (1916); R. Pinon, *France et l'Allemagne, 1870–1913* (1913); H. M. Egerton, *British Foreign Policy in Europe* (1917); G. Cecil, *Robert Cecil, Marquis of Salisbury* (1921); G. Murray, *The Foreign Policy of Sir Edward Grey, 1906–1915* (1915); G. H. Perris, *Our Foreign Policy and Sir Edward Grey's Failure* (1912); R. Millet, *Notre politique extérieure de 1898–1905* (1905); G. Reynald, *La diplomatie française, l'œuvre de M. Delcassé* (1915); C. Schefer, *D'une guerre à l'autre, 1871–1914* (1920); J. Larmeroux, *La politique extérieure de l'Autriche-Hongrie (1875–1914)*, 2 vols. (1918); J. B. Moore, *Principles of American Diplomacy* (1918); W. F. Johnson, *America's Foreign Relations*, 2 vols. (1918); J. H. Latané, *From Isolation to Leadership* (1918); M. W. Williams, *Anglo-American Isthmian Diplomacy, 1815–1915* (1916); W. A. Dunning, *The British Empire and the United States* (1916); S. A. Korff, *Russia's Foreign Relations during the Last Half Century* (1922); F. Rachfahl, *Deutschland und die Weltpolitik, 1870–1914* (1923); E. Brandenburg, *Von Bismark zum Weltkriege* (192).

CHAPTER XXXIV

THE CAUSES OF THE WORLD WAR 1914–1918

1. The Underlying Causes

A knowledge of world history for the past century and a half is necessary to explain the World War. One who has comprehended the clash of political, economic, and social interests and forces during that period, as shown in this volume, will understand that an armed conflict in Europe was almost inevitable. Before 1789, on the continent of Europe, princes, kings, emperors, and little oligarchies, ruled by divine right without much regard to the will of their subjects. In Great Britain, and in the Thirteen Colonies in America alone, were found the beginnings of democratic political institutions. The cruel partitions of Poland; the harsh treatment of Venice by Napoleon; and the unwise settlements of the Congress of Vienna, illustrated the low public morality a century or more ago. An autocratic system of government persisted in central and eastern Europe, both nationally and internationally, largely under the influence of Metternich, until the middle of the nineteenth century. Bismarck, in a political sense, became the heir of Metternich. As an enemy of liberalism, until forced to compromise with it, he fought constitutionalism and sought to perpetuate autocratic rule. His weapons were: a powerful army, diplomacy, and secret alliances. The spirit of strong rule became incarnate in the tsar of Russia, Emperor Franz Joseph of Austria, and William II of Germany. This persistence of autocracy in central and eastern Europe, led indirectly to the World War.

Autocracy and international relations

Just as Europe before 1789 was ruled politically by divine right monarchs, so Europe was controlled socially by a powerful nobility, and economically by the middle class. These privileged classes, immune from most of the taxes, owned the greater portion of the land, monopolized the best offices in the church and the state, and clung tenaciously to their feudal rights. They opposed a new order and resisted every effort of the common people to better their lot. The unprivileged classes dug the ditches, built the roads, and tilled the fields to feed the nation. They paid most of the taxes to support the government and the clergy. They fought the wars for their monarchs. Many of them were still serfs, as in the Middle Ages. In Switzerland and America alone there were no nobility and no serfs. Long after serfdom disappeared in Great Britain and France, it continued in central and eastern Europe. It was also true that for economic reasons Negro slavery flourished in the United States,

Economic discontent

Latin America, and some of the colonies of the European countries for years after it was abolished in the Old World. The persistence of these social and economic inequalities made it easier to maintain autocracy, and thus helped to set the stage for the World War. At the same time the cost of living in Europe began to increase greatly about 1905 because production was not sufficient to meet the needs of the enlarged population. Economic discontent left Europe in a state of ferment and on the verge of a social upheaval.

Autocracy versus liberalism

One hundred and fifty years ago the masses of Europe, without political and civil rights, denied the opportunities of intellectual and material advancement, began to regard themselves as the victims of an unjust political, social, and economic order. They became disgruntled over the injustices and discriminations, and accepted the writings of Voltaire, Rousseau, Thomas Paine, the Encyclopedists, and Adam Smith, as the gospel of a new freedom. As a result there broke out a gigantic conflict in the New World and the Old between mediaeval and modern civilization, between the privileged and unprivileged classes, and between autocracy and democracy. Absolutism, clericalism, Napoleonism, Metternichism, tsarism, and kaiserism, on the one side, were arrayed against liberty, equality, enlightenment, progress, and self-government, on the other. The American Revolution and the French Revolution were followed in rapid succession by the revolutions of 1820 in southern Europe; the liberation of the Latin-American republics; the independence of Greece; the Revolution of 1830 and the Great Reform Bill; the Chartist movement and the Revolution of 1848; the unification of Italy and Germany; the emancipation of serfdom and slavery; the series of social and economic reforms; the overthrow of the Shogunate in Japan and the Manchu dynasty in China; and the First Balkan War. The World War was, in large measure, merely the latest clash between these two sets of forces, or at least such was the belief of hundreds of millions of people.

2. Contributary Factors in Europe and the World: Nationalism, Militarism, Capitalism, Imperialism, Secret Diplomacy

The spirit of nationality, by the opening of the twentieth century, had created in the world fifty-odd states. Some were large and strong, others were small and weak, but each was proud of its own tongue, its literature, its history, and its institutions. Nationalism led to new conquests in arts and letters, science and inventions, popular educational and political programs, and social betterment. In these ways it was a blessing to the peoples of the world. But nationalism also became an exaggerated form of organized selfishness, inflated with egotism, and dangerously aggressive. When it stressed not the common good, but the things peculiar to itself, it too often became a world menace. It encouraged the powerful nation

to become still more powerful, and made the weak nation ambitious to develop into a great power. It taught the superiority of its own civilization and the inferiority of that of all "foreigners." It produced Pan-Germanism, Pan-Slavism, Pan-Islamism, *Italia irredenta*, Greater Serbia, Greater Bulgaria, Greater Greece, the demand for the recovery of Alsace-Lorraine, and the unrest of the submerged nationalities. Some of these ambitions sought to right old wrongs, but others were due to nationalistic greed. Land-locked states wanted openings on the sea. Germany talked of breaking through to the English Channel. Russia coveted Constantinople, Port Arthur, and a route to the Indian Ocean. Austria held Triest and Fiume, which both Italy and Serbia wished to secure. Austria, Greece, and Bulgaria all had their eyes on Salonika. As a result Europe was full of "sore spots," "arenas of friction," misunderstandings, hatreds, lies, suspicions, plots, and counterplots. *Nationalism*

Exaggerated nationalism popularized the new imperialism. In feverish haste the backward parts of the earth were brought under the economic or political control of the European powers, while the United States was beginning to travel the same course. Great Britain's vast empire belted the globe. Russia possessed about half of Asia. France was the first state in the nineteenth century to deliberately plan a great colonial empire in Africa and Asia. Little Holland, Belgium, Portugal, and Denmark had empires many times their own size. Germany and Italy were the latest European states to launch a colonial program. Seeing the best portions of the earth taken by her rivals, Germany rushed over the globe to secure her "place in the sun." Soon islands were obtained in the Pacific, large areas of Africa were annexed, and Kiao-chau in China secured. The most promising field for exploitation, however, was the Near East, where valuable concessions were given to her by Turkey. In 1914 Italy had won a colonial empire in Africa six times her own extent and was looking for further opportunities in the eastern Mediterranean. Austria-Hungary began effectively to forge her way into the Balkans. The United States and Japan established colonial empires. Thus by 1914 the eight great powers and four of the small states had practically divided the globe among them. This imperialistic scramble for colonies filled the world with rivalries, jealousies, conflicts, and threats of war. *Imperialism*

The new imperialism, inspired by nationalism and industrialism, led to the rapid growth in rival armaments. Gigantic armies and navies, such as had never been known before in history, covered the earth. The mad race for militarism was begun by Germany in 1862 and tenaciously pursued down to 1914. The example set by Germany was followed by the other powers, large and small. The actual standing army of France in 1914 was larger than that of Germany (910,000 to 870,000). Compulsory military service was a rather general practice and loudly lauded. Europe was an armed camp

with fortresses lining the frontiers. Military life was idealized as the highest civic service, and the uniform set the social standards. States were spending as much as 85 per cent of their total national incomes for past and future wars, leaving only 15 per cent to run the government, to educate the people, and to aid general welfare. During the four decades following the Franco-Prussian War, the nations of Europe spent forty and a half billion dollars for military and naval armaments, or an average of a billion dollars a year. The Boer War cost Great Britain one and a third billion dollars; and the Russo-Japanese War was quite as expensive. This enormous sum of money was spent by Europe because it was feared that sooner or later the continent would flame into war. France, Great Britain, Russia, Germany, Italy, and Austria-Hungary, in the order named, appropriated the largest sums for military puposes. The $550,000,000 spent by Europe in 1873 had increased by 1913 to $1,894,000,000. Such is the terrible European story of preparedness for an "armed peace." The German Army Act of 1913 increased the standing army from 656,000 to 870,000 and provided an unprecedented budget of $225,000,000. France paralleled this action by reviving the three-year term of military service in order to enlarge her army. The French bill was actually introduced before the German act, though the German act became law first. Russia, and even little Belgium, took the precaution to multiply their soldiers. The Russian army was much larger than that of France or Germany. The same rivalry existed in the construction of navies and all the deadly engines of warfare. The "greatness" of a "power" was judged by the size of its army and navy. Thus Italy and France were "great powers," but China and Brazil were not. All the strong states boasted that their large armies and navies were intended to secure peace and not to make war. As long as heavy armaments secured concessions from other states, they seemed to be worth while however costly they might be. The World War was the logical outgrowth of this "armed peace."

Militarism

Philosophy, literature, political science, history, and education were employed to vindicate militarism. The militarists naturally glorified war as a divinely sanctioned institution. They held that, because of human nature, war is inevitable among men as is shown by the fact that in the past there has been one year of peace to every thirteen years of fighting. They contended that armed conflict exerts a wholesome moral influence on nations; stimulates culture; preserves physical virility; and aids progress. "It must be remembered," said Roosevelt, "that even to be defeated in war may be better than not to have fought at all." "We must perform those deeds of blood, of valor, which above everything else bring national renown." Similar ideas were uttered in all nations, except, perhaps, China. The Young German League, corresponding to the Boy Scouts, boasted: "War is the noblest and holiest expression of human

war cult

activity. For us, too, the glad hour of battle will strike. Still and deep in the German heart must live the joy of combat, and the longing for it. Let us ridicule to the utmost the old women in breeches, who fear war and deplore it as cruel and revolting. No! War is beautiful!" "The time is near," wrote Wirth, "when the earth must be conquered by the Germans." Nietzsche asserted: "A good war hallows every cause"; Bernhardi, "War is a political necessity"; and Treitschke, "War is a part of the divinely appointed order." "Might is the supreme right, and what is right is decided by war." Active societies among most peoples labored strenuously for "preparedness." With the big powers armed to the teeth and ready for instant war, there was constant danger that some minor friction in any corner of the globe might precipitate a world conflict.

Exaggerated nationalism and militarism created a partisan patriotism with all the fervor of an earlier religious intolerance. All foreigners were regarded as inferiors, while the dealings of the home government with other peoples were applauded as right. Decatur's toast, "Our country right or wrong" was the sentiment of this kind of patriotism. A higher type was expressed by Carl Schurz: "Our country! When right to be kept right, when wrong to be put right." The press, pulpit, legislative hall, and school were used to instil in the minds of each national group a belief in the superiority of its people and institutions. "God has assigned to the German people a place in the world and a role in history," said Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg. "God has called us to civilize the world," William II told his subjects. "I contend that the British race is the finest which history has yet produced," wrote Cecil Rhodes in his will. "The Anglo-Saxon race is infallibly destined to be the predominant force in the history and civilization of the world," asserted Chamberlain. "Chauvinists" and "Jingoists" filled the yellow journals with war-scares, canards, and falsehoods. Fears, hatreds, and misrepresentations abounded. The west spoke of the "Yellow peril"; the French and British dreaded the "German menace"; the Germans were fed on the "Slav peril"; and the orientals spoke of the "White peril." These psychological conditions made it easy for the war party to gain popular support, and kept the world in a nervous state, suspicious, and frightened at every scare-crow.

Obsessed patriotism

The spread of the Industrial Revolution produced the age of big business, alert and competitive. The captains of industry preached the gospel of "power through wealth and wealth through power." The remarkable expansion of world trade after 1870 produced "arenas of friction" all over the earth, which repeatedly threatened war. The business men of each nation relied for security upon the armies and navies of their home governments rather than upon the code of International Law. Free trade, and the "open door" policy, were replaced generally by high tariffs and special commercial

Capitalism and economic rivalries

treaties. When the national flag followed trade and investments over the earth, national rivalries were increased and world business became a standing cause of war. When the Mannesmann Brothers in Morocco were backed by the German government, an international crisis threatening war arose. American investors in Mexico attempted to involve the United States in war with Mexico. Private interests in Persia, China, Turkey, and Latin America precipitated conflicts. National prestige became identified with railroad concessions, mines, banking, and trade. Economic victories abroad aroused keen pride at home. Patriots supported a "strong foreign policy" because it meant both greater wealth and more power. As a result, economic rivalry over the seats of production, channels of trade, markets, and sources of coal, oil, cotton, iron, and manganese, bred ill-will, fear, and resentment, and carried with it the threat of war.

States sought to protect their interests and gain new advantages through favorable alliances. To retain the war loot of the Franco-Prussian War, Germany formed a series of alliances, which culminated in the Triple Alliance. Austria-Hungary welcomed these alliances to further her Balkan policies. Italy entered the Triple Alliance to gain support against France and to obtain backing for her Mediterranean projects. Fear of the Triple Alliance spurred France on to form the Dual Alliance with Russia. To safeguard her Asiatic interests against Russia, Great Britain formed an alliance with Japan. The menace of Germany induced Great Britain to settle her differences with France and Russia, and to enter the Triple Entente to offset the Triple Alliance. And thus it was, that for a quarter of a century before the outbreak of the World War, Europe was divided between two hostile and competitive groups, each armed and ready for instant war. The lesser states swung in the orbits of one or the other of these two major unions. So jealously was this balance of alliances guarded, that the slightest move in foreign policy, or increase in military strength, in one group produced a counter-move in the other. Indeed, one trivial incident after another almost precipitated a clash of arms. The cumulative effects of these recurring crises made a mighty international war a standing possibility. Furthermore secret diplomacy, secret treaties, and clever systems of spying, were employed, as in the days of divine-right monarchies, to gain national advantages and to imperil the peace of the world.

Secret diplomacy

Had there been adequate international machinery, these crises might have been averted in a peaceable manner without the danger of war. But with a lack of common authority to regulate world interests, each of the fifty-odd sovereign states took its own self-interest as its supreme guide. The concept of "national honor"; the national schemes for "vital interests" in colonies, trade, and power; and the various "pan" movements, prevented the federation of the nations of Europe, to say nothing of the world, for mutual coöpera-

Lack of international agencies

tion and security. National good was placed above the good of mankind. Within the separate nations, government, law, and justice were highly developed, but anarchy prevailed in international, political relations. In the fields of science, education, religion, banking, communication, and transportation, the world was largely organized internationally in both theory and practice. In the realm of politics, on the contrary, little progress had been made towards effective inter-state activity. The national state, on a militaristic basis, remained the unit of political civilization. The efforts of the Hague Peace Conferences to curtail war burdens in time of peace and to reduce the dangers of militarism were blocked by the opposition of Germany. The attempts to set up an efficient world court of justice were defeated by national jealousies. Only a few states, in separate treaties, agreed to submit all disputes to the newly organized Hague Tribunal.

Thus it was that by the summer of 1914 the stage was set for the great tragedy, and the actors were more or less conscious of the parts they were to play. Of the eight great powers, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Russia, and Japan were autocratically organized; France and the United States were republics; and Great Britain and Italy were democratic, constitutional monarchies. These powers virtually dictated the policies that regulated the rest of the world. Imbued with an intense nationalism, most of them were militaristic and imperialistic. All of them were competitors for world trade. Several of them were in open conflict over colonies. Some of them held in subjugation alien peoples. Their relations were maintained with one another by treaties and alliances. The destinies of the three continents of the Old World hung in the balance held by two powerful groups: (1) the Triple Alliance and (2) the Triple Entente with Japan as a possible fourth member. Not only Europe but also Asia and Africa were covered with clashing interests, delicate "situations," and sources of "friction." Every international crisis threatened to disrupt the "armed peace" and kept the two groups of allies in a state of nervous, suspicious hostility. The mines were laid for the explosion, and only a match was necessary to shake the earth.

3. The Immediate Causes of the World War

The Archduke Franz Ferdinand was assassinated at Sarajevo in Bosnia on June 28, 1914. But any attempt to understand even the immediate causes of the World War must go back for at least two years and review the major phases of the diplomatic situation with respect to the Balkans and the growing closeness of diplomatic relations between France and Russia. In this study of the immediate causes, the investigators are uniquely fortunate as to source material. For the first time in the history of mankind the same generation of scholars that witnessed a great European conflict have at their disposal the contents of the archives of the more im-

New evidence on war guilt

portant governments which participated. The Socialist governments which assumed charge of Germany and Austria following the World War quickly made public the diplomatic negotiations of the earlier régime in the hope that such a procedure would help to discredit the previous capitalistic and monarchical governments. In this way there is adequate information concerning the diplomatic negotiations of the Central Powers. For the same general reasons the Bolshevik government in Russia at once opened the archives at Petrograd to scholars, though, even earlier, De Siebert, the secretary of the Russia embassy at London, had published a large collection of communications which had passed between London and St. Petersburg during the period from 1908 to 1914. Inasmuch as Russia was allied with France and England, the Russian archives revealed much of the pertinent information with respect to the negotiations, relations and coöperation between the Entente Powers in the period preceding the outbreak of the war. Now even England is to allow two reputable scholars, George Peabody Gooch and Harold Temperley, to publish two volumes of communications on English diplomacy in 1914 and the years immediately preceding. Because of these circumstances, honest historical scholars are now able to eliminate well-nigh entirely the grotesque mythology concerning war origins which was spread by the various powers during the period of the great conflict, and may handle the subject upon the basis of fact, truth, and candor. An effort will be made in these few pages to summarize briefly and clearly the consensus of historical experts who have thoroughly and carefully analyzed the source material mentioned above. Any such collection of competent students of contemporary diplomatic history would certainly include the following names: G. P. Gooch, S. B. Fay, B. Schmitt, V. Valentin, M. Montgelas, P. Renouvin, M. Morhardt, A. Fabre-Luce, G. Frantz, W. L. Langer, John S. Ewart, and Corrado Barbagallo.

Importance of period 1912–1914

The period from 1912 to 1914 is very significant in the diplomatic history of Europe: (1) because of the developments during this time in the way of strengthening the Franco-Russian Alliance; and (2) on account of growing and decisive hostility between Serbia and Austria, the latter of which was unquestionably intensified by the Russian encouragement of the Serbian nationalistic aspirations. While there is no doubt that some of the aggressiveness in the Austro-Serbian situation must be assigned to Austria, it is certainly true that these two major diplomatic developments mentioned above were closely interrelated. The closer collusion between France and Russia promoted the increase of Russian ambitions in regard to Constantinople and the Straits and, consequently, led to a notable increase of Russian activity in Balkan problems and issues. This intensification of Russian concern in regard to the Balkan area took the specific form of encouraging the Serbian nationalists, while it was but natural that the propaganda and activity of these patriots should

arouse the suspicion and antipathy of Austria, and increase her already unfriendly and somewhat aggressive attitude towards her troublesome little Balkan neighbor.

The Franco-Russian Alliance

The Franco-Russian Alliance goes back to about 1892, but during most of the twenty years following that time it had been looked upon by the participating powers as primarily a defensive alliance against the triple union of Germany, Austria, and Italy. About 1908, a transition set in. The century-old Russian desire for Constantinople began to assert itself with a new intensity. The Russian suggestion in 1908 that Austria annex Bosnia and Herzegovina had been based upon the assumption that Russia would receive as compensation the opening of the Straits to Russian war vessels. Having been frustrated in this ambition by the disapproval of England, Russia, after the failure of direct negotiations with Turkey and of the Balkan League, turned her interest to the only other probable means of securing control of the Straits, namely, a European war which would make it possible for the Russians to seize Constantinople and realize the ambition of Russian generals, statesmen, and diplomats since the time of Catherine the Great. While many members of the Russian court and diplomatic circle were extremely favorable to this policy, its leader was unquestionably Isvolski, who became the Russian foreign minister and later ambassador to Paris. It was quite obvious, however, that no such policy as this would prove successful unless Russia could count upon the support of France and, if possible, that of England as well.

Russia and the Straits

Poincaré and Alsace-Lorraine

About 1912 the French situation became more favorable to Russian policy than it had been during most of the time in the previous generation. There was arising to power in France a new and more aggressive group of militant Republicans, led by Raymond Poincaré. Poincaré had been born in Lorraine, and since childhood had entertained an all-dominating passion to rescue his fatherland from what he sincerely believed to be the unjustifiable and humiliating seizure by Germany. As there was little probability that Germany would ever voluntarily cede Lorraine to France, because, among other reasons, of the valuable iron-ore deposits in this area, Poincaré well understood that Alsace-Lorraine could presumably be restored to France only as an incident of the favorable outcome of a general European war. Hence, with the rise of the Poincaré party to power in France, Isvolski found in Paris a cordial interest in his proposal that France and Russia should draw more closely together for the furtherance of their mutual ambitions, which could be realized jointly and solely through a Franco-Russian victory in a general European conflict. From this time on the Franco-Russian Alliance became a positive and powerful factor in European diplomacy.

To bring this about, it would, of course, be necessary to secure the support of the mass of the people in France. Russia being an au-

tocracy, there was likely to be little difficulty in that country, for military and diplomatic affairs were thoroughly controlled by an irresponsible monarch and his court, ministry, and general staff. In France the situation was far different, because, theoretically at least, the ultimate control of foreign affairs rested with the Chamber of Deputies. Hence, it was necessary to carry on a long and effective campaign of propaganda in the press which would culminate in the conversion of the mass of the French people from a pacifically inclined population, to one which believed Germany likely to attack France at any time and was convinced that the Austrian and German policies in the Balkans were diametrically opposed to the peace and safety of France. To bring about this transformation of French opinion, Isvolski obtained from Russia large sums of money which were adroitly distributed with the advice of Poincaré, to the French newspapers of every description and class bias. There was thus executed a generally successful process of bribery of these French newspapers, so that they changed their editorial and news policies markedly in the direction of emphasizing the indispensable value to the French of the closer arrangement with Russia, and stressing the dangers which faced France in the alleged aggression of Germany and Austria. Many of Poincaré's henchmen, such as Tardieu, also contributed extensive articles to these papers, sharply criticizing Austro-German policy in the Balkans and warning Frenchmen of the grave menace to their interests and safety alleged to reside therein. The net result was the growing conviction of the French people that Balkan affairs were of vital importance to the country. The Franco-Russian Alliance was, thus, "Balkanized." When in 1913 Poincaré became a candidate for the French presidency, Russian pecuniary aid also played a part in defraying his campaign expenses.

Isvolski and Poincaré bribe the French press

This intensification of the Franco-Russian Alliance produced specific results in the negotiations between these states. On November 17, 1912, Poincaré, in conference with Isvolski, gave Russia a free hand in the Balkans, promising unconditional French support if she were attacked by Austria or Germany. The one stipulation was that Poincaré or his successors should have a general supervisory control over Russian acts in the Balkans, lest these might on some occasion take a form or course not designed to redound to the specific interest of France or the furtherance of those aims of the Franco-Russian Alliance in which Poincaré was interested. The years 1912–14 augmented the Russian interest and restlessness in regard to the Straits. The Balkan wars appeared to have resulted rather unfavorably to Austro-German ambitions and interests in the Balkan area, particularly in the increased power and prestige of Serbia, and Austria assumed a progressively more menacing attitude towards Serbia. Russia was likewise disappointed by the failure of the Balkan League in advancing her struggle for the Straits. By December, 1913, even Sozanov was convinced that the Straits could be secured only by a

France and Russia in the Balkans

European war. The Russian impatience took on a significant form in February, 1914, when a secret Crown Council was held at St. Petersburg to decide as to whether it would be wisest to strike suddenly and unaided against Turkey and seize Constantinople and the Straits, or to await a probable European war which would give Russia the advantage of the aid of the British and French fleets in holding in check the naval forces of Germany and Austria. It was deemed best to accept the latter alternative. In the meantime, the encouraging Russian attitude towards Serbian nationalism was helping to create a situation which promised to aid notably in producing a crisis that might actually serve to precipitate the desired war.

The military increases of 1913

It has often been asserted that this aggressive action of France and Russia after 1912 was not the result of deliberate and independent planning on their part, but a program of defense into which they were forced by the increase of German aggression and militarism at this time, in particular the German military bill of 1913. This position has little substantial basis in fact. The combined Franco-Russian military forces in 1910 were far greater than those of Germany and Austria, and after the Grey-Cambon correspondence of 1912 it was practically certain that the support of England could be counted upon. It should be remembered that, while the German military law of 1913 was passed before that of the French, the French army bill was introduced in the parliament first; the military and naval increases of 1913–14 grew out of the general European alarm over the Balkan situation of 1912–13, which threatened to produce a crisis at almost any time.

The Jugo-Slav movement in Serbia

The nationalistic movement in Serbia had been strong for more than a generation, and had been notably forwarded by what the Serbs regarded as the aggressive and utterly unjustifiable annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria in 1908. Serbian officials did not know that this annexation had actually been suggested by Serbia's supposed protector, Russia. Throughout the period from 1912 to 1914 Austria became more active and aggressive in regard to the Balkans, and during the Balkan crises of 1912–14 assumed a threatening attitude towards Serbia, adding specific causes of irritation in such incidents as the "Pig War." The patriotic and unification movements in the latter state were therefore enormously stimulated from a defensive point of view. In her aggression towards Serbia at this time, Austria had acted without the instigation or encouragement of Germany; in fact, Germany had on two occasions moved to restrain Austria. It should be pointed out, however, that about this time Germany had secured what seemed to be a very thorough-going control over Turkish foreign policy, and was bringing to completion her negotiations and activities in regard to the Bagdad railroad. Hence Germany was not likely to view with equanimity any increase of Russian activity in the Balkans, to say nothing of the Russian desire to obtain control of Constantinople

and the Straits. Likewise, Sazonov was greatly alarmed at the growth of German influence over the sublime porte.

The antagonism between Austria and Serbia tended to become acute in the spring of 1914. In the spring of that year a notorious Serbian plotter and assassin, Dragutin Dimitrievitch, who was at this time chief of the intelligence division of the Serbian general staff, decided in company with a number of Serbian plotters in the notorious patriotic society, the Black Hand, that the Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir apparent to the Austrian throne, must be assassinated before he could institute reforms in Austria which would be a serious obstacle to the Greater Serbia program. A number of courageous young Bosnian adventurers were enlisted in the plot, trained in pistol marksmanship and the throwing of bombs by Serbian military authorities and then sent, with the connivance of the Serbian authorities, to Sarajevo in Bosnia, where they awaited the impending visit of the archduke. It is stated that Dimitrievitch lost his nerve, as the time for the visit of the archduke approached, and attempted to call off the plot when it was too late. Whether this is true, cannot be determined with certainty, but there is no doubt about the origin and planning of the plot.

The Serbian plot against Austria in 1914

When this information concerning the complicity of Dimitrievitch was first made public by a Serbian historian, Stanojevic, in 1923, it was believed that while the Serbian military authorities may have been cognizant of the plot, the Serbian civil government was innocent of this knowledge. But the exuberance at the tenth anniversary of the outbreak of the World War has proved too much for the discretion of certain Serbian officials, and L. Jovanovitch, a member of the Serbian cabinet in 1914, has exultantly boasted that the Serbian civil government was likewise in full possession of the facts regarding the plot nearly a month before the assassination was consummated. There is some evidence that the Serbian minister to Vienna in 1914 passed a hint of the impending assassination to Bilinski, who was at that time minister of finance and administration in Bosnia, but Bilinski, who was out of favor at the Austrian court, never handed on this warning if he actually received it. The Serbian government, hoping that the secret in regard to the collusion of the Serbian military and civil authorities in the plot for the assassination of the archduke might die with its author, attempted during the war to secure the assassination of Dimitrievitch, and, failing in this, was able in 1917 to execute him on a trumped-up charge of treason. In the light of the fact that the Serbian premier, Pashitch, was aware of the assassination plot at least three weeks before the murder of June 28, it is illuminating to remember his ardent and repeated insistence upon his complete ignorance of the plot in July, 1914. Austria entertained at the time of the assassination the strong conviction of the direct participation of the Serbian government in this plot, and acted on this supposition, though as an actual matter of

Serbian denials of guilt in 1914

fact the Austrian committee of investigation was unable in July, 1914, to find any convincing evidence supporting this contention, beyond such broad and general considerations as the arming of the assassins in Serbia, the treachery of the frontier guards, and the exuberant attitude of the Serbian press and patriotic societies in regard to the assassination and the assassins.

The crisis after Sarajevo

The assassination of the archduke on June 28, 1914, shocked and startled the various European chancelleries. The tension had been high in the international situation in the spring of 1914, and the murder of the Austrian heir was recognized by most foreign offices as likely to create a serious crisis in diplomatic affairs. In general, there was a fairly common feeling throughout Europe that the assassination had been an atrocious affair, and that Austria would be justified in taking rather a severe attitude towards Serbia. Poincaré and Isvolski, though they probably did not know of the actual details of the plot to assassinate the archduke, recognized at once the significance of the episode for the policy which they had been planning during the previous two or three years. Sometime earlier Poincaré had arranged for a visit to Russia in July, 1914, and this trip was executed as planned, though it was to involve a discussion of far more momentous and immediate issues than had earlier been contemplated. Many of the ultra-severe critics of Poincaré have alleged that this trip was planned solely to encourage the aspiring but cowardly and hesitant Russian militarists. It is definitely known, however, that the trip had been fully provided for a considerable time before the assassination. This fact does not, however, in any way affect the thesis that Poincaré exploited the visit primarily for the purpose of stiffening the Russian determination to prevent any strong Austrian action in the Serbian crisis, and hoped to use the Balkan controversy as the basis for precipitating the World War which would lead to the Russian seizure of the Straits and the French recovery of Alsace-Lorraine.

Poincaré's visit to St. Petersburg, July, 1914

It is known upon authentic information that Poincaré was most enthusiastically welcomed at St. Petersburg, that he did everything possible to strengthen practically and symbolically the Franco-Russian Alliance, and that he urged the Russians to be firm in their attitude towards the Serbian situation. He also assumed a somewhat menacing attitude towards the Austrian ambassador to St. Petersburg. Poincaré's visit to St. Petersburg took place before either he or the Russians had any complete knowledge of the specific nature of the impending Austrian ultimatum to Serbia. Yet the long postponement of a definite statement of the presumably punitive action in regard to Serbia had aroused the suspicion of both the French and the Russians that something ominous was imminent. But one must not fail to point out that at this early date Poincaré gave Russia a free hand to act in the Serbian crisis, and promised full French aid in any event before either he or Sazonov knew the specific terms of the Austrian ul-

timatum to Serbia. The kaiser has been frequently, and not unjustly, condemned for giving Austria a blank check in regard to Serbia. But it should be indicated in frankness and candor that this was exactly what Poincaré did during his St. Petersburg visit with respect to the Russian attitude and policy in regard to Austria. Largely as a result of Poincaré's visit the Russian militarists thoroughly gained the upper hand over the pacific party at the court. General Russian preparations for the war began July 24, and we may most certainly accept as accurate the conclusion of the scholarly Frenchman, Alfred Fabre-Luce, to the effect that after Poincaré's visit to St. Petersburg there was only a very slight chance that a European war could be averted.

Slight chance of preserving peace after Poincaré's visit

It was generally contended by the Entente propagandists during the World War that 1914 was a particularly fortunate date for such a conflict from the standpoint of the Central Powers, and an especially unfortunate one from the point of view of the Entente. Exactly the opposite was the case. There was no specific reason why Germany and Austria should have considered 1914 advantageous for a European conflict, and only the nebulous general one that the longer the conflict was delayed, the greater would become the disproportionate military strength of Russia and France. Then, it must be remembered that all of Austria's plans for the Balkans and most of Germany's foreign policies were likely to be wrecked by a European war. On the other hand, 1914 was a crucially important date for a European war from the standpoint of the interests of Russia and France. Without the British navy Russia and France would have been gravely handicapped in a war against Germany and Austria. In June, 1914, England and Germany had settled in a satisfactory manner their outstanding difficulties in international relations, particularly their disputes over Mesopotamia and the Bagdad railroad, and were getting on better terms than during any other period in the previous eighteen years. Hence, in another year it would be highly doubtful if Great Britain could be induced to undertake warlike action on behalf of France and Russia. In the same way that this Anglo-German *rapprochement* created a greater necessity for war in 1914 on the part of the French and Russians, so it decreased the occasion for any German war against Great Britain at this moment. It also gave the Germans greater assurance of probable British neutrality. At the same time Russia was faced with a social revolution in 1914 and France feared lest the radicals might secure the repeal of the three-year service act of 1913. A war would remove both dangers.

Why France and Russia desired war in 1914

The Austrian court and military circles had for some years before 1914 become alarmed at the Serbian nationalistic agitation and its encouragement by the Russians. It seemed to them the most menacing movement then directed against the integrity of the Dual Monarchy. If successful, it would lead to the immediate loss of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and would constitute an invitation to

revolution and secession on the part of the other minority nationalities within the polyglot Empire. Up to the time of the assassination of the archduke, active Austrian intervention in Serbian affairs had been prevented by the opposition of the moderates in the Austro-Hungarian ministry, particularly Count Tisza, the Hungarian premier, and by the adverse attitude of Germany towards any open aggression against Serbia. The assassination of the archduke brought the matter to a crisis by enormously strengthening the activity and determination of the interventionists, and by helping to silence or weaken the opposition to such a policy. The Vienna authorities, civil and military, quickly came to the decision that the Serbian menace could no longer be ignored, and Count Tisza was soon won over to the policy of forcible intervention which was to follow diplomatic pressure.

Austrian policy after the assassination

The attitude of Germany in the crisis had, of course, to be ascertained by the Austrians, and on July 5 a letter from Franz Josef was delivered to the kaiser, setting forth the Austrian grievances against Serbia and stressing the fact that the Austrian Empire could not be kept intact without immediate and vigorous action against this south Slavic state. The kaiser, who had earlier been frequently accused by Austro-Hungarian ministers of special partiality and friendliness towards Serbia, was now alarmed about the future of Austria-Hungary, with which the destinies of the German Empire were so closely linked. He was also personally shocked and doubtless somewhat frightened by the assassination of the archduke, with whom he was personally friendly, and whose dynastic fortunes were so closely related to the house of Hohenzollern. Consequently, after consultation with his chancellor and the foreign office on July 5, the kaiser made the following momentous decision: "Austria may judge what is to be done to clear up her relation with Serbia; whatever Austria's decision may turn out to be, Austria can count with certainty upon it that Germany will stand behind her as an ally and a friend." The kaiser recognized at the time the possibility that this decision might lead to war, but he believed it highly improbable, because he felt that the tsar, like himself, would be so shocked at the assassination as to eliminate any considerable probability of Russian opposition to the proper punishment of Serbia. And, in any event, he believed Russia insufficiently prepared, and he staked too much on the assumption of British neutrality.

Germany's first reaction to the Austrian punitive policy

During the latter part of the World War there developed a luxuriant myth concerning an alleged "Potsdam Conference," said to have been held on July 5, 1914, at which the kaiser was claimed to have met the leading German and Austrian officials, as well as prominent members of the financial and industrial world in the Central Empires, to have revealed to them his determination to precipitate a general European war, and to have warned them that they would have only about three weeks to prepare for its outbreak.

The myth of the Potsdam Conference of July 5, 1914

It is now known that there is not the slightest shred of evidence to support this fabrication, which was published immediately throughout the Allied world by Henry Morgenthau, who was during the war the American minister at Constantinople. There was no such conference whatever; the kaiser at that time had only the slightest anticipation that a European war was to come, and was distinctly opposed to any general clash of arms over the Serbian issue. He and his chancellor can, however, be accused of grave indiscretion in giving Austria this blank check. But they repented of this folly later, and would unquestionably have made satisfactory amends for it had not the premature Russian mobilization frustrated the really earnest German efforts to restrain Austrian aggression when the latter seemed likely to bring on a general European conflict. There is no evidence that Poincaré ever repented of his grant of a free hand to Russia or made any effort to curb Russian aggression.

The Austrians delayed the sending of their ultimatum to Serbia until July 23. This was once believed to be due to the fact that it had been decided at the "Potsdam Conference" on July 5 that several weeks would be required to put the Central Empires into shape for a continental war. It is now known that the delay was due to the necessity of converting Tisza to the war policy, the desire to delay the ultimatum until Poincaré had left Russia, and the effort to secure proof of official Serbian complicity in the assassination as the result of a study of the facts by an Austrian committee of investigation. This committee was unable to find much evidence of that official governmental responsibility of Serbia which has been subsequently so thoroughly established. But the general attitude of the Serbian government, the conduct of the Serbian press, and other symptoms, only demonstrated still further the already well-known fact that the Serbian state was countenancing the nationalistic and the patriotic movements which had produced the assassination. The Austrian government resolved that this time they would thoroughly dispose of the Serbian nuisance, whatever the consequences. The Austrian army was partially mobilized on the Serbian boundary on July 25, but not until six hours after the Serbian mobilization order had been issued. In spite of the fact that even the German officials regarded the Serbian reply as quite satisfactory, Austria declared war on Serbia on July 28. That the Serbians, encouraged by the Russian attitude, were as stubborn and recalcitrant as the Austrians is proved by the fact that the Serbian army was ordered mobilized some three hours before the Serbian reply to the ultimatum had been sent to the Austrian officials.

The Austrian determination to punish Serbia

There can be no doubt that the Austrians were determined upon a punitive expedition into Serbia, but Germany was willing to see this policy carried out only on condition that it did not bring with it the strong probability of a general European war. The German civil government distinctly wanted the conflict localized, and limited

to a punishment of Serbia. This is in sharp contrast to the policy of Poincaré and the Russians, which was clearly based upon the desire to bring about a general European war, without which the Franco-Russian ambitions could not have been in any way satisfied. The distinction between the type of war contemplated by Austria and that envisaged by France and Russia is of the utmost importance in assessing the relative responsibility of these various powers for the general cataclysm which began during the first week in August, 1914.

Austria opposed to a European war

While every friend of peace might well wish that Austria had accepted the terms of the Serbian reply to her ultimatum, yet no one can with any propriety criticize her for not doing so. In 1898 Spain made a far more complete surrender to the terms of the American ultimatum than did Serbia to the Austrian demands. Yet President McKinley kept the Spanish reply secret and urged Congress to declare war. Certainly no one could contend that American interests in Cuba in 1898 were in any way as urgent or direct as those of Austria in the Serbian crisis of 1914. But a better analogy can be found by asking what would the United States have done if on July 4, 1901, Vice-President Roosevelt and his wife had been assassinated at El Paso, Texas, by members of a notorious Mexican secret society given over to plotting against the United States and whose murder of Mr. Roosevelt had been immediately proclaimed in the Mexican papers as a noble and laudable patriotic act? It is to be hoped that there is no reader naïve enough to suspect that Americans would even have waited for any diplomatic exchanges whatever before rushing soldiers into Mexico!

What would the United States have done in 1914?

The action of Russia following the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia was prompt and decisive, though it cannot be too strongly emphasized that Russia had little moral ground either expressed or implied for interfering with Austria's plan to punish Serbia. Russia had urged the Serbian plotters to continue their intrigues against Austria, and had even furnished the Serbians with munitions for the impending conflict. Hence, Russia was herself culpable in regard to the Serbian plot to assassinate the archduke, and in a general way was fully aware of the Serbian guilt. The Russian militarists, after the impetus and advantage they had gained from Poincaré's visit and encouragement, were in full command of the situation at St. Petersburg, and they had a most enthusiastic and aggressive aide in Isvolski at the French capital who, in these crucial days, presided over the negotiations between St. Petersburg and Paris. The Austrian ultimatum to Serbia seemed likely to present an admirable occasion for the precipitation of that world war which the crown council had foreseen and longed for in the previous February. The Russian military preparations for a European war had been in process of development for more than a year previous. They had been still further increased following February, 1914, and real activity had been initiated as soon as the

Russia seizes the opportunity for war

news of the assassination of the archduke reached St. Petersburg... When the court and military circles were informed of the terms of the Austrian ultimatum, military preparations on a large scale began in dead earnest. Widespread preparatory military measures were ordered on July 24, the day that Russia learned the nature of the ultimatum. A partial mobilization was begun on the 26th, and general mobilization ordered on the 30th. All of this came before there had been any evidence of German or Austrian military activity anticipating a world war, and when diplomatic negotiations were in full swing.

As it had been frankly admitted and assumed by French, Russian, and English military authorities for a generation that a general Russian mobilization would inevitably mean a European war, there can be no question that the Russian militarists were as determined to bring about a general European conflict as was Austria to invade Serbia. The tsar was unquestionably a well-intentioned ruler, but unintelligent, vacillating, and confused before the impending calamity. Grand Duke Nicholas and the strongest element in the court group were extremely enthusiastic for war, as in general were the military circles, though there seems some probability that the minister of war, Sukhomlinov, lost his nerve in the face of the crisis. It was for a considerable time believed by scholars that the Russian foreign minister, Sazonov, was really in favor of mediation, and was brought around to the war view only by full realization of the menace of Austrian policy to Russian ambitions in the Near East. More thorough investigation, particularly the marshalling of the evidence in the recent book by Professor Frantz and in Baron Schilling's diary, has established the fact unquestionably that Sazonov had, by the time of Poincaré's departure from St. Petersburg, become thoroughly converted to the aggressive attitude and throughout the crucial period of the last two weeks in July was aligned with the military party in the Russian capital. It need not be further emphasized at this point that among all the prominent Russians of the time the zeal of Isvolski in Paris for a European war was matched only by that of the Grand Duke Nicholas at home.

Russia brings on the World War

Much has been made, by Poincaré and others, of the fact that Germany was the first country technically to declare war, but this assertion is entirely misleading. Russia was the first country to take steps which inevitably led to war, with the Russians fully conscious that their acts would unavoidably produce a general European war. The Russian general mobilization order was sent out July 30 at 6 P.M. The Russians themselves recognized that this actually and technically meant the beginning of the war. General Dobrorolski, chief of the mobilization division of the Russian army in 1914, has himself written:

"This once fixed (the mobilization order) there is no way backwards. This step settles automatically the beginning of war. The

affair had now begun irretrievably. The order was already well known in all the larger cities of our huge country. No change was possible. The prologue of the great historic drama had begun."

The World War, then, actually began on July 30 at 6 P.M. This was forty-seven hours before Germany ordered general mobilization on August 1 at 5 P.M. In the same way that Russia was the *first country to take the step which made war unavoidable*, France was the first country actually to declare herself for war. At 1 A.M. on the morning of August 1 Isvolski telegraphed to St. Petersburg that "the French war minister has informed me, in hearty high spirits, that the government is firmly determined upon war." This was sixteen hours before Germany declared war on Russia and two and a half days before Germany, as a mere formality, declared war on France.

French the first to declare for war

Inasmuch as Poincaré had probably been the chief factor and influence in leading the Russians to determine upon an immediate and actively aggressive policy in July, 1914, it was scarcely to be expected that France would vigorously oppose the Russian preparatory and mobilization measures, even though French authorities knew that once they were started in real earnest, there was absolutely no possibility of preventing a general European war. Most of the dispatches exchanged between the French government and the Russian government at St. Petersburg on the subject of the military measures are now available. There is not a single telegram in this collection which reveals any serious French effort to restrain the Russian military activity. At a secret meeting on the night of July 29, the French authorities decided to support the Russian mobilization. In fact, the most important telegram was one sent by Isvolski on July 30, stating that the French minister of war had suggested that the Russians might well speed up their military preparations, but should be as secretive about this activity as possible, so that more time might be gained upon Germany, no open incitement or excuse be given to the Germans for counter-mobilization on their part, and no cause for alarm be presented to England. In a number of important telegrams Isvolski described to his home government the high enthusiasm of the French government and military circles with respect to the impending war. As shown above on August 1, Isvolski telegraphed home that the French ministry had revealed to him their great exuberance and enthusiasm over the final decision for war, and asked him to request the Russian government to direct their military activities against Germany rather than Austria. And at this same time Isvolski was joyously and enthusiastically admitting his part by openly boasting: "*C'est ma guerre.*"

French secretly encourage Russian aggression

During the war the French persistently called attention to a certain phase of their pre-war military activity as a definite proof of their pacific intent. This was the famous French order of July 30, directing the withdrawal of the frontier troops in certain sections

to a line about six miles back of the boundary. As the French patrols were left at the border posts, so that they could detect any aggressive advances on the part of Germany, who in fact had not yet mobilized at all, this movement of troops did not in any way whatever reduce the military efficiency of the French defenses against German invasion. The patrols were in a position to report any advance movement of German troops, and the French armies could have been marched over the intervening six miles in an hour. As a matter of fact, this withdrawal was a positive aid to French military preparations, as they carried on extensive preparatory activities back of the screen of the six-mile line. In some sectors it was strategically necessary to withdraw the troops in order to get them out of the way of defensive shell-fire. We now know that the whole thing was primarily a picturesque gesture to aid Sir Edward Grey and the "strong" members of the English cabinet in duping the English Parliament and people by convincing them of the pacific and defensive attitude of France. The French authorities recognized clearly, as the dispatches of the time indicate, that if the English people had any serious suspicions of aggressive Franco-Russian action, there would be the greatest difficulty in getting the English nation enthusiastically into the war on the side of France and Russia, and it might even be very difficult to get the English cabinet to decide upon war. It is also necessary to remember that the withdrawal gesture was further designed to produce a favorable opinion of French official action in the minds of the French and Italian people, in order that the French might rally loyally and the Italians refuse to join Austria and Germany. There is, thus, no substantial evidence that the group in charge of French policy in July, 1914, took any significant steps whatever to avert the great catastrophe, and there is an overwhelming body of proof to support the position that they did everything possible to make the war inevitable.

French efforts to deceive England and Italy

The French authorities would probably have encountered some difficulty in carrying out this policy if they had gone through the usual constitutional process of putting up the matter of the declaration of war to the Chamber of Deputies, but this Poincaré and his associates carefully avoided; the ministry itself determined independently upon war, and, after its precipitation, endeavored with success to justify their acts to the Chamber. It needs to be pointed out here that France went beyond the terms of the Franco-Russian military convention. This promised French aid only in the event of a prior Austrian or German general mobilization against Russia, whereas in 1914 Russia had ordered full mobilization before either Germany or Austria had ordered mobilization against Russia. France was not technically obligated to aid Russia under the terms of the military convention; what bound her was Poincaré's blank check given during his visit to St. Petersburg. This fact probably made Poincaré all the more loath to put the matter of the declaration of war before

in 1914

the Chamber of Deputies. The one great Frenchman living at the time who might have exposed Poincaré and his policy and aligned the majority of sane French pacific opinion against such a foolhardy determination for war, was the socialist leader, Jean Jaurès. But he was assassinated by a militant, patriotic and fanatical supporter of the Poincaré policy before he could take any effective steps in this direction.

As soon as Germany discovered that Austria was determined to go ahead with the Serbian campaign regardless of consequences, and discerned that these consequences, due to the Franco-Russian procedure, would be likely to bring on a general European war, the Berlin authorities began a feverish, but unfortunately belated, effort to put pressure upon those at Vienna in order to restrain Austrian activity and secure some settlement of the situation which would prevent involving all the great powers in war. There is little reason to feel that the German authorities, while they may have regarded the Austrian ultimatum as too severe, were inclined to be at all worried about the vigorous Austrian policy in Serbia, provided this should not bring on a general conflict. There is, on the other hand, but little evidence that they were willing to have a European war precipitated over the Balkans, if the Austro-Serbian conflict could possibly be localized. The activities of the German government from July 27 to 29 were concentrated upon the effort to delay the Russians in the matter of intervention in the Austro-Serbian affair, and upon discriminating coöperation with Sir Edward Grey with the aim of bringing about discussions and negotiations between Russia and Austria. Both efforts failed. The Russian military group, now in undisputed control of Russia, refused to be turned aside from their determination upon war. Likewise the Austrian authorities, equally set upon going ahead with the punishment of Serbia, refused to heed the kaiser's admonitions, and even declined to answer his telegrams containing the suggestion and offer of mediation. By July 30 the Berlin authorities became highly alarmed at the prospect of war, and Bethmann-Hollweg sent insistent telegrams, warning Austria that unless she delayed or abated her policy in Serbia the responsibility for a European war might be laid upon her shoulders. On the same day the kaiser exclaimed in exasperation that he and his chancellor had been asses to put their necks into a noose through the blank check given to Austria on July 6. That the German militarists were, however, in sympathy and collusion with the Austrian war party is apparent from telegrams sent by Von Moltke to Hötzendorf at the height of the crisis, urging Conrad to stand firm in his aggressive attitude in spite of the pressure for mediation and peace by the kaiser and Bethmann-Hollweg.

German efforts to restrain Austria and avert a European war

It is now known that the Austrian authorities viewed this German intercession for peace and mediation with great levity, and were

thoroughly decided that nothing should turn them aside from the long-awaited opportunity to discipline Serbia and get the Balkan situation under control. What Germany might have done still further in the way of attempting to restrain Austria cannot be said, as by this time the Russian mobilization had been ordered. As soon as this had been discovered by the Germans, the only feasible German strategic policy was to warn Russia that the continuation of Russian mobilization must be followed by a German declaration of war, a thing which the Russians from the beginning had known would be the case. One of the chief myths embodied in the Entente propaganda during the war was the allegation that at the close of July, 1914, Austria was showing signs of weakening in her aggressive policy and of willingness to accept the Entente proposals of mediation, when Germany, fearing lest she should lose the opportunity to precipitate a world war, rushed into the breach and brutally and wantonly declared war against Russia. Nothing could be further from the actual facts in the circumstances. Up to July 31, Austria never was in the slightest diverted from her original aggressive determination, and until Germany was confronted by the Russian mobilization, she made sincere efforts to avert any general European conflict over the Serbian episode.

Austria ignores German pressure

Some have argued that Germany should have contented herself with mere counter-mobilization against Russia. But every European military expert of any competence whatever has fully recognized that this policy would have been fatal for Germany, surrounded on both sides by powerful foes, and having as her chief security against the greater Russian numbers her superior mobility and power to strike with rapidity. The Franco-Russian authorities had fully reckoned with this fact, as it had been a basic consideration in their strategy to recognize that general Russian mobilization would inevitably be followed by a speedy German declaration of war. The kaiser's rapid and definite effort to avert the Russian general mobilization stands out in sharp contrast to the complete absence of any such attempt on the part of Poincaré. Also the admitted perturbation, if not dismay, of the kaiser in signing the war orders was something far different from the exuberance and enthusiasm of Izvolski and of Poincaré and his associates when they recognized that the war was on at last.

Germany forced into the war by Russia

As to England, it seems certain that, along with Germany, she was one of the two great powers involved in active conflict in August, 1914, which desired to preserve peace in the crisis. She was unquestionably definitely committed to France and Russia in what was for all practical purposes a defensive alliance, although Asquith and Sir Edward Grey had repeatedly denied this when questioned in the House of Commons. There is, however, nothing to lead to the belief that, if he had not been bound by fatal agreements with France and Russia, Sir Edward Grey himself would have preferred war to peace

in July, 1914, though unquestionably Winston Churchill and certain of the naval clique, together with Bonar Law, Maxse and the conservative nationalists were ready for war. It must also be remembered that Grey had been forced into the unpopular agreement with Russia and France chiefly by the sinister influence of Holstein in leading Bülow to reject the British advances towards a better understanding with Germany, and by the foolish and menacing naval policy of Von Tirpitz.

If Germany had not invaded Belgium, but had merely defended herself on the western front against French invasion, it is possible that the English cabinet would not have been able to enter the war on the side of France and Russia; indeed, it is likely that if they had done so, popular opposition would have paralyzed their efforts. It is true that Sir Edward Grey offered several suggestions as to mediation, but his policy throughout the crisis was vacillating and weak. His evasions and hesitancy encouraged both groups to hasty action. Having sown the wind between 1910 and 1914, he found it difficult to avoid reaping the whirlwind in 1914. His chief potential trump cards which he might have played at the time would have been a declaration of neutrality or an early warning to Germany that an aggressive campaign on her part in the west, and particularly an invasion of Belgium, would certainly bring about English intervention on the side of the Dual Alliance. A declaration of neutrality would have had a sobering influence on France and Russia. If he had issued a warning to Germany in decisive terms around July 25 or 26, it is probable that Germany would, even earlier than she did, have taken such steps as would have still further restrained Austria and made it more difficult for France and Russia to enlist the aid of England.

Weak and vacillating policy of Sir Edward Grey

But the most damaging indictment against Sir Edward Grey is that he did not put any effective restraint upon Russia or France in their aggressive action following Poincaré's visit to St. Petersburg, and actually seems to have had a strong positive influence upon the final decision of the Russians to go ahead with the fatal general mobilization. In spite of the fact that Buchanan, the English ambassador at St. Petersburg, was urging caution on the Russians, Grey, as early as July 25, told Benckendorff, the Russian ambassador at London, that he believed that the nature of the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia would make it necessary for Russia to mobilize against Austria. This led Sazonov and the Russians to feel at this early date that they could surely count on English as well as French support in their projected military measures which they knew would inevitably bring on a European war. No fair-minded historian can well doubt that Sir Edward Grey had worked earnestly if unintelligently for some pacific adjustment of European difficulties in the period following 1908. At the same time, no one who has consulted the works of Loreburn, Morel, Henderson and Ewart can well maintain that he

Grey encourages Russian mobilization

behaved as a sincere, devoted and astute champion of peace in the crisis of the early summer of 1914. He must now be included as second only to the French, Russian and Austrian diplomats in degree of actual and immediate responsibility for the world conflict.

It must also, of course, be recognized that Grey was rather ignorant of the details of foreign policy and diplomatic problems. Like Berchtold, he was wont to rely for advice upon his under-secretaries. Of these, *Sir Arthur Nicolson, former ambassador at St. Petersburg,* a favorite of the tsar, and a traditional diplomat and militarist, was the most important. Grey admitted that Nicolson had been made under-secretary in 1910 in order to strengthen the ties between England and Russia. There is little doubt that Grey was as much influenced by Nicolson in his decisions of July, 1914, as was Berchtold by Forgach, Hoyos and others. That Grey did, however, take credit personally for bringing England into the war is apparent from the following telegram of Benckendorff to Sazonov (in the Italian archives):

Grey personally responsible for forcing England into war

"Let me add for your most personal information that there is a feeling that Grey carries about almost incessantly, and one which is well founded up to a certain point; namely, that at the moment of indecision of the British public and of the whole ministry, Grey it was, more than anyone, who dragged England into the war, and for that reason he always feels a sense of the deepest responsibility, apart from that of the cabinet. Still I don't see any symptoms that his energy of decision is affected by it."

In his memoirs Grey admits that he would have resigned if he had not been able to swing England for war.

The delicate and embarrassing situation in which the imminence of war placed the British cabinet, some of the most eminent members of which resigned rather than participate in any declaration of war, was suddenly removed by what was for Asquith and Grey the heaven-sent episode of the German invasion of Belgium. It is highly probable that the British cabinet would have tried to force the country into war irrespective of the invasion of Belgium, but the actual invasion saved them from a crisis by arousing British indignation, and it put the country rather solidly behind the government in support of active intervention in behalf of the Entente. It should be pointed out, however, that there was no particular ground for ultra-sensitiveness in the British conscience with respect to the German invasion of Belgium. On two earlier occasions, namely, in 1870 and 1887, the British government and British opinion had repudiated any idea of a treaty obligation of Great Britain to protect the existing neutrality of Belgium. England had also, in the decade before the war, made repeated, if futile, efforts to secure Belgian consent to the landing of British troops on Belgian soil in the event of war between the Triple Entente and the Triple Alliance. Further, Grey coldly rejected the German proposal to keep out of Belgium if

Invasion of Belgium not cause of English entry into war

England would remain neutral. It should also be emphasized that the conduct of Great Britain during the World War was scarcely in line with what would naturally have been expected of a country which entered the conflict primarily to sanctify the cause of neutral rights, International Law and international obligations. She coerced Greece into the war by methods comparable to those used by Germany in Belgium, and her procedure with respect to the International Law of blockade, contraband and continuous voyage was such as to constitute most flagrant violations of International Law in these fields. The British assaults upon neutral rights during the war are among the darkest of the blots upon the Entente conduct during this period.

Great Britain, Belgium and neutral rights

Italy, along with Belgium, may be freed of any responsibility whatsoever for the outbreak of the war. Italy, after the war had actually started, quite naturally and properly considered which group of combatants seemed likely to offer the most favorable opportunities and results from aid and intervention, and joined the Entente because she felt she had the most to gain thereby. Nevertheless, in the crisis of July, 1914, she was distinctly favorable to peace and, as Morhardt has shown, offered the most attractive and feasible plan of mediation and arbitration of the Serbian issue set forth by any great European power.

It has been charged frequently that, whatever the other facts in the circumstances connected with the outbreak of the World War in 1914, certainly Germany and Austria were the most stubborn and determined in rejecting arbitration and mediation. This is no more correct than the other phases of the earlier opinion of war responsibility. It is true that Austria rejected all schemes for arbitration which looked to any intervention of other powers in her treatment of Serbia, but it is equally true that the Russians were as determined and precipitate in regard to their mobilization in defense of Serbia. Sazonov categorically announced at the outset that Russia would tolerate no restraint in her policy towards Austria and Serbia. And if Germany declined to accept one of Sir Edward Grey's earlier plans for a conference on the Serbian controversy which was disapproved by her ally, Austria, an equally damaging indictment can be made of the Entente for its refusal to consider seriously the very attractive Italian plan for a satisfactory arbitration of the Balkan dispute. And France and Russia refused Grey's proposal to submit the Austro-Russian dispute to mediation. Germany actually accepted Grey's two latest proposals which he admitted were better than his original conference plan.

Italy and Belgium guiltless

It has been held to be a difficult thing to state with any mathematical precision the order of responsibility attaching to the various European powers for the outbreak of the World War, but it would seem that the evidence is so clear and the information so adequate that one can now scarcely err in this respect. It would appear that France and Russia must unquestionably be regarded as tied for

Order of war guilt

first place, with Austria, Germany and England following in the order named. Of course, if one desired to include the lesser powers as well, the first place in the immediate responsibility for the war would have to be assigned to Serbia, though her action in producing the assassination of the archduke would have had little European significance without the aggressive intervention of Russia encouraged by Poincaré.

Ultimate responsibility for the World War

But fully as important as the individual responsibility of nations was the basic responsibility of the European system of secret alliances, nationalism, militarism and imperialism. Far from being a guarantee of peace, the balance of power in Europe, as represented by the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, was, as Professor Schmitt *has so clearly shown, a guarantee of almost inevitable war as soon* as a crisis of sufficient proportions should bring these two great coalitions in sharp and active conflict.

Significant as the system of militarism and secret alliances may have been in making possible the World War, one must not, however, accept the fatalistic thesis of the inevitability of the conflict. The same "system" had existed for a generation before 1914, and it had not produced war in any of the earlier crises, however close war may have been at these other times. The system was so manipulated by specific individuals in 1914 as to bring on the great calamity of the four succeeding years, with its disastrous aftermath. It is a recognition of this fact which justifies the above analysis of the manipulation and direction of the European situation in the crisis of 1914. Any hope of permanent peace must involve an elimination both of international systems which invite duplicity, aggression and force, and of leaders so minded as to wish to exploit this favorable opportunity in the direction of the spirit and practices of war and militarism.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

J. Bakeless, *The Economic Causes of Modern War* (1921); H. N. Brailsford, *The War of Steel and Gold* (1914); E. A. Pratt, *The Rise of Rail Power in War and Conquest, 1833–1914* (1916); J. T. W. Newbold, *How Europe Armed for War* (1916); E. F. Henderson, *Germany's Fighting Machine* (1914); C. von der Goltz, *A Nation in Arms* (1915, translated by F. A. Ashworth); G. F. Nicolai, *The Biology of War* (1918, translated 1919); A. Toynbee, *Nationality and the War* (1915); G. Young, *Nationalism and War in the Near East* (1915); H. C. Woods, *The Cradle of the War: The Near East and Pan-Germanism* (1918); M. Jastrow, *The War and the Bagdad Railway* (1917); A. von Fischel, *Der Pan-slavismus bis zum Weltkrieg* (1919); C. Andler, *Pan-Germanism* (1915); M. Mayr, *Der italienische Irredentismus* (2d ed. 1917); G. Boirdon, *The German Enigma* (1913, English translation); P. Rohrbach, *Germany's Isolation* (1914, English translation); H. Andrillon, *L'Expansion de l'Allemagne* (1914); F. von Bernhardi, *Germany and the Next War* (1911, translated 1912, A. H. Powle); W. H. Dawson, *What Is Wrong with Germany* (1915); J. A. Cramb, *The Origins and Destiny of Imperial Britain and Nineteenth Century Europe* (1915 ed.); L. M. Leger, *Panslavisme* (1917); *Collected Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War* (1914); Lord Loreburn, *How the War Came* (1919); E. von Mach, *Official Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War* (1916); J. B. Scott, *Diplomatic Documents Relating to the Outbreak of the European War*, 2 vols. (1916); K. Kautsky, editor, *Die deutschen Documente zum Kriegsausbruch*, 4 vols.

(1919), English translation; R. Goos, *Diplomatische Aktenstucke zur Vorgeschicte des Krieges*, 1914, 3 vols. (1919) English translation; *Das Wiener Kabinet und die Entstehung des Weltkrieges* (1919); R. Marchand, *Un livre noir: diplomatie d'avant-guerre d'après les documents des archives russes, 1910–1914*, 2 vols. (1922–1923); B. de Siebert and G. A. Schreiner, *Entente Diplomacy and the World, 1909–1914* (1921); B. Rombero, *The Falsifications of the Russian Orange Book* (1923); E. C. Stowell, *The Diplomacy of the War of 1914* (1915); Y. Guyot, *Causes and Consequences of the War* (1916); J. H. Rose, *The Origins of the War* (1914); W. S. Davis, *The Roots of the War* (1918); J. W. Headlam, *The History of Twelve Days* (1915); *The German Chancellor and the Outbreak of the War* (1917); Lord Haldane, *Before the War* (1917); G. von Jagow, *Ursachen und Ausbruch des Weltkrieges* (1919); Profs. Meinecke, Oncken, and others, *Modern Germany in Relation to the Great War* (1916), translated by W. W. Whitlock; M. Montgelas, *Leit faden zur Kriegsschuldfrage* (1923), English translation, *The Case for the Central Powers;* M. Morhardt, *Les Preuves* (1924); J. S. Ewart, *The Roots and Causes of the Wars, 1914–1918*, 2 vols. (1925); C. Barbagallo, *Come si scatenò la guerrò monodiale* (1924); H. E. Barnes, *The Genesis of the World War* (1926); R. Poincaré, *The Origins of the War* (1921); H. H. Asquith, *Genesis of the War* (1923); W. Churchill, *The World Crisis*, 2 vols. (1921, 1922); A. Fabre-Luce, *The Limitations of Victory* (1926); P. Renouvin, *Les origins immédiates de la guerre* (1925); E. Durham, *The Sarajevo Crime* (1925); G. L. Dickinson, *The International Anarchy, 1904–14* (1926).

CHAPTER XXXV

HOW THE EUROPEAN WAR BECAME A WORLD WAR

1. German Violation of Belgian Neutrality

For years European states had formed military plans for the eventuality of just such a war. Germany's strategy consisted of (1) a swift display of her major force to crush France before unwieldy Russia could attack from the east; and (2) with France beaten the transfer of her strength to the eastern front to defeat Russia. German military leaders were confident that this plan would insure a speedy victory. The quickest and easiest way to reach Paris was through Belgium. There can be no doubt that, from the outset, the German general staff contemplated the violation of the neutrality of Luxemburg and Belgium. It would also seem that the French plans embodied a similar move. On August 2, before a formal declaration of war was made against France, German troops were moved towards the French frontier on the Belgian-Luxemburg line, and not against the strong French fortresses at Verdun, Toul, and Belfort.

German military plans and the invasion of Belgium

The little duchy of Luxemburg, neutralized in 1867 by the powers of Europe, was occupied on August 2 in the face of protests from the grand-duchess. The same day, the German government demanded of Belgium permission to move troops across that country into France. Promise was made to respect the territory and sovereignty of Belgium, and to pay an indemnity for all losses incurred. But in case of refusal or resistance, Belgium would be treated as an enemy and the "declaration of arms" would determine the future relations of the two countries. Since her neutrality had been solemnly guaranteed by the large states, including Prussia, little Belgium stood heroically on her incontestable rights. King Albert, in reply to the German ultimatum, refused to "sacrifice the honor of the nation and betray its duty towards Europe." He reminded Germany of her own pledge and said that the Belgians were resolved to repel every "attack upon their rights." France assured Belgium on August 1 that she would "respect the neutrality of Belgium," although the action of Germany might force her to modify this attitude. King Albert appealed to Great Britain "to safeguard the integrity of Belgium" and was assured on August 3 that in case of an attack by Germany "it means war with Germany."

To maintain one or two small states on the continent across the English Channel from London, had been for centuries a fundamental principle in British foreign policy, though in 1887 she had repudiated

responsibility for Belgian neutrality. Hence Great Britain made it clear, though too late to influence the invaders, that she would fight to preserve Belgian neutrality. On August 4 Germany committed the unpardonable diplomatic blunder of invading Belgian soil, a flagrant violation of International Law. In his famous speech to the German Reichstag, Chancellor von Bethmann-Hollweg defended the act in these words: "We are now acting in self-defense. Necessity knows no law. This is a breach of International Law, but we shall try to make good the injustice as soon as our military goal has been reached." The German emperor explained to President Wilson that Belgian neutrality "had to be violated by Germany on strategic grounds." To the British ambassador at Berlin, the chancellor in anger regretted that Great Britain was about to wage war on a kindred nation merely for "a scrap of paper," as he called the neu*trality treaty.*

The violation of the neutrality of Luxemburg and Belgium had serious consequences for Germany. In the first place, it arrayed the Belgians with their resources and indomitable courage, against her, and thus delayed her progress until the mighty fighting machine of France could be massed in the path of her conquering troops. In the second place, it aroused the moral indignation of the entire world, outside of her own allies, against Germany. In the third place, it brought the powerful British Empire with all its military and naval strength, and material resources, into the war against her. It seems quite probable that Great Britain would have entered the war on the side of France and Russia, even if Belgium had not been invaded, but the delay of her entrance would have been distinctly to the advantage of the Central Powers.

Consequence of the invasion of Belgium

2. Rapid Spread of the War Area

On August 4 Austria-Hungary was officially at war with Serbia; *and Germany, with Russia, France, and Great Britain. Quickly the* war area spread until it covered much of the six continents and the five oceans. On August 5, Austria-Hungary declared war on Russia. The next day Montenegro joined Serbia, and three days later Germany proclaimed war on both of them. On August 12, Great Britain issued a formal proclamation of war against Austria-Hungary. Thus within a fortnight the war had become a clear-cut alignment between two hostile groups, based on the balance of alliances, and each member was pledged not to make peace without the consent of its allies. The group led by Germany was called the Central Powers, or the Germanic Allies; the other was known as the Entente Allies. Through the colonial possessions of the belligerents, the war had already spread over the world. On August 23, Japan declared war on Germany, and became a party to the Entente Pact of London. Turkey, fearing Russia, espoused the cause of the Central Powers, and hence the Entente Allies declared war on her on November 3–5,

whereupon the sultan then proclaimed a "Holy War," or Jihad, against all "the enemies of Islam" and ordered the Mohammedans to exterminate them.

Meanwhile both groups of belligerents were using promises of reward and threats of punishment to win the support of Italy, Bulgaria, Rumania, and Greece. On April 8, 1915, Italy demanded from Austria-Hungary, as the price of her continued neutrality, the Austrian portions of *Italia irredenta*. Austria-Hungary made many concessions, and Germany offered "guarantees" that the Italian demands would be met when the war was won. The Entente Allies were more generous in offering what did not belong to them, and on April 26 concluded a secret treaty with Italy, promising practically everything that Italy had asked of Austria-Hungary, and, in addition, twelve Greek-speaking islands in the Ægean, Adalia in Asia Minor, more territory in Africa, and the exclusion of the Holy See from the war settlements. With such allurements, the rising tide of Italian patriotism against the ancient oppressor, Austria, led Italy to declare war on her on May 23, thus forcing the Central Powers to face another fighting front. On October 14 Bulgaria, abandoned by the Entente to Austro-German pressure, attacked Serbia, with the result that the Entente Allies declared war on her. Portugal, on March 9, 1916, through her alliance with Great Britain, was drawn into the conflict. Rumania, after much wavering, made common cause with the Entente Allies on August 27, when she declared war on Austria-Hungary. And Greece on June 29, 1917, under some pressure, joined the Entente Allies. Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Switzerland, and Spain remained neutral throughout the entire war.

3. The United States Enters the War Against the Central Powers

At the outbreak of the World War, public opinion in the United States was confused on the merits and issues involved. The war had the appearance of a strictly European conflict. The disputes between Austria-Hungary and Serbia, the Slavs and the Teutons, and over Alsace-Lorraine, colonies, and world trade, seemed to involve the New World only indirectly. Neutrals generally suspected Englishmen, Frenchmen, and Italians along with Germans, Austrians, Russians, and Japanese of imperialistic designs. They found it difficult, therefore, to interpret the struggle as one for liberty and democracy against autocracy and militarism so long as autocratic Russia and Japan were the powerful allies of Great Britain, France, and Italy. Many persons sincerely doubted whether an Entente victory would mean greater world peace and security than a triumph of the Central Powers. It was felt that each one of the Entente Allies had entered the war to serve its own national ambitions, and that beyond defeating Germany they had no common cause. If the sword

America and the War

wielded for world empire were struck from the hand of Germany, only to be placed in the hand of a powerful Russia, or an aggressive Japan, where would be the gain? American historical traditions and geographical location were also factors. For more than a century Washington's warning against "entangling alliances" with European states had been rather closely followed. The Monroe Doctrine had accentuated the aloofness of the New World from Old World affairs. With a vast, uncrowded territory, and a lavish supply of natural resources, the United States was economically independent — a condition that made her political isolation easier.

American sentiment was complicated further by the fact that the people were connected by ties of kinship with the various European countries. A large part of the 40,000,000 immigrants from 1776 to 1914 had arrived after 1900. When the war broke out 14,000,000 of the inhabitants of the United States were foreign-born — 31 per cent German, 19 per cent Irish, 8 per cent British, 7 per cent Russian, 7 per cent Italian, and 4 per cent Swede. Most of these persons of foreign birth still retained deep attachments for their motherlands, and hence it was natural that they should be divided in their sympathies. The Germans, Austrians, Magyars, and Bulgarians were vociferous in defense of the Central Powers. The German government, particularly, had taken pains before the war to cultivate a strong sentiment for the fatherland among German-Americans, who now revealed a "Pro-German" spirit and were aided with literature and agents from Germany. The Irish immigrants denounced Great Britain. The British and French sought to arouse "Pro-Ally" sympathy. In general, however, from the outset many Americans supported the cause of the Entente Allies, because, through the domination of Entente propaganda, they felt that Germany stood for military might against law and democracy; and that she represented international anarchy in her determination "to rule or ruin." It was also quite generally believed that Germany had provoked the war. Though England also "ruthlessly" violated American neutral rights through her blockade and contraband procedure, the Pro-British attitude of the ambassador of the United States at London, Walter Hines Page, brought to naught the efforts of the state department to protect the rights of Americans as neutrals.

German and English violations of neutral rights

At the outset President Wilson issued an appeal for neutrality to the American people, who are "drawn from many nations, and chiefly from the nations now at war. It is natural and inevitable that there should be the utmost variety of sympathy and desire among them with regard to the issues and circumstances of the conflict." He feared that they would become "involved in the war itself in impulse and opinion, if not in action." Hence he said that the United States "must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that try men's souls." But the course of events drew the United States irresistibly into the maelstrom. Americans soon became conscious

of the fact that a thousand forces had made the world one in interest and welfare. The conflict, which at first seemed European, quickly disturbed conditions everywhere, and it was found impossible to follow a policy of aloofness and fancied security. The storm of hostility against Germany and her allies gathered with each incident of the war. Thousands of young Americans found their way into the military service of France and Great Britain. The invasion of Belgium sent a wave of indignation across America, and active sympathy for the Belgians was expressed through the relief work under Herbert Hoover. Exaggerated stories of German atrocities in Belgium still further enraged the Americans. The charge of the German government that America was acting in an unneutral manner in supplying munitions of war to the Entente Allies, wounded the national pride. Vexing problems about trade, contraband, mails, and blockades forced President Wilson to protest repeatedly against unwarranted interference with American rights by both belligerents.

Official neutrality

The sinking of the great, unarmed British steamer, *Lusitania*, which carried some munitions of war in her cargo, by a German submarine, with a loss of 1,252 lives, of whom 114 were American citizens, some of them innocent women and children, sent a thrill of horror throughout the United States. This ruthless outrage, like the invasion of Belgium, made Germany appear as a lawless nation that would commit any act to gain victory. Pro-Ally sympathizers clamored for intervention; Pro-Germans defended the deed. After a "war of notes," Germany promised not to sink merchant vessels without warning. Then followed revelations of the activity of German agents in the United States and in Latin America, and more vessels were sunk with the loss of American lives. Finally, Dr. Dumba, the Austro-Hungarian ambassador, was recalled at the request of the American government, and certain members of the German embassy were sent home. Pro-Ally sympathizers made the most of these incidents to inflame Americans into a war spirit against Germany, and these efforts were supplemented by an effective propaganda by the Entente Allies, who cut off communication with the Central Powers and flooded the United States with their literature. Eminent Englishmen and Frenchmen imitated the Germans in making lecturing tours, and secret-service agents and journalists were employed to influence public opinion. After his reëlection on a peace platform in 1916, President Wilson interpreted his victory as a warrant to preserve neutrality and to strive for international amity. "When the present war is over," he said, "it will be the duty of America to join with other nations of the world in some kind of league for the maintenance of peace."

Sinking of Lusitania

The occasion for America's entrance into the war was the proclamation, on January 31, 1917, of Germany's order for unrestricted submarine warfare in retaliation against the British blockade of the German coast. Wide war zones were marked off around the British

Isles, and along the coasts of France and Italy. Notice was given that all vessels within these zones, but outside the safety lanes specified, would be sunk at sight. This violation of the "freedom of the seas," for which America had always stood, proved to be the last straw. All the emotions of fear, hatred, and resentment, which had been *mounting higher and higher, now demanded war.* Diplomatic relations were severed with Germany, and after more American ships were sunk, President Wilson called Congress and asked for a declaration of war on Germany. On April 4, 1917, it was voted in the Senate 82 to 6 and two days later in the House by 373 to 50. "The world must be made safe for democracy," said President Wilson. "We desire no conquest. . . . We are but the champions of the rights of mankind. . . . We shall fight . . . for democracy . . . for the rights and liberties of small nations, for such a concert of free peoples as shall bring peace and safety to all nations and make the world itself at last free." Seven months later war was also declared on Austria-Hungary.

Unrestricted submarine warfare

4. Relative Strength, Resources, and Ideals of the Belligerents

The area of the World War rapidly widened until it covered the greater part of the civilized and uncivilized peoples of the globe. Never in all history had there been such a colossal conflict. All the great powers on earth with their far-flung colonial empires, and fifteen of the smaller states, were directly involved. The remaining states were in one way or another indirectly affected. The Central Powers totaled in geographical area 2,225,000 square miles; in population, 158,000,000; and in annual revenues about $4,000,000,000. The Entente Powers with all their allies covered 37,267,000 square miles; numbered 1,392,000,000 people; and had a yearly income of $6,881,000,000. *Thus all races, all religions, and all degrees of civilization* were involved in the struggle. Germany and Austria-Hungary started the war with 1,306,000 troops ready for action, and Bulgaria and Turkey added 240,000 more. The reserved forces of the Central Powers numbered 10,600,000 while the unorganized, available strength was 17,600,000. The German colonial army had only 11,000 men. The standing armies of the Triple Entente totaled 2,312,000 soldiers, and their total war strength was 13,380,000, while the available unorganized troops numbered 39,000,000. To these figures Japan added a war strength of 1,500,000 men; Italy 3,380,000; Portugal 1,260,000; Rumania 580,000; Greece 450,000; and the United States an active army of 132,000 soldiers, a national guard of 144,000, and an unorganized militia of 20,000,000. France also *had a colonial army of 134,000; Great Britain 118,000;* Italy 22,000; and Portugal 8,000. The other allies of the Entente contributed nothing to the fighting forces. All the armies in the so-called "fif-

Population and resources

teen decisive battles of the world" would not equal in number the soldiers who fought in a single campaign of this World War.

This comparison of the actual and potential strength of the two sides seemed to give the Entente Allies a great advantage in both active troops and reserves. But this was largely offset by the fact that the Russian soldiers were poorly trained and equipped, and of inferior intelligence. Further the standing armies of Great Britain and the United States were small and it took many months to bring the enlisted and drafted men into good fighting form. On the contrary, Germany had developed war into an exact science, so that all the resources of the nation could be mobilized for immediate use. She had one of the best-prepared armies on earth, and took the greatest pains to insure an adequate supply of war munitions. The geography of Europe was shown on carefully prepared military maps. All that science and invention could discover was used to increase military efficiency. Railroads for use in war were built to the western and eastern fronts, with great trunk lines over which large armies could be shifted back and forth like a shuttle, thus doubling their striking power. Germany's strong strategic position divided the forces of her foes and thus gave her an advantage. Her effective spy system gathered exhaustive knowledge about other countries, and enabled her to reduce war to what seemed to be a mathematical certainty. All of the large European states had systems of secret service, but none of them were superior to the German in extent and shrewdness. Finally, the civilians and all material resources were carefully studied to see how they might contribute to winning the war.

Fighting strength

Germany's superiority on land was offset by the supremacy of the Entente Allies on the ocean. The British navy, effectively mobilized in the opening days of the war, swept the German merchantmen from the high seas, and penned up the German fighting fleet in home harbors. When the British naval strength was supplemented by that of France, Russia, Japan, Italy, and the United States, the Central Powers realized that victory was possible only on land. To overcome this handicap, the Germans developed the submarine, or U-boat, as a new type of ocean warship.

If the war was to be decided by military power alone within a comparatively brief period of fierce fighting, the advantage lay with the Central Powers. On the other hand, if it were to become a test of wealth, natural resources, reserved man power, endurance, and morale, covering a long period of time, then the odds were greatly in favor of a triumph of the Entente Allies. The combined wealth of the Central Powers did not exceed $110,000,000,000, and nearly two-thirds of that sum was in Germany alone. The wealth of the British Empire and of the United States each exceeded that of the Central Powers by many billions. The total wealth of those two states, plus that of France, Russia, Italy, Japan, Belgium, and Por-

tugal, was four times that of the Central Powers. In natural resources, such as minerals, coal, rubber, food, and clothing, the difference was even greater. Besides, Great Britain, France, and the United States, as great manufacturing states, had excellent shipping facilities, and easily turned their factories into plants for war supplies. Furthermore the sources of raw materials were open to them and closed in large measure to the Central Powers.

From the standpoint of civilization, the two warring groups had many resemblances and also many differences. The Germans were regarded as one of the most progressive nations on earth, ranking with the leading western powers, but Austria-Hungary was not so advanced, Bulgaria still less, and the Turks were looked upon as a stagnant, backward people. The German emperor declared: "The German people will be the granite block on which the good God will build and complete his civilization of the world." The Central Powers all had constitutions, and parliaments with popularly elected lower houses, but they were in spirit and practice autocratic. The Entente Allies were composed of four of the most democratic states on earth — Great Britain, France, the United States, and Italy; of two autocratic powers — Russia and Japan; and of a number of lesser powers all with popular governments. With the withdrawal of Russia from the war in 1917, the leadership of the Entente cause passed into the hands of the democratic states. Whatever the war may have been in the beginning, it ended in the opinion of the people of the Entente side as a contest between autocracy and democracy. The major powers of the two sides were Christians — some Protestants, others Catholic. With both camps were Jews and Mohammedans; and with the Entente Allies fought adherents of all the faiths of Asia. As a whole, perhaps, the moral standards of the Entente Allies were higher than those of the Central Powers. No such stain as the Armenian massacres sullied the hands of the former. Both groups violated International Law. When the Entente pointed the accusing finger to Luxemburg and Belgium, the Central Powers called attention to Shantung and Greece.

Culture and civilization

In the realm of education, art, industrial and social progress, and domestic life, Germany bore an enviable reputation. Her scientists, artists, musicians, writers, professors, and inventors had won high fame. Among the Entente Allies, Russia, most of the Latin-American republics, China, and many of the colonies, lagged far behind in the race for intellectual and economic development, but the leading powers were among the most alert and advanced nations on earth. The conflict was one between two sets of ideas and two standards of culture — Teutonic, on the one hand; and Anglo-American and Latin, on the other.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

L. Renault, *First Violations of International Law by Germany, Luxembourg and Belgium* (1917); C. de Visscher, *Belgium's Case: A Juridicial Enquiry* (1916); C. Sarolea, *How Belgium Saved Europe* (1915); L. van der Essen, *The Invasion and the War in Belgium* (1917); K. A. Fuhr, *The Neutrality of Belgium* (1915); C. P. Sanger and H. J. F. Norton, *England's Guarantee to Belgium and Luxembourg* (1915); E. P. Barker and others, *Why We Are at War: Great Britain's Case* (1914); H. A. L. Fisher, *The War, Its Causes and Its Issues* (1914); R. Muir, *Britain's Case against Germany* (1914); E. J. Dillon, *A Scrap of Paper* (1914); *From the Triple to the Quadruple Alliance* (1915); F. C. Cocks, *The Secret Treaties* (1918); W. K. Wallace, *Greater Italy* (1917); R. W. Seton-Watson, *Austria, Italy, and the Adriatic* (1915); *Roumania and the Great War* (1915); Balkanicus, *The Aspirations of Bulgaria* (1915), P. Hibben, *Constantine I and the Greek People* (1917); J. B. Scott, *Diplomatic Correspondence between the United States and Germany, 1914–1917* (1919); *President Wilson's Foreign Policy* (1918), L. Rogers, *America's Case against Germany* (1917); J. von Bernstorff, *My Three Years in America* (1920); A. von Tirpitz, *My Memoirs*, 2 vols. (1919), J. B. McMaster, *The United States in the World War*, 2 vols. (1918); J. S. Bassett, *Our War with Germany* (1919); J. K. Turner, *Shall It Be Again?* (1922); B. K. Hendrick, *The Life and Letters of Walter Hines Page*, 2 vols. (1920).

CHAPTER XXXVI

THE LEADING MILITARY EVENTS OF THE WORLD WAR, 1914-1918

1. The First Year

During the first few days of August, 1914, two millions of men were mobilized by land and sea with clock-like precision to strike the first blow in the World War. Nineteen German corps grouped in seven mighty armies overran Luxemburg, invaded Belgium, and captured one city after another from Liege to Brussels. After making their last important stand at Louvain, the Belgians were joined by the British and French, who, however, were defeated and driven back until within a month the conquering Germans crossed the Marne river and were threatening Paris only fifteen miles away. In terror the French withdrew their capital to Bordeaux. In this crisis General Joffre said: "The hour has come to hold at all cost, and to die rather than give way." In the first Battle of the Marne on September 6–10 the German line, which had advanced too rapidly to be able to consolidate its gains, was shattered and forced to retreat to trenches along the Aisne river. Paris was not taken. One of the decisive battles of the World War was won by the Entente Allies.

First Battle of the Marne

The Germans next made a drive for the Channel ports. Antwerp was taken, but at Ypres the Allies, with the aid of warships at sea and the flooding of the country, held the Germans in check. The gigantic movements in the west now came to a standstill, and both sides settled down in fortified lines that ran from the North Sea to Switzerland. Germany was in possession of nearly all of Belgium and northeastern France including the chief supply of coal and iron. Little Belgium was the chief victim of the frightful struggle. Her cities were put under tribute and ruined; her farms and villages were devastated; her factories were dismantled; her chief citizens were taken prisoners and some of them executed; the ancient library of the University of Louvain was burned; and the country was treated as a conquered province. The old cathedral of Rheims in France was bombarded and almost destroyed.

Meanwhile Russia, mobilizing more rapidly than was expected, sent one army into East Prussia and another into Galicia. General von Hindenburg in the Battle of Tannenberg dealt the Russians a severe blow and forced them out of Germany. In Galicia, however, the Russians were masters of the whole region until General von Hindenburg's capture of Warsaw and counter-offensive against Petrograd weakened the Russian line in Galicia and enabled the

Battle of Tannenberg

Austro-Hungarians, with the help of General von Mackensen, to drive the Russians out of their country. The eastern battle front was now formed on a line running from Riga in the north to Czernowitz on the Rumanian border.

While these things were transpiring, the Entente Allies undertook the daring and dangerous project of seizing Constantinople, which, it was thought, would induce the neutral Balkan states to enter the war on their side and thus permit another attack on Austria-Hungary from the south and also open a path for sending ammunition into Russia. Early in February, 1915, a combined fleet of British and French men of war forced the entrance to the Dardanelles. In the "narrows" a fierce engagement ensued between Turkish forces on land and the battleships. After the destruction of several of the best warships, the fleet was forced to give up the attack. An unsuccessful attempt was made to take Gallipoli by land. By December, 1915, the effort to capture Constantinople had proved to be so costly that the forces were withdrawn. The disappointment over this campaign was offset, however, by the entrance of Italy into the war, thus establishing a southern fighting front and forcing Austria-Hungary to divide her forces to defend it.

Gallipoli disaster

2. The Second Year of the War

At the beginning of the second year of the World War, the advantage, as a whole, seemed to lie with the Germanic Allies. They held both the western and eastern fronts far outside of their own borders. The Entente Allies could point to the Marne victory and to the acquisition of the aid of Italy. The western front during the year was characterized by trench warfare along the front of 600 miles — a distance equal to a line from New York to Chicago. No noteworthy gains were made on either side. The German effort to crush the French line at Verdun, which lasted six months and cost the lives of half a million men, was defeated by the stubborn resistance of the French, buoyed up by the cry, "They shall not pass," and an Allied attack on the Somme. In the east, Russia under General Brusilov made a second drive towards Galicia. The Teutonic line was bent back, but not broken, and hence little was accomplished.

German advantages in 1915

The Balkan situation was changed in October, 1915, when Bulgaria joined the Central Powers. The Serbians and Montenegrins, who had driven the Austro-Hungarians out of their countries and even invaded the Dual Monarchy, were now attacked by General von Mackensen on the north and by Bulgarians on the east. Hence by the close of 1915 Serbia was wholly eliminated as a fighting unit and Montenegro and Albania were overrun. An open passage was made by the Central Powers to the Ottoman Empire. Still hoping to save something from the Balkan disasters, an Anglo-French force landed at Salonika in the face of strong opposition from Greece because of the violation of her territory. The Entente Allies justi-

fied their action on the ground of an invitation from the party led by Venizelos, previously prime minister, who was hostile to the neutral attitude taken by King Constantine. An effort to move northward to relieve the Serbians failed. War was also declared on little Portugal by Germany for having seized her interned ships, and Portugal sent a small army to the western front. The year ended with few important changes on either side.

3. The Third Year of the War

Battle of the Somme

After the Battle of the Somme, the Germans on the western front, in March, 1917, withdrew to the Hindenburg line over a stretch one hundred miles long, completely devastating the 1,000 square miles they evacuated. Encouraged by this retirement, the Entente Allies attempted two great offensives — one on the British section to retake Lens and St. Quentin; the other on the French section at Laon. Both movements failed to reach their objectives and the entrenched deadlock went on.

Conquest of Rumania

In the Balkans the situation was changed by the decision of Rumania in August, 1916, to join the Entente Allies. After penetrating Transylvania in Hungary, her army was driven back by General von Mackensen, who took Bucharest, and in three weeks conquered the entire country. With the Rumanian disaster before his eyes, the king of Greece persisted in preserving the neutrality of his realm until deposed by the Entente Allies and replaced by his second son, Alexander, with Venizelos restored as prime minister. Then in June, 1917, under the armed threats of Great Britain, Greece cast in her lot with the Allies.

Russia abandons the War

Resistance to the Central Powers on the eastern front was broken in March, 1917, by the Russian Revolution. Kerensky, as head of the government, inspired a new drive into Galicia in July, but after some minor successes it collapsed completely. On November 7 Kerensky was succeeded by the Bolsheviki under the leadership of Lenine and Trotsky, who demobilized the armies, and signed the peace treaty of Brest-Litovsk in February, 1918. Russia dropped out of the war, and the Germans were free to devote all their energies to the western and southern foes.

The loss of Russia was offset by the entry of the United States in April, 1917. Germany calculated that with unrestricted submarine warfare and the concentration of all her force on the western front, she could win the war before American participation could count for much. America's first contribution was in the form of badly needed supplies and money. After mobilizing the navy and the small army, President Wilson was authorized to increase the regular army by enlistments, and to raise 10,000,000 men by selective draft. In July 625,000 men were drawn, the National Guard was summoned for service, and by September the new army was sent into training. By October Congress had appropriated nearly $18,000,-

000,000, taken over the railroads, and set thousands of factories to work producing war supplies. General Pershing hurried to Paris in June with a few troops, and on October 27 the first American shots were fired in France. In December 250,000 American troops landed in France, and a month later they were occupying a "certain sector" of the front-line trenches. For months the navy had been coöperating with the Entente fleets.

4. The Fourth Year of the War

The example of the United States was followed by some of the Latin-American republics, China, Liberia, and Siam. But in the fall of 1917, the Entente cause received a serious shock in the Italian disaster. The Russian peace enabled the Central Powers to plan an overwhelming blow against Italy. In a spectacular attack, the Italians were driven back to the Piave river. Entente troops were hurried over the Alps, General Cadorna replaced General Diaz, and the route was checked. This setback resulted in the creation of an Allied general staff and various other boards "to supervise the general conduct of the war." To counteract the Italian defeat, the British General, Byng, made an unexpected drive at the German line on the western front in the direction of Cambrai. With the aid of "tanks," the German line was broken from Arras to St. Quentin, but before the gains could be adequately defended, a German counter-attack regained over half the territory lost. But this attack by the Allies heralded the break-through and open warfare of the coming spring.

Italian reverses

The introduction of tank warfare

Meanwhile the British successes in the Near East served further to equalize the Italian disaster. The Arabs of Hedjaz were encouraged to declare their independence of Turkey and to set up the sherif of Mecca as sultan. A British force under General Allenby, starting from Cairo, invaded Palestine and by December, 1917, forced the surrender of Jerusalem. The small British force which had been slowly working its way up the Mesopotamian valley succeeded in March, 1917, under General Maude in taking Bagdad, the key to that region.

In the spring of 1918 Generals Ludendorff and von Hindenburg planned a colossal offensive drive on three fronts. The Bulgarians were to strike the Entente forces in Macedonia. The Austro-Hungarians were to attack Italy. And all the other available troops were to crush the French and British on the western front and thus win a decision before the Americans could send their full man power across seas. Unlimited submarine warfare was to help win the victory, which was predicted before autumn. Seven mighty armies were massed to strike the fatal blow at the joint of the British and French forces in the Somme valley. Emperor William II went to the general headquarters at Spa to announce the triumph to the nation. The first onslaught in March divided the British from the French. The

The final German effort

next month a terrific blow was aimed at the British, while the world held its breath, and Field Marshal Haig told his soldiers that they were fighting with their "backs to the wall" and that "every position must be held to the last man," because the "freedom of mankind depends alike upon the conduct of each one of us." The shortened British lines, aided by French reserves, held. Germany won 800 square miles at a cost of half a million men. In May a third offensive was begun against the French which by June reached Chateau-Thierry, only 43 miles from Paris. There it slowed down. The promised victory had not come. At Chateau-Thierry and Belleau Wood American troops took a conspicuous part.

American forces in battle — Chateau-Thierry

For a month the mighty armed camps faced each other. Then in July the Germans made a last desperate push in the second Battle of the Marne. It failed, and the French and Americans took the offensive. The German reserves were exhausted; their munitions were now of inferior quality; their air service had passed its zenith; their generals were discredited; and discontent arose at home. The United States by November 11, 1918 had 2,500,000 men in the field. The German armies continued to retreat, fighting as they went, until by September they were back on the Hindenberg line. All through October the Teutonic front from Belgium to Sedan was broken and pressed back. The Americans took St. Mihiel, the Argonne Forest, and Sedan. Finally on November 11, 1918, at five o'clock in the morning, the terms of the armistice were signed.

Second Battle of the Marne — Argonne

5. The War in Asia and Africa

The possessions of the European belligerents in Asia would have carried the war into that continent had not the Asiatic countries like Japan, China, Siam, and Turkey become active participants. As it was, practically the whole of Asia was involved. Japan, after declaring war on Germany, blockaded the harbor of Kiau-chau, and with the aid of British Indian troops captured Tsing-tau and seized the whole Shantung peninsula. The German islands in the Pacific Ocean north of the equator, were also taken by Japan, while the Australians and New Zealanders took those in the southern Pacific. During the conflict China sent 150,000 "coolies" to France as war laborers. Men from Siberia, India, and other parts of Asia fought on European soil. In western Asia, the British and French conquered valuable portions of the Turkish Empire, and the Russians in 1916 invaded Turkish Armenia.

In Africa, during the first years of the war, Anglo-French forces took Togoland from Germany, and troops from South Africa invaded German Southwest Africa. The next year General Botha completed the conquest of the latter colony, and the Cameroons came under Anglo-French control. Parts of Southeast Africa were conquered by General Smuts in 1916, but it was not until the close of the war that the British gained possession of the entire region. Egypt was made

a British protectorate. African troops, white and black, shed their blood on the European battlefields.

6. The War on the Seas

From the outset of the war, it was understood among the Entente Powers that France and Russia would check Germany and Austria-Hungary on land, while Great Britain would defeat them on the sea. The mobilization of the British navy was quite as spectacular and effective as the mobilization of the German army. Control of the sea was absolutely vital to the life of Great Britain; to Germany it was a matter of secondary importance. British warships almost immediately blockaded the German coast, tied up the German battleships in their harbors, kept the paths of the seas open for supplies and the movement of troops, and stood between Germany and her dream of world power. The German Far Eastern squadron of eight cruisers escaped from Kiao-chau. Five of them defeated a British squadron off Chile in 1914, but four of them were sunk and the fifth wrecked. The other three cruisers turned commerce raiders and inflicted much damage on Entente shipping before they were destroyed. Within a week after the outbreak of the war, German commerce was driven from the oceans into home and neutral ports.

Blockade of Germany

Germany's reaction to this early defeat on the water and the blockade of her ports was the declaration of a counter-blockade of the British and French coasts. Her only means of enforcing this blockade was the submarine, or U-boat. This new type of war vessel was improved until it had a radius of action of 5,000 miles. All the powers had submarines, but their use was advantageous only to the Central Powers, who hoped to have the benevolent neutrality of the United States in attacking the navy of Great Britain. During the early stages of the war, America was in serious disagreement with the British over contraband, the blockade, and the mails, and sent many strong notes of protest to the British government. When Germany placed all food supplies under governmental control, the British extended contraband to include all food stuffs. Germany retaliated by declaring a "war zone" around the British Isles, threatened to destroy every enemy merchantman found in the "zone," and warned neutrals of the danger of entering it. This novel naval vessel, which was used to patrol the "zone," had not yet been given a legal status under International Law, which required that merchantmen must first be warned before being searched for contraband. If they resisted, they might be sunk; otherwise they must be taken to port, or if for good reasons sunk, the safety of the passengers and crew must be assured. The undersea boat could not meet these requirements, because it was unsafe to give warnings, and there was no space to care for the passengers and crew of vessels destroyed. The submarine had to act quickly and secretly. The American government informed the German government that it would be held to

Submarine warfare

"strict accountability" for its illegal acts on the sea. The British government replied to the German blockade by refusing to permit any vessels to sail to German ports and by confiscating all goods destined for the Central Powers.

The sinking of the *Lusitania* in 1915 by a submarine made it clear that Germany could not count on the United States to help her to break the British blockade, but the German U-boat campaign came dangerously near to success. Disputes over the use of the U-boats grew more aggravating until the order for their unrestricted use after February 1, 1917, helped to draw the United States into the war. Up to January, 1918, the total losses of the Entente and neutral shipping was 11,800,000 gross tons with an estimated value of $8,000,000,000. New methods of meeting the submarine led to a perceptable decline in the sinkings. Furthermore, to offset the losses, up to that date some 6,600,000 tons of new vessels were built. After that date the new vessels exceeded those destroyed. Thus the German submarine was not only a great blunder; it was a failure. Of the 441 submarines, which Germany had built by November, 1918, 343 had been either captured or destroyed.

Besides the activity of the submarines, the only other operations of the Central Powers on the sea were the sowing of mines, the destructive work of an occasional raider, and the bombardment of English coast towns. Only once did the German high-seas fleet venture out for battle. The resulting Battle of Jutland in the North Sea was the only gigantic naval engagement of the entire war. Both sides lost heavily, and both sides laid claim to the victory. Great Britain's position as mistress of the sea, however, was not shaken. *Mines—Battle of Jutland*

7. The War in the Air

The World War differed from all previous conflicts in the unprecedented number of airships used. Only six years previous to its outbreak had power-driven flight through the air developed into a reality, but by 1914 it had become one of the most spectacular international sports. During the first year the one-man airplane was employed as the eyes of the armies. When in the second year a 1,000 pound weight was dropped from an airship, effective bombing from the skies became common. Specialized two-seaters of incredible speed operated by day and night, as spies, scouts, guides for artillery, "bombers," and photographers. By 1916 flying became organized into regular squads and large formations, and air battles became famous. The feats of daring attracted the attention of the whole world and produced a new class of heroes. The British used large flying-boats to attack the submarines. When the war ended, this weapon of warfare had developed into one of the decisive factors. Thousands were in use along the fighting fronts on land and over wide areas of the sea. The art of flying had been advanced through "looping," "turns," "rolling," and "spinning." Inventions and

scientific discoveries enabled this machine to perform feats that taxed the imagination. The Zeppelin type of airship was used by the leading belligerents for bombing and patrol duty. War in the air was the only branch of military service that seemed to perpetuate the earlier type of chivalry in warfare.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

C. J. H. Hayes, *A Brief History of the Great War* (1920); A. F. Pollard, *A Short History of the War* (1917); J. Buchan, *A History of the Great War*, 4 vols. (1922); *The Battle of the Somme* (1917); F. H. Simonds, *The Great War*, 5 vols. (1914–1920); *History of the Great War Based on Official Documents* (1920–1924); *Guerre de 1914: Documents officiels, textes legislatifs et reglementaires* (1914); C. H. Babr, *Der Volkerkrieg* (1915); H. F. Helmholt, *Der Weltkrieg* (1915); H. Stegemann, *Geschichte des Krieges*, Vols. I–III (1917–1919); The *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, new Vols. XXX–XXXII (1922); American Association for International Conciliation, *Bulletins* (1914–26); P. Azan, *The Warfare of Today* (1918); D. W. Johnson, *Topography and Strategy in the War* (1917); E. von Falkenhayn, *General Headquarters and its Critical Decisions* (1919); E. Ludendorff, *My War Memories*, 2 vols. (1919); Lord French, *1914* (1919); J. H. Boraston, editor, *Sir Douglas Haig's Dispatches* (1919); L. Madelin, *La victoire de la Marne* (1916); Baumgarten-Crusius, *Die Marneschlacht* (1919); E. Roussiet, *La bataille de l'Aisne* (1919); F. Maurice, *The Last Four Months, How the War Was Won* (1919); J. C. Wise, *The Turn of the Tide* (1919); S. Lauzanne, *Fighting France* (1918); E. Lavisse, editor, *Histoire Contemporaine*, Vol. IX, *La Grande Guerre* (1922); J. Reed, *The War in Eastern Europe* (1916); S. Washburn, *The Russian Campaign* (1915); B. Gourko, *War and Revolution in Russia, 1914–1917* (1918); E. H. Powell, *Italy at War* (1917); S. Low, *Italy in the War* (1917); J. Masefield, *Gallipoli* (1916); H. W. Nevinson, *The Dardanelles Campaign* (1918); A. T. Clark, *To Bagdad with the British* (1917); Admiral Jellicoe, *The Grand Fleet, 1914–1916* (1919); J. S. Corbett, *Naval Operations*, 3 vols. (1920–1923); C. Domville, *Submarines and Sea-Power* (1919); L. Persius, *Der Seekrieg* (1919); A. von Tirpitz, *My Memoirs*, 2 vols. (1919); W. S. Sims, *The Victory at Sea* (1920); *The American Navy in the War* (1920); W. J. Abbott, *Aircraft and Submarines* (1918); C. C. Turner, *The Struggle in the Air, 1914–1918* (1919); C. R. Gibson, *War Inventions and How They Were Invented* (1917); J. F. C. Fuller, *Tanks in the Great War* (1920); J. B. McMaster, *The United States in the World War*, 2 vols. (1918–1919); J. S. Bassett, *Our War with Germany* (1919); C. Seymour, *Woodrow Wilson and the World War* (1921); F. Palmer, *America in France* (1918); de Chambrun and de Marenches, *L'armée américaine dans le conflit européen*, 2 vols. (1919); H. P. Davison, *The American Red Cross in the Great War* (1919); P. Gibbs, *Now It Can Be Told* (1920); J. W. Gerard, *My Four Years in Germany* (1918); H. Morgenthau, *Ambassador Morgenthau's Story* (1919); B. Whitlock, *Belgium: a Personal Narrative*, 2 vols. (1919); A. Toynbee, *The German Terror in Belgium* (1917); H. L. Gray, *War Time Control of Industry* (1918); G. B. Clarkson, *Industrial America in the World War* (1923); C. E. Fayle, *Sea-Borne Trade*, 3 vols. (1923); F. Walling, *The Socialists and the War* (1915); P. W. Kellogg and A. H. Gleason, *British Labor and the War* (1919).

CHAPTER XXXVII

MAKING PEACE

1. First Peace Drive of the Central Powers

Next in importance to the responsibility for starting the war is the responsibility for prolonging it unnecessarily. After the war had lasted a year and a half when they had given up any hope of an easy or certain victory, the Central Powers believed the psychological *moment had come to make a drive for peace. Hence they asked* the neutral powers and the pope to consult the Entente Allies about "an appropriate basis for the establishment of a lasting peace." Replying to the proposal, the tsar of Russia said that the time was not ripe for peace since Russia's war aims — Constantinople and a free Poland — had not been realized. Italy, France, Great Britain, and nine Allied states, declared that "no peace is possible so long as the Allies have not secured reparation for violated rights and liberties; recognition of the principle of nationality; and the free existence of small states."

Speaking for the neutrals, President Wilson next asked both belligerents to state their war aims in plain terms, hoping: "It may be that peace is nearer than we know." He proposed a "peace without victory," which would recognize: (1) a free Poland; (2) security for all people; (3) free access to the seas for all states; (4) the limitation of armaments; and (5) the adoption of the Monroe Doctrine for the whole world. But the declaration of war on Germany four months later put a stop to all peace talk in the United States except among the pacifists and Pro-Germans. In the Entente countries, however, President Wilson's suggestion for a "negotiated peace" was urged by (1) liberals, who feared Germany might gain possession of Russian man power and thus prolong the war indefinitely; (2) capitalists, who dreaded a wave of post-war revolutions; (3) pacifists, who denounced the war as immoral and futile; (4) Christians, who disliked to see the followers of Christ killing one another; and (5) old-time diplomats, who believed that more could be accomplished through intrigue than by fighting. The several German chancellors encouraged these pacific efforts in other countries because there was a genuine desire for peace in the Central Empires. Lloyd George, Poincaré, Clemenceau, and others, bent on crushing Germany, would hear nothing of peace.

Wilson's peace plans

2. Peace Proposals of Pope Benedict XV

The head of the Roman Catholic Church, Pope Benedict XV, who was installed into office a few weeks after the war began, suggested

on August 1, 1917, to both sides the following peace terms: (1) the substitution of moral for military force in international affairs; (2) a mutual disarmament; (3) freedom of the seas; (4) arbitration; (5) "self-determination" for territorial disputes; (6) no indemnities; and (7) the restoration of all occupied regions. President Wilson answered the pope's proposals for the Entente Allies by drawing a sharp line between the autocratic German government and the German people; and by declaring that negotiations for peace with *the former were out of the question. Hence he called upon the* German people to repudiate their rulers.

The "Fourteen Points"

Six months later President Wilson presented to Congress "The program of the world's peace" in his famous "Fourteen Points": (1) the abolition of secret diplomacy and treaties; (2) removal of economic barriers; (3) freedom of the seas; (4) reduction of armaments; (5) adjustment of colonial claims in the interest of the people concerned; (6) aid to Russia to rehabilitate her national life; (7) restoration of Belgium; (8) evacuation of France and the return of Alsace-Lorraine; (9) readjustment of Italy's frontiers; (10) autonomy for subject nationalities in Austria-Hungary; (11) restoration of the Balkan states; (12) self-government for non-Turkish nationalities and the freedom of the Dardanelles for all ships; (13) an independent Poland; and (14) a League of Nations. These items, elaborated by President Wilson in subsequent addresses, formed the program of the Entente war aims during the latter part of the struggle and by the terms of the armistice were to serve as the basis for peace. In stating the British war aims Lloyd George accepted (7), (11), (12), *and (14) of the "Fourteen Points" and added the "reconsideration"* of the Alsace-Lorraine question and the disposal of the German colonies in accordance with the desire of the natives.

The Central Powers, in answer to the pope's peace plea, announced that they were in favor of the substitution of moral for physical force, the reduction of armaments, and the freedom of the seas. In reply to President Wilson's "Fourteen Points" and the British war aims, they accepted most of them, but made it clear that Germany was to retain most of Alsace-Lorraine, and that the frontiers of Russia, Italy, and the Balkan states were to be settled by local agreement. The Belgian problem and northern France were to be left to the *peace conference.*

3. Russia's Peace Efforts

After the Russian Revolution in March, 1917, the All-Russian Congress of Soviets in Moscow conditioned their support of the war upon the formula of "no annexations and no indemnities." The provisional government asked the Entente Allies to assent to this provision, but the request was refused. Prime Minister Kerensky met with no better success in begging the Entente Allies to restate their war aims in order to hold Russia in the war. The radicals

then began to say that there was no difference between the purposes of the two warring groups. When the Bolshevists seized the government, they telegraphed all the belligerents proposing a three months' armistice to discuss peace terms. Receiving no answer, the famous "secret treaties" showing the imperialistic aims of the Entente Allies were made public. Then Russia formed an armistice with the Central Powers and proposed fifteen articles of peace: (1) self-government for Poland, Lithuania, and the Letts; (2) autonomy for Armenia; (3) a plebiscite for Alsace-Lorraine; (4) restoration of Belgium by an international indemnity; (5) access to the sea for Serbia and autonomy for Bosnia-Herzegovina; (6) plebiscites for contested Balkan and (7) Italian territories; (8) restoration of Rumania, and (9) Persia and Greece; (10) return of the German colonies; (11) neutralization of all waterways; (12) no indemnities; (13) prohibition of economic boycotts; (14) a peace congress chosen by the legislatures of the states, and abolition of all secret treaties; and (15) general disarmament and the substitution of militia for standing armies. The Entente Allies refused to have anything to do with these peace proposals; and the Central Powers also ignored them in forcing upon Russia humiliating terms of peace.

4. Peace Terms in the Armistice

It became apparent by the spring of 1918, that nothing short of a military decision would bring peace. The Central Powers cast all their stakes on one final effort in the west, and lost. Since Germany was no longer able to give adequate defense to her weaker allies, they fell one by one. Bulgaria, with her lines broken and Sofia threatened, on September 30, 1918, surrendered unconditionally, and her tsar, Ferdinand, abdicated. Turkey, isolated from her partners, collapsed and agreed to an armistice the next month. The Austro-Hungarians, after a feeble attack on Italy, were swept back in one of the greatest disasters of the war and on November 4 surrendered. President Wilson's diplomacy and Marshal Foch's military leadership forced Germany to bow to the inevitable. Chancellor Prince Maximilian appealed directly to President Wilson for a cessation of hostilities. Mutinies in the German navy and among the soldiers at the front, caused General Ludendorff to resign. Revolution was growing behind the lines among the German people. On November 5, President Wilson notified Germany that Marshal Foch was empowered to conclude an armistice in accord with the "Fourteen Points," excepting (1) freedom of the seas, to which Great Britain objected, and (2) compensation to the Entente for civilian losses. The hard terms of the armistice were signed on November 11: (1) the evacuation of Belgium, France, and Luxemburg within two weeks; (2) the evacuation of all territory west of the Rhine within one month; (3) Entente occupation of the west bank of the Rhine and the chief crossings; (4) renunciation of the German treaties with Russia and

Rumania; (5) the surrender of German submarines and warships, together with 5,000 locomotives, 5,000 motor lorries, and 150 railway cars; and (6) continuance of the economic blockade. The armistice was renewed from time to time until the Treaty of Versailles was signed several months later. Within a few weeks Alsace-Lorraine was giving a frenzied welcome to a French army, and by December the Entente troops were in possession of the Rhine valley.

5. The Paris Peace Conference

Entente aspirations

Having by revolution ranged herself among the democratic republics, Germany hoped that the terms of peace, which were to be in accord with the "Fourteen Points," would be reasonably moderate. But the victory of the Entente Allies was so complete that they were tempted to think more of their selfish national ambitions than of an ideal justice and the future welfare of the world. The peoples of the earth were led to believe that after the autocratic powers were defeated, the peace conference would lay the foundations for a new world order of democracy, peace, and security. But the statesmen of the Entente states, while professing adherence to these roseate dreams, had to face hard, practical facts: (1) The hatred aroused against Germany demanded a crushing punishment and the substitution of vengeance for justice. (2) Most of the Entente Allies had specific wrongs to be righted, or ambitious "vital interests" to be realized. France was determined to recover Alsace-Lorraine and to secure guarantees against future German attacks. Great Britain desired to protect her Empire by destroying German rivalry on the high seas. Italy thought of *Italia irredenta* and the control of the Adriatic. Japan had her eyes on the Shantung peninsula. Serbia dreamed of an outlet to the sea. (3) Submerged nationalities like Poland, Finland, Ireland, Egypt, and the Slavs in Austria-Hungary wanted political independence. (4) The Entente Alliance had been built up in part by secret treaties, which guaranteed to individual members certain territories and other concessions. For instance, Russia was promised Constantinople and all of Poland; France was to extend her territory to the Rhine; Great Britain was to have the bulk of the German colonies; and Italy was promised adequate "compensations." Naturally the fulfillment of these engagements was now demanded.

The secret treaties

Central powers excluded

The United States was the only great power among the Allies that did not have any selfish ambitions to gratify. She had not been a party to the secret commitments — in fact, it seems that she was kept in ignorance of their real significance until the war was won. The first of the "Fourteen Points," which Germany had accepted as the basis for peace, insisted upon "open covenants." But a wide chasm soon appeared between the altruistic expectations of an intelligent public opinion in the world, and the concrete, secret obligations made by the Entente governments under the stress of

war. To make matters worse, national divergences began to appear among the victors. To insure harmony, it was decided to exclude the Central Powers from the Peace Conference altogether until final terms were drawn up. Out of deference to the heroic part played by France in defeating the foe, Paris was selected for the Conference. President Wilson sailed for Europe in December, 1918, and in a hasty tour through Great Britain, France, and Italy explained the "Fourteen Points," predicting a new era to the enthusiastic and hopeful multitudes.

The nature of the Paris Conference

The Paris Peace Conference on January 18, 1919, held its first session. The leading statesmen, generals and diplomats of the Entente states were present — about 70 all told — of whom the most important were Clemenceau and Marshal Foch of France; Lloyd George and Balfour of Great Britain; Wilson and Lansing of the United States; Orlando and Sonnino of Italy; and Saionji of Japan. A host of experts, secretaries, reporters, moving picture men, and representatives of all kinds of "causes" overcrowded Paris. The press reported the proceedings to an expectant world. The Inter-Allied Supreme War Council and the Informal Conference of the five great Entente Powers — Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States — created the following machinery to draw up the treaty of peace:

Organization

1. The Supreme Council consisting of two representatives from the five great "Powers with special interests," formulated all proposals, heard all claims, and made all rules of procedure. It was known as the "Big Five" and the "Council of Ten," and was patterned after the Congress of Vienna held in 1815. It was soon reduced to President Wilson and the four premiers. Then Japan was dropped, and the "Big Four" determined all questions. In the end Italy withdrew and the "Big Three" — Wilson, Lloyd George, and Clemenceau — settled the remaining problems. All the sessions were secret.

2. Special committees, appointed by the Supreme Council, studied the particular, important issues and reported back to it.

3. Sub-committees of specialists and experts investigated all sorts of disputes and proposed changes and made recommendations to the special committees.

4. The General Congress composed of from one to five representatives of the 32 Entente and Associated Powers, each with but one vote, in plenary session heard the recommendations of the Supreme Council and ratified them.

After four months of effort, under high pressure and amidst much wrangling, in which the "Fourteen Points" were compromised with nationalistic ambitions, the treaty with Germany, containing 1,000 articles and about 80,000 words — "an epitome of the affairs of the world" — was accepted on May 6 by the General Congress. Portugal, France, China, and Italy made reservations. The next day

the Germans were handed the treaty. For six weeks they tried to secure a modification of the stringent terms, and presented counter-proposals in 60,000 words. The Supreme Council made some minor concessions, answered the objections, and demanded acceptance or refusal before June 23. On that date the German National Assembly by a vote of 237 to 138 accepted the treaty unconditionally. The last dramatic act in the tragedy occurred on June 28 in the hall of mirrors in the palace of Versailles, where in 1871 the German Empire had been created. There the Peace of Versailles was signed by Germany and 30 of the Entente Allies, China alone refusing. On July 9 the German National Assembly by a vote of 208 to 115 ratified the treaty, which in so many ways undid the work of the Iron Chancellor, Bismarck, and his masters, the Hohenzollerns, and also remade the map of Europe and the world.

Signing of the Treaty by Germany

The territorial changes made by the treaty deprived Germany of *15 per cent of her European territory, 10 per cent of her population,* and all her colonies. She ceded Alsace-Lorraine free of debt to France; Eupen, Malmedy, and part of Moresnet to Belgium; Memel to Lithuania; most of West Prussia and East Silesia to Poland; a portion of Upper Silesia to Czecho-Slovakia; and Danzig to the Entente Allies. Other sections, like the Saar Basin, Schleswig, and certain portions of East and West Poland and Upper Silesia were to be settled by popular vote. As a result, North Schleswig went to Denmark. Upper Silesia went to Poland by vote of the League of Nations, but was later divided. The plebiscite in the Saar Basin will not be held until 1934. German leases and rights in China, together with her islands in the north Pacific went to Japan. Her other colonial possessions went to Great Britain, France, and Belgium, and she was forbidden to annex Austria. Thus millions of German citizens were transferred to alien rule.

Territorial changes

By the political terms of the treaty, the Entente Allies were given a free hand in dealing with Russia, Turkey, Bulgaria, and Austria-Hungary. The complete sovereignty of Belgium, Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, and Poland was recognized. The military power of Germany was broken by the surrender of her navy, the abolition of compulsory military service, the reduction of her army to 100,000 men, the limitation of factories for war materials and aircraft, and the destruction of all forts on the Rhine and on the island of Heligoland. The Kiel Canal was opened to all nations. Finally provision was made for the trial of Emperor William II and other German leaders for the violation of International law—a provision that was never carried out. The west bank of the Rhine and the bridgeheads were to be held by the Entente troops to enforce the terms of the treaty.

Military and naval terms

By *the economic clauses of the treaty Germany lost the greater* part of her coal and iron mines, yet for ten years she was to supply France with 7,000,000 tons of coal annually, and Belgium and Italy

Economic phases of the Treaty

each with a total of 8,000,000 tons of coal yearly. In 1920 the total for all was reduced to 2,000,000 tons monthly, with the privilege of money payments instead. Germany accepted responsibility for all damages to civilians in the war, and agreed to pay an indemnity which was fixed in 1921 at approximately $33,000,000,000 of which $5,000,000,000 was to be paid by May of that year. The payments were later reduced to $500,000,000 annually. Germany surrendered all her large merchantmen, half her small merchant ships, and a part of her fishing boats and river craft — nearly two million tons gross. She was required to reconstruct the devastated areas with her own live stock, machinery, and materials. She had to pay the costs of the armies of occupation. No tariff discriminations were to be made against any Allied nation for a period of five years, and certain German rivers were to be opened for free navigation.

To deal with social and economic unrest throughout the world, the treaty provided for an annual International Labor Organization and a permanent International Labor Office. Each state, however, was left free to accept the recommendations of these bodies. The following principles were recognized: (1) labor is not a commodity; (2) employers and employees have the right to organize; (3) equal treatment of workers; and (4) the protection and education of children. Between 1919 and 1923 four international conferences were held at which a large number of measures were adopted to promote social welfare. Albert Thomas of France was appointed the director of the Labor Office at Geneva, and had 300 persons representing 28 nations on his staff. There are now 55 members of the Organization, which publishes weekly and monthly papers, and special reports.

Before the close of the year 1919, most of the signatories had ratified the Treaty of Versailles. China accepted it with reservations concerning Shantung. The American Senate refused to approve it without important changes. After waiting for the United States until January 10, 1920, the ratifying powers deposited their certificates at Paris, and it went into immediate effect. Fourteen of the hostile nations resumed friendly relations with Germany. The United States remained technically at war with her until a separate treaty of peace was negotiated with Germany October 18, 1921. The Treaty of Versailles which should have pacified Europe proved illusory. Its harsh terms were due to Allied distrust of Germany and to lack of trust in their own principles. It was a treaty of penalties, not of peace and amity — "a peace for which there was no precedent." General Smuts, after signing the treaty, said that it did not contain a real peace, but that the machinery it created for amending the treaty would bring peace after war passions had died out.

6. The League of Nations

The treaty created The League of Nations, which was said to be one of the purposes of the World War. Its object was "to promote international coöperation, peace and security." The first members were increased in number until there were 55 in 1925, leaving only nine states on earth which were not members. By 1923 Germany, Russia, Turkey, and the United States were coöperating with the League in one way or another. The governmental machinery of the League consists of (1) the Assembly which is composed of from one to three representatives from each state. Thus far it has met annually, its sessions are public, and it has helped to solve many international problems. (2) The Council consisted of nine members originally — the "Big Five", and four others chosen by the Assembly. Since the United States refused to join the League, the number of members remained eight until 1923, when it was increased to ten. Up to 1923, 24 sessions were held at which 815 decisions were made, many of which settled ugly disputes that might have ended in war. (3) The permanent Secretariat at Geneva under the leadership of the Englishman, Sir Eric Drummond, with a large staff of 300 assistants, representing 36 nationalities, has been exceptionally busy in looking after the business of the League. (4) The Permanent Court of International Justice with eleven judges and four deputy judges held its first session in 1922. It has already settled several important cases, and given its opinions on half a dozen disputed questions. Forty-seven states were members in 1925.

The League of Nations came into existence primarily to enforce the terms of the treaties of peace, to bring about a reduction of armaments, and to prevent war. Its members promised to protect each other's territory and independence against outside attack. All treaties inconsistent with the objects of the League were to be abrogated, and future treaties were to be registered with the Secretariat. By 1923 over 300 international engagements were filed and printed. The Monroe Doctrine was recognized as a means of keeping the peace. Although severely criticized for its defects, yet the League was one of the best results of the war and, on the whole, the most constructive work accomplished by the Paris Peace Conference. It settled disputes over the Aaland islands, between Poland and Lithuania, and over Upper Silesia, Albania, and Eastern Galicia. It prepared a plan for the financial reconstruction of Austria and Hungary. It formulated an international treaty to abolish the evils of the opium traffic and other dangerous drugs. It averted a threatened war of Italy against Greece. It has taken steps to stop the white slave traffic, to prevent epidemics, and to safeguard public health. It has proposed means for improving international communication and transit. It appointed committees on intellectual cooperation, and on international economics and finance. It supervised

the new system of colonial control through mandates, and sought to protect minorities in their rights. With these auspicious beginnings, the supporters of the League believe that it will develop into one of the most useful agencies for the advancement of the civilization of the earth.

7. Treaties of Peace with Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria and Turkey

After much delay the treaty of peace with Austria was signed on September 10, 1919, and ratified the next month by the Austrian National Assembly. It forced her to recognize the independence of Hungary, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and Jugo-Slavia. Thus Austria was left as a small independent Republic with an area smaller than Ireland and consisting of the poorest part of the Empire at that, a population under 7,000,000, an army of 30,000 volunteers, and no seaport. A war indemnity of a "reasonable sum" was to be paid before May 1, 1921. The economic penalties were similar to those inflicted on Germany. Thus Austria — "the fragment of a nation" — was left in a most desperate condition. After several years of chaos the League of Nations agreed to stabilize her finances in order that she might live. The principle of self-determination was denied her by an order that she could not join Germany. *Austria*

The treaty of Neuilly made with Bulgaria on November 27, 1919, gave the Dobrudja to Rumania, Thrace to Greece, and most of Macedonia to Serbia. Thus all the Bulgarian gains in the Balkan Wars were lost and she was deprived of a seacoast, leaving her about as large as the state of Ohio with 4,500,000 inhabitants. Her army was restricted to 20,000 men, an indemnity of $445,000,000 was assessed against her payable in 37 years, and severe economic penalties were laid on her. The treatment of Bulgaria was most unwise and unjust, and will keep the Balkan problem unsettled. *Bulgaria*

The conclusion of a treaty of peace with Hungary was delayed by the creation of a Soviet Republic under Bela Kun. But Rumanian troops drove him from power. After a National Assembly was elected in 1920, a treaty of peace was signed at the Trianon June 4. Hungary was deprived of all her non-Magyar regions — Slovakia went to Czecho-Slovakia, Transylvania to Rumania, Croatia to Jugo-Slavia, and the Banat was divided between the last two powers. In all cases of doubt or dispute, Hungary lost out in regard to the fixation of boundaries. She was left with an area of about half that of Finland, 10,000,000 people, and completely cut off from the sea. She was saddled with a large war indemnity, and onerous economic exactions were imposed. Her army was limited to 30,000 soldiers. Count Apponyi, the liberal leader, denounced the treaty as a "rag of iniquity." *Hungary*

The settlement of questions concerning the Ottoman Empire were perplexing and difficult, largely because of the secret treaties concern-

ing the partition of the country and the subject Jewish and Christian nationalities. It was not until August 10, 1920 that the Turkish delegates signed the treaty of Sevres. By the treaty, Turkey ceded Thrace and the Ægean islands to Greece; Smyrna was put under Greek administration with the right to annex it in five years if favored by a plebiscite; Italy secured the Dodekanese islands, Rhodes, and jurisdiction over Adalia; and Mesopotamia, Palestine, Syria, Armenia, and Hedjaz became independent — the first two under a British mandate, and the third under a French mandate. Kurdistan also became autonomous, and the British protectorate over Egypt and annexation of Cyprus were confirmed. Constantinople was to remain the capital but the Straits were neutralized under an international commission. Thus Turkey lost 440,000 square miles of land and nearly 12,000,000 subjects, leaving an area somewhat less than the new German Republic, with 8,000,000 inhabitants. Turkish finances were put into the hands of Great Britain, France, and Italy. The army was reduced to 50,000 men and the navy was abolished. Although the sultan continued to reside in Constantinople, he lost his political and military control over it. The Christian dream of the expulsion of the Turks from Europe seemed to be almost a reality. The jealousy and distrust among the Entente Powers, however, prevented its realization.

Turkey

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

G. L. Dickinson, *Documents and Statements Relating to Peace Proposals and War Aims, 1916–1918* (1919); H. W. V. Temperley, editor, *A History of the Peace Conference*, 6 vols. (1920–1924); *The Second Year of the League of Nations* (1922); C. H. Haskins and R. H. Lord, *Some Problems of the Peace Conference* (1920); C. T. Thompson, *The Peace Conference Day by Day* (1920); H. Hanson, *The Adventures of the Fourteen Points* (1919); H. W. Harris, *The Peace in the Making* (1919); E. M. House and C. Seymour, *What Really Happened at Paris* (1921); R. S. Baker, *Woodrow Wilson and World Settlement*, 3 vols. (1922); R. Lansing, *The Peace Negotiations: A Personal Narrative* (1921); *The Big Four and Others of the Peace Conference* (1921); A. Tardieu, *The Truth about the Treaty* (1921); A. P. Scott, *An Introduction to the Peace Treaties* (1920); J. M. Keynes, *The Economic Consequences of the Peace* (1919); *A Revision of the Treaty* (1922); B. Baruch, *The Making of the Reparations and Economic Sections of the Treaty* (1920); J. L. Garvin, *The Economic Foundations of Peace* (1919); F. B. Potter, *Introduction to the Study of International Organization* (1922); G. Butler, *A Handbook to the League of Nations* (1919); F. Pollock, *The League of Nations* (1919); W. H. Taft, *Papers on the League of Nations* (1920); S. P. Duggan, *The League of Nations: the Principle and the Practise* (1919); G. G. Wilson, *The First Year of the League of Nations* (1921); C. H. Levermore, *Year-Book of the League of Nations* (1919); H. A. Gibbons, *Europe Since 1918* (1924); W. E. Dodd, *Woodrow Wilson and his Work* (1920); E. M. House, *Intimate Papers*, 2 vols. (1926).

CHAPTER XXXVIII

RESULTS OF THE WORLD WAR

1. Losses in Life and Property

Of all the sovereign states on earth only 14 preserved neutrality during the war — 6 in Europe, 7 in Latin America, and 1 in Africa. Against the 4 Central Powers were ranged 32 states — 15 in open warfare on all of them; 12 against one or more of them; and 5 with severed diplomatic relations. Never in all history, ancient or modern, had there been assembled such an aggregate of man power for human combat. The Central Powers officially mobilized nearly 20,000,000 men; and the Entente Allies over 40,000,000 — making a grand total of 60,000,000. In addition, the neutral powers of Europe, for defense, kept their own armies mobilized to war strength. Furthermore the belligerents utilized the entire civilian population for such work as was necessary to wage a successful war, and also appropriated all the material resources for the same purpose.

Of the 60,000,000 men mobilized, over 13 per cent, or about 8,000,000 were killed in action or died of wounds. The wounded numbered more than 19,000,000, of whom 6,000,000 became total wrecks. The Central Powers lost 3,000,000 dead and 8,000,000 wounded; the Entente 5,000,000 dead and 11,000,000 wounded. Russia, Germany, France, Austria-Hungary, the British Empire, Italy, Serbia, and Belgium, in the order named, lost the most men by death. Over 7,000,000 were reported prisoners or "missing." The total casualties were slightly under 32,000,000. To these numbers should be added the civilian victims on land and sea — those who were drowned or slain by engines of war, or who died from famine, disease, grief, and massacre. For instance: 692 Americans and 20,620 British were killed on the sea; 1,270 British men, women and children were killed by air raids and bombardments; 4,000,000 Christians and Jews were massacred or starved by the Turks; and 4,000,000 above normal died from epidemics. These deaths of civilians would bring the total toll of human life up to 17,000,000. Nor did the death roll stop with the armistices, because the years following witnessed a death-rate, due either directly or indirectly to the war, almost as high as during the conflict. These losses will be reflected in the coming generations. The soldiers and sailors killed were the best youth of the race; and the civilians who perished were largely women and children. The birth-rate in European countries declined during the war. In France and Germany it fell 50 per cent, and no doubt the same results occurred in other states. The consequences of

Losses of life

these losses have been felt in the decreased agricultural and industrial output; in the loss of inventive genius; in lowered scholarship and scientific investigation; and in the retardation of progress. Economists have estimated that the capitalized value of the men who fell or were crippled during the war was the colossal sum of $33,551,000,000 — an amount equal to the whole wealth of the United States in 1875. A similar value was placed upon the loss of civilian lives. This would bring the total monetary worth of the life lost in the war to a sum comparable to the entire wealth of the United States in 1890.

The total loss of life measured in dollars was exceeded by the destruction of wealth. The total direct cost of the first year of the war was $19,000,000,000; the second year, $33,000,000,000; the third year, $40,000,000,000; and the fourth year, $94,000,000,000 — or a grand total of $186,000,000,000. This colossal sum just about equalled all the wealth of the United States in 1918, or the combined wealth of the British Empire and Austria-Hungary, or the entire wealth of Germany, France and Russia in 1914. The Entente Allies spent $126,000,000,000 and the Central Powers $60,000,000,000. The average daily cost of the war was $123,000,000, and in 1918 it rose to $10,000,000 an hour. The expense bore heaviest on the chief belligerents in the following order: Great Britain, France, the United States, Germany, Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Italy. France spent 30 per cent of her pre-war wealth, Great Britain 28 per cent,

Property losses

Italy 16 per cent and Russia 13 per cent. The total public debts of the leading participants on both sides increased from $26,000,000,000 in 1914 to $130,000,000,000 in 1918; of the world from $40,000,000,000 to $260,000,000,000. The United States, Great Britain, and France loaned to their allies a total of $20,000,000,000; Germany to her allies $2,000,000,000. In addition to the losses of life and wealth spent in waging the war, there were property losses on land of $30,000,000,000; shipping and cargoes, $7,000,000,000; and war relief and loss to neutrals, $2,000,000,000, or a total of $39,000,000,000. This made a grand total of war cost, directly and indirectly, of $338,000,000,000, or a sum equal to the combined wealth of the United States, the British Empire, and Italy, or approximately of all Europe in 1914. To put the total cost of the war in another form: it was about ten times greater than all the gold and silver taken from the earth from the earliest times down to 1923. Everywhere the world's productive industry was crippled. The value of money dropped as a result of inflated paper currency, the price of labor and the cost of living began to mount, and business was seriously disturbed. The peoples everywhere were burdened with heavy taxes, and the resources of the entire earth were mortgaged for years to come to pay for the war. To the Old World, particularly, was left a heritage of economic chaos and misery. In France, for example, pensions cost $117,000,000 annually and the interest on her debt an additional $1,767,000,000.

2. The Political Results

The political results of the World War were so far-reaching that the great catyclism will be spoken of by future generations as the Great Revolution of 1914. More significant, perhaps, than even the French Revolution of 1789, it closed one era of human history and began another. It will have to recede in time somewhat before its greatest effects will stand out in strong relief. Because the peoples of the world were stirred so deeply, the civilization of the earth of the future will differ in many fundamental particulars from that before 1914. Much of the old order continues, of course, and many of the apparent changes are proving to be but temporary, but the transformations have been sufficiently sweeping to designate them as landmarks of a new era.

The greatest immediate result was the overthrow of the autocratic and militaristic powers of Europe — Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Germany. The proud Romanovs were driven from their throne by their own subjects. The ancient throne of the Hapsburgs crashed to pieces in a disrupted Empire. The lordly Hohenzollerns, who by brandishing the sword had kept Europe in a state of fear for two generations, fell by the very weapon they used for their own self-aggrandizement. "World power or downfall," boasted Bernhardi, and downfall was the fate of Prussianism. With the Hohenzollerns and the Hapsburgers fell their allies, Turkey in disruption, and Bulgaria in disgrace. A host of lesser dynasties were driven from power by their emancipated peoples, eight more independent states were created out of these old empires, and Ireland became a "Free State." About two thousand miles of new boundary lines appeared in Europe. The remnants of autocratic government in the states of the Entente Allies were severely criticized, and in many instances changed.

End of autocracy

Another major political result was the growth of republicanism. Popular government had been making a conquest through parliaments, but for several generations it had not attacked thrones except in the case of little Portugal. The keen interest in economic problems had drawn attention away from the overthrow of monarchies, and the newer imperialism used monarchy as a unifying cement. At the same time to many persons in Europe republicanism seemed to make civil institutions insecure. In 1814 there was but one republic in Europe and in 1914 there were only three of any consequence — France, Switzerland, and Portugal. But after 1914 a republican form of government appeared in Russia, Germany, Austria, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia, Finland, and Ukrania. To the 21 republics of the New World were now added those of Europe; China, the Far Eastern Republic, Georgia, Armenia, and Azerbaijan in Asia; and Liberia in Africa. Except in Turkey and Japan divine-right monarchies disappeared from the earth — and in 1925 the Republic of Turkey was proclaimed. Even liberal monar-

New republics

chies, like Great Britain and Italy, were becoming more democratic in response to the suggestions for their overthrow. In imitation of the forepart of the nineteenth century there appeared a new crop of popular constitutions, based partly upon the experience of France and the United States and partly upon the discussions of enlightened political scientists throughout the earth. At the same time numerous amendments were made to the old constitutions to make government more responsive to public opinion. The franchise was widened in Russia, Germany, Austria, Great Britain, the United States and elsewhere to include women. Other measures such as the redistribution of seats in the legislature, the payment of legislators, proportional representation, the abolition of plural voting, representation of "functional" bodies, and ministerial responsibility were quite generally adopted. Personal and civil liberties were more adequately guaranteed. Thus, beyond doubt, the war resulted in the triumph of more democratic political institutions.

Reaction against democracy

One of the accompaniments of the war was "an impatience with popular government." Democractic governments under the stress of conflict temporarily adopted the autocratic practices, which they so loudly denounced in their adversaries, in order to suppress criticism and to use all the national resources to win. Among the Entente Allies political democracy was supplanted by a "bureaucracy of experts," and by cabinets and executives with dictatorial power. Legislatures were deprived of their normal functions and received "orders" from the heads of the government. Even neutral countries like Holland and Switzerland resorted to these arbitrary methods. The press was censored; freedom of speech and association was denied; minorities not in sympathy with the war were treated with intolerance and severely punished; and liberty came to mean abject obedience to the will of those in political control. Passion and hysteria supplanted justice and reason in many instances. These conditions continued for several years following the armistice, but with the coming of peace they began gradually to disappear in the more stable states. But a complete return to the political practices of 1914 seemed as difficult as the reversion to economic normalcy. Italy lapsed into a dictatorship under Mussolini and the Fascisti. In Spain King Alfonso XIII dissolved the Cortes and turned the government over to a military dictatorship in 1923. These examples in Italy and Spain were followed in some of the smaller states to curb radicalism.

Exaggerated nationalism was one of the fundamental causes of the World War. One of the war aims set forth by the Entente Allies was to curb this world menace and to give all nations, large and small, the right to security and peaceable progress. Nationalism was the most potent force in the conflict, for it was a "War of Nations," or groups of nations, and both sides appealed to it for victory. Much was said about the deliverance of "submerged nationalities," and

this principle was back of the territorial punishment of Germany and the dissolution of Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Turkey. The Paris Peace Conference attempted to resettle Europe on the basis of nationalism, and eight new states appeared on the map of Europe, which seemed to reverse the previous tendency towards larger political units. It was hoped that a saner and safer type of nationalism would prevail in Europe after the defeat of the Central Powers. Old wrongs of previous wars and congresses, which ignored nationalism, were righted. In the British Empire the right of the Dominions to exercise control over their own foreign affairs was recognized. But unfortunately the nationalistic spirit was intensified to dangerous proportions as an aftermath of the struggle. Some of the states sought to extend their boundaries at the expense of other nationalities, which left Europe full of hatreds, fears, and wranglings. In central Europe and the Balkans the overlapping territorial claims — the "gray zones" and "twilight areas" — were difficult to settle satisfactorily and had in them the germs of trouble for the future. Although the Peace Conference sought to adjust problems on the basis of nationality, such questions as Albania, Ireland, Shantung, Korea, Egypt, India, and the Philippines still remained to be settled. Their "right of self-determination" was no longer questioned, and it was expected that the League of Nations would work out a solution of these knotty conflicts.

Stimulation of national spirit

In world history the most significant result of the World War was the organization of the League of Nations. It was seen that "within the states generally there was peace, law, order, and a high moral standard, but that among the states there was anarchy, low moral standards, and wars. Christianity taught universal brotherhood, and socialism advocated the obliteration of state lines and the unification of the world on economic class lines. The internationalists, on the contrary, took the nation as a unit and sought to federate the nations for world peace. This effort to use nationalism as the basis for a new political organization of the peoples of earth was called internationalism. The League of Nations was intended to promulgate this practical coöperation. If it succeeds in accomplishing even a part of what was hoped from it, it will prove to be an epoch-making departure in public world affairs. If the new system of internationalism prevails, with the abolition of secret treaties and the democratization of diplomacy, no national state will assume to set up its own selfish interests against those of mankind. But should the old forces of 1914 triumph, then nationalism may once more become a world menace and the causes, which it was hoped had been outgrown, may again deluge the earth with an Armageddon.

League of Nations

The World War destroyed the imperialistic ambitions of the Central Powers and Russia. On the other hand, it increased the imperialism of some of the Entente Allies. Great Britain not only remained the greatest colonial power on earth, but to her also fell

the largest share of the German colonies and parts of the Turkish Empire. France regained Alsace-Lorraine, used the non-payment of German reparations as an excuse for remaining in the Rhine valley and for seizing the Ruhr basin, and, by winning Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and other small states as her satellites, became the ascendant military power on the continent of Europe. Beyond Europe, with the addition of her portion of the German colonies and the Turkish Empire, she has become the second largest colonial and imperialistic power in the world. Italy not only secured a large part of *Italia irredenta* but won control of the Adriatic, gained a foothold in Albania and Asia Minor, and was promised "compensation" in Africa to offset the British and French share of German colonial spoils. Belgium likewise made territorial gains in Africa. The United States secured from Europe a definite recognition of the Monroe Doctrine, departed from her policy of isolation, and took her place among the great world powers. Japan shared with Great Britain the German islands in the Pacific, strengthened her grip on China, and cast greedy eyes on eastern Siberia. A forward step was taken at Paris, however, when the treaty provided for the establishment of "mandates" over the German colonies and other backward parts of the globe. This was a recognition of "the international rather than the national character" of imperialism and set up a guardianship under the League of Nations.

Failure to prove a war against militarism

The Entente Allies characterized the struggle as "a war to end war." Germany and her confederates, it was charged, had worshipped force as the best means of attaining their nationalistic ambitions. To defeat them the Entente Allies mobilized their military power and employed "force to the utmost, force without stint or limit" for four long years. Prussian militarism fell by the very thing it championed. The peace treaties reduced the military equipment of the Central Powers by land and sea to the minimum necessities of internal police and abolished enforced military service, with the hope that the revival of militarism by them was made impossible. France, however, emerged from the war as the strongest military power on earth, capable of cutting like a knife through any part of Europe. Great Britain still possessed the most powerful navy on the globe. All the Entente Allies, and even the neutrals, to a certain degree, were militarized. In 1922 France was reported to have a standing army of 770,000 men, Russia 1,300,000, Poland 290,000, Italy 250,000, Spain 217,000, Greece 250,000, and Belgium 113,000. Many of the newly created states also supported very large armies. For several years following the conclusion of peace, minor clashes of arms occurred in Europe and Asia as reverberations of the World War. The dangers of Russian Bolshevism perpetuated a state of uneasiness. The Entente Allies kept troops in the Rhine valley. To France the cost of the days of peace was almost as great as the days of war. Europe continued to be pretty much a military camp with over 4,000,000 men under arms.

The vaunted boast of militarism that it preserved the peace of the world was exploded. People now saw that it was the curse of the old order, crushing the life out of humanity with heavy taxes, robbing nations of funds for human welfare, and engendering hate, fear, and suspicion in all quarters of the globe. To the Council of the League of Nations, therefore, was entrusted the important task of forming plans for some decisive reduction in armaments, which arrangement was to be revised every ten years. Although the United States had refused to join the League of Nations, still in 1921 the national government was in sympathy with the purposes of the League. Consequently President Harding in that year invited Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan to send delegates to attend the Washington Arms Conference. After a remarkable session of several months, it resulted in a general reduction of the navies of the British, the Americans and the Japanese, which were to follow the proportion of 5:5:3. Ther elative strength of France and Italy was placed at $1\frac{3}{4}$. As a result of these agreements, billions were saved, the dangerous rivalry of sea armaments was lessened, and the threat of war minimized. The Conference also agreed that poisonous gasses should not be used in future wars, nor were submarines to be employed to sink merchant vessels. Since disarmament was closely connected with Pacific problems, China, Portugal, Belgium and Holland were invited to join the other states in (1) agreeing to respect Chinese independence and the "open door" policy; (2) adopting a self-denying understanding that would prevent outside powers from gaining "special privileges" in China; and (3) forbidding the further fortification of the mandated areas of the Pacific. At the same time the Pacific powers pledged each other support in the maintenance of their insular possessions in the Pacific and the use of arbitration to settle disputes over them. The Anglo-Japanese Alliance was replaced by the Four-Power Treaty. Japan agreed to restore Kiao-chau to China and to sell her the Shantung railway. These settlements did much to replace international rivalry by coöperation and friendly understanding, and thus eliminated enmities and reduced the causes of armed conflict.

Washington Conference, 1921

3. The Economic and Social Results

The economic results of the World War were almost as revolutionary as the political. Indeed many persons interpreted the conflict as one for industrial supremacy, for world trade and markets, for colonies, and for control of the sources of coal, iron, rubber, oil, and food supplies. "Economic imperialism" was the term applied to the struggle. The defeat of the Central Powers left these material advantages in the hands of the Entente Allies. Then there reappeared in the Entente camp the old rivalries over the division of the spoils of war both within and beyond Europe, which carried with them at times the threat of war. France thought mainly of crushing the economic life of her old foe by depriving her of her iron and coal

supplies. Italy wished to possess the eastern shore of the Adriatic in order to hold the gateways of trade into the Balkans. The British were chiefly concerned with a recovery of the lost trade with Germany and Russia. Landlocked states were seeking ports. In writing the peace treaty the Entente Allies gave little heed to the financial and industrial rehabilitation of Europe, to the stabilization of the new states, to the preservation of economic solidarity among the victors, or to a solution of the chaos in Russia, Germany, Austria, and Italy. Europe was left prostrate, starving, and disintegrating. Reparations were imposed on the defeated powers as punishments and handicaps impossible of fulfillment rather than as measures for restoration. In July, 1919, Mr. Hoover reported that there were 15,000,000 families receiving unemployment allowances. The coal production of the continent declined 30 per cent. The produce of the soil in some of the countries of central and eastern Europe dropped from 50 per cent to 75 per cent of normal. The breakdown of the systems of transportation made matters worse. The debauchery of the currency through the process of inflation with paper money secretly and arbitrarily impoverished the well-to-do classes and imposed hardships on the workingmen, while it enriched a few shrewd "profiteers." Millions turned their eyes hopefully towards Bolshevism for relief, and the whole political, social, and economic system of Europe was threatened with subversion. And so intimately was the life of Europe related to other parts of the globe that everywhere the tremors of the European earthquake were felt.

Economic aftermath of war

In this critical condition, men acquainted with world affairs turned their attention to the herculean task of finding remedies. It was proposed: (1) to revise the Treaty of Versailles through either a new conference or the League of Nations; (2) to reduce the reparations assessed upon the defeated powers to reasonable sums which they could pay in money and materials annually over a long period of time; (3) to pool the inter-Allied debt and apportion it to each member in proportion to the capacity to meet it, or to cancel it by having the richer members assume the burden; and (4) to raise an international loan for the economic and financial restoration of the states of central and eastern Europe. But the hatreds, fears, and national selfishness aroused by the war were so pronounced that the governments of the world found it impossible to make much headway with these suggestions. Finally, in April, 1922, nearly four years after the conclusion of the World War, Premier Lloyd George of Great Britain called the Genoa Economic Conference. Its purpose was to bring about a solution of Europe's alarming economic condition. All the European states were invited to attend, and Bolshevist Russia and the German Republic were treated for the first time as members of the society of nations rather than as outlawed states. France sent representatives only on the understanding that reparations and the Treaty of Versailles should not be changed and that the Russian debt to

Genoa Conference, 1922

France should not be questioned. It was estimated that, counting the delegates and assistants of the 34 states, 1,500 persons were in attendance. In his opening address Lloyd George called the conference "the greatest gathering of European nations which has ever assembled on this continent" and said that it should make a "common effort to repair the devastation wrought by the most destructive war ever waged." He urged peace as the fundamental need and accused the French of keeping up the "snarling" and "canine clamor," which destroyed confidence and "rattled the nerves." He appealed to "the common statesmanship of Europe" to save "the cradle of the great civilization which during the last 500 years has spread across the globe." The efforts of the British to bring about an agreement on Russian finances were frustrated by Belgium and France, and the unexpected signing of a Russo-German treaty of alliance spread consternation among the Entente Allies. In the end little was accomplished and the complicated problems were left for future conferences to settle.

The war and state socialism

Under the old era of business, banking, commerce, mining, railroading, communication, manufacturing and many other agencies of production, distribution, and finance were left to the initiative of private individuals and corporations. Before the World War, however, governments had begun to regulate business in many ways. In some of the European countries railroads, telegraphs, and express companies had already been taken over by the governments. Socialists and labor groups had long clamored for the extension of this process. But the war carried forward coöperation in industry to a far greater degree than had ever been known before. Governments quite generally took over the means of transportation and communication; controlled or subsidized mines, mills, and factories; intervened in labor disputes; regulated the hours of labor, wages, output, consumption, profits, and prices; and operated some of the war industries. After the war ended, it was demanded, chiefly by labor organizations, that these experiments in state socialism, which had been made as war necessities, should be made permanent. Although most of the industries were returned to private hands after the war, still some of the results of the innovations endured. The colossal venture in socialization and nationalization made it easier, should the occasion arise, to repeat the process of conscripting property as well as life for general welfare.

War and labor

"Labor won the war" was a cry heard in industrial centers. With the fighting men at the front, leaving a scarcity of manual workers at home, the importance of labor increased. The rise in wages produced a corresponding increase in the comforts of life. Labor bore its share in the war loyally, but it also perfected its organization, and demanded higher pay, shorter hours, and better working conditions. When peace came, labor was so strong that it could not only maintain war scales of wages but even increased them. Hence, with the

post-war decline in the price of products, the world was disturbed with a contagion of strikes and unemployment during the period of economic reconstruction. One of the results of the war was the decrease in the number of skilled workers through death, injury, and disease. Another result was the employment of large numbers of women in labor formerly performed by men alone. And still another result was that labor began to demand a larger share in the responsibilities of industry. The new status of labor was reflected in politics by the organization of labor parties, by the widening of the franchise, and by the governmental recognition of the rights of labor. The Paris Peace Conference recognized this new status of labor in creating the International Labor Organization already mentioned. The war also stressed the primary importance of agriculture in modern life and the value of having a large number of small peasant farmers. In Russia, Prussia, Austria, Poland, and elsewhere, the large estates were divided among the people. In Great Britain the large landlords, in many instances, voluntarily divided their huge holdings among the tillers of the soil. As a consequence of this economic revolution, the rural districts in some countries in Europe have gained a preponderance over the cities. The world will be the gainer undoubtedly by these changes.

The mobilization of the industrial life of the world for a mighty international purpose brought multitudes of women and children into many new fields of human activity. Indeed there was great danger that the pressure for output to win the war would be taken as an excuse for breaking down all the safeguards that had been built up to protect them against industrial abuses. The demonstrated ability of woman in the work of the world, and her right to equal pay with man, were recognized. In the munition factories of France, for instance, women ran heavy lathes and drills, and operated forges and trip-hammers. In some kinds of work they revealed a dexterity and skill superior to men. It was a recognition of the new status of woman that led the more progressive nations to extend the privilege of voting to them.

War and women

During the war, money played as powerful a role as soldiers, food, and labor. Bankers and financiers gained a new significance. Never had international loans and credits been carried out on so gigantic a scale. National systems of finance had to be reorganized, new taxes devised, billions of dollars worth of bonds sold, and millions raised for charitable work in caring for the sick and wounded, and in saving the starving. Opportunities were given, likewise, for profiteering, and millionaires were created on an unprecedented scale. Paper currency flooded Europe to an unheard of degree, prices soared, and the value of money declined until at the close of the conflict European countries were on the verge of bankruptcy. The whole earth was left in more or less economic chaos, showing how the normal standards of life may be disturbed by a great modern war.

International finance

Out of these conditions came a tremendous impetus to all sorts of socialism. The radical Socialists, called Communists or Bolshevists, gained control of Russia, where they created a Soviet Republic, crushed all counter-revolutions, and attempted to reorganize the whole life of the nation. They made peace with the Central Powers, and carried on propaganda among neighboring peoples and even in distant lands, where harsh measures were used against them. In some countries, notably, Great Britain gild-socialism appeared as a counter-tendency to secure industrial democracy through profit-sharing, shop stewards, and joint management without the aid of the state. Trade-unions, including members in all kinds of occupations from farmers to government officials, covered nearly all parts of the globe and sought to improve the lot of the workers and to gain control of industry through legal means. Germany, Great Britain, Russia, the United States, and France, in the order named, had the largest membership. The International Federation of Trade Unions with headquarters in Amsterdam in 1921 had 24,000,000 members. After the World War every industrial country on earth had one, and some of them several, Socialist parties, the divisions being caused largely by their attitude towards the World War. After the Russian Revolution of 1917 Communist parties appeared in most of the advanced states of Europe and the world, and in some countries like Germany and Italy their ranks were split by factions. Socialists and Communists in general disagree as to methods rather than ultimate ideals. All of them agree that industry for private profit produces anti-social results, but they differ widely as to the form the socialist society should take and as to the means to be employed to attain their goal. Their programs have been gradually widening until they now include all spheres of both national and international policy. As a result of the renewed interest in socialism, there was planted in the minds of millions the conviction that economic reforms and social readjustments were imperatively needed, and that competition must give way to coöperation.

War and socialism

The lessons of coöperation — local, national, and international — enforced by the World War were not lost. A new conception of the character and purpose of human society was gained. The successful experiments in democractic conscription for military and industrial service revealed the startling possibilities of what might be accomplished for the common good in time of peace. The war revealed a tendency towards the confiscation of great fortunes for the welfare of the state, and the consequent equalization of wealth. After seeing billions of dollars and millions of lives wasted in war, men asked why similar energy, brains, and wealth might not be devoted to the solution of the problems of civilization. Humanity was stressed as superior to both the individual and the nation, and a new sense of social values was created. The coöperative methods of raising money for slaughter gave people a better conception of

what might be done to eradicate human disease, to spread intelligence, and to abolish poverty.

4. The Religious and Educational Results of the War

The war was not a religious conflict. Men of all faiths and of no faith were found fighting on both sides. Nationalistic, racial, and economic motives, not religious, controlled men. Both groups called their cause righteous and prayed to the same God for victory. The war, with its lies and deceptions, its coarsening and brutalizing influences, its hatreds and crimes, its barbarities and massacres, its sacrifice of life and devilish cruelty, was a travesty on the fundamental teachings of Christianity. Yet it must be remembered that the various religious societies sought in every possible way to mitigate the horrors and cruelties; to aid the sick and wounded and to care for the dying; and to provide comforts and wholesome recreation for the soldiers in the trenches. For these worthy purposes millions of dollars were generously contributed. Never before on so large a scale had Christians, Jews, Mohammedans, Hindus, and Confucians coöperated more harmoniously within two warring groups. In America, Christian churches and Jewish synagogues pooled their charitable work, while the Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., Knights of Columbus, the Salvation Army, and Jewish Welfare Board united to keep up the morale of the soldiers on the fighting lines. The International Red Cross was conspicuous for its humanitarian work. The entrance into the long sleep of so many brave youths led to an extraordinary interest in spiritualism and occult mysteries. The Papacy and other religious organizations made futile efforts to secure peace by negotiation. The Orthodox Church in Russia was quite seriously disrupted. As a result of the sentiment engendered by the war, the Protestant bodies of the United States through the Inter-Church World Movement sought to unite all denominations in a mighty coöperative effort to carry the Gospel and Christian civilization more effectively to all parts of the globe.

Religion and the war

Millions of men — white, red, black, yellow, and brown — from the corners of the earth rushed to the European battlefields. The war was an intermingling of the races and nations of earth. Nothing in the world's history — neither the wanderings of the barbarians in the early days nor the crusades of the Middle Ages — could compare with this national, racial, and religious mingling in the war. Men's minds were broadened and their sympathies enlarged by travel to new lands, strange peoples, and foreign institutions. While it meant death and suffering to many, to others it brought knowledge, experience, education, and new contacts. The colored races came to have less fear of their white masters, and gained a self-confident expectation that through the principle of "self-determination" they might become masters of their own destinies.

The war and the races

In Europe the first effect of the war on education was seen in the

desertion of the halls of higher learning by both students and professors. The same thing occurred among the older boys and the teachers of the secondary schools. Efforts were made, however, to keep the processes of education running normally for the younger pupils, but the call of the male teachers to service and the appropriation of the school buildings for war needs, together with the employment of children in industry, largely defeated these intentions. Steps were taken, however, through "continuation schools" and "adult education" to provide educational facilities for those who were in military service, and the various armies became in a sense "popular universities." Special means were taken to instruct the civilians in the war aims through the use of the press, pulpit, platform, music, and the movies as both official and unofficial mediums of propaganda. Most countries had assigned the direction of propaganda to responsible national bodies like the Committee of Public Information in the United States, the British Department of Information, and the German Press Department of the Foreign Office. The knowledge of the history and geography of the world was greatly increased. Conscription revealed an astonishingly large percentage of those who were illiterate and physically unfit, which resulted in placing a stronger emphasis on the training of the body as well as the education of the mind and morals.

The war and education

After the war ended, in the first enthusiasm over reconstruction, the world was going to be made over through education. In England the Act of 1918 made attendance at school up to the age of 14 obligatory, and gave local boards power to care for the health of the pupils and to provide for the defectives. Young persons between 14 and 18 were required to attend continuation schools for at least 320 hours a year. In Scotland similar measures were taken, but the educational authority was centralized in the hands of about 40 boards. In Russia and the new states of Europe occurred the greatest changes in popular education. In most of the war-wrecked countries of Europe, as the black days followed the waste of resources and wealth, programs of educational progress were suspended. The war left in its wake pitiful problems of cultural reconstruction. Art, music, and literature were dealt a stunning blow. And yet a new thirst for learning imbued the youths of the world and the schools and colleges were crowded beyond their capacity.

In the field of experimental science and its application, there was marvelous advance. One needs only think of the improvements and inventions in artillery, machine guns, explosives, gases, tanks, airplanes, submarines, wireless communication, and navigation to comprehend the impetus supplied by the war. Many of these agencies of destructive warfare were converted to the uses of peace after the conflict ended. Both groups of belligerents were forced to create many things which in pre-war days they bought from each other. Thus Great Britain and the United States developed their own chemical

The war and science

and dyeing establishments, an industry which Germany practically monopolized before 1914. In surgery, sanitation, preventive medicine, antiseptics, and dentistry the experience gained in the war will be serviceable in the years ahead. New methods of detecting and curing mental disorders were discovered. Vocational education for disabled soldiers was so successful that governments are applying it to industry. The gains made in scientific knowledge are being applied to agriculture and all forms of business.

The war and international coöperation

Perhaps the greatest single lesson learned from the war was that of coöperation in a competitive world. It was coöperation among the Entente Allies that enabled them to defeat the Central Powers. It was coöperation within the national groups that gave efficiency to the members of the two warring alliances. It was clearly demonstrated that no single nation can any longer set its own interests above those of the rest of the world. No autocratic monarch can put his will above that of the people. No social class, whether wage-earners or capitalists, can dominate an entire social group. No individual can ignore his obligations to his fellow man. Political coöperation is the prerequisite of a better state. International coöperation means a cessation of world anarchy. Industrial coöperation will apply democracy to trade and industry. Religious coöperation will spread higher moral standards more effectively over the earth. Educational cooperation will abolish ignorance and superstition, and advance man to a higher plane of civilization. Is it too much to hope that against the old order of competitive nationalism, competitive patriotism, competitive armaments, competitive alliances, competitive systems of culture, competitive industry, competitive colonial empires, and competitive ambitions to dominate the world, there will evolve, eventually, a new world order of coöperation, friendly international understanding, mutual goodwill, security, and peace?

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

E. L. Bogart, *Direct and Indirect Costs of the Great War* (1919); H. A. Gibbons, *Introduction to World Politics* (1922); O. Spengler, *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* (1917); F. A. Vanderlip, *What Happened to Europe* (1919); *What Next in Europe* (1922); F. C. Hicks, *The New World Order* (1920); N. Angell, *The Fruits of Victory* (1921); A. Dermangeon, *Le declin de l'Europe* (English translation, *America and the Race for World Dominion*) (1921); F. Nitti, *Europe without Peace* (1922); *The Decadence of Europe* (1923); F. A. Ogg and C. A. Beard, *National Governments and the World War* (1919); D. C. Macmurtie, *The Disabled Soldier* (1919); F. A. Cleveland and J. Schafer, *Democracy and Reconstruction* (1920); B. Russell, *Proposed Roads to Freedom* (1919); A. Gleason, *What the Workers Want* (1919); J. A. Hobson, *The New Protectionism* (1917); W. S. Culbertson, *Commercial Policy in War Time and After* (1919); T. F. Millard, *Democracy and the Eastern Question* (1919); B. L. P. Weale, *The Truth about China and Japan* (1919); R. L. Buell, *The Washington Conference* (1922); D. W. Morrow, *The Society of Free States* (1919); J. W. Hughan, *International Government* (1923); M. E. Ravage, *The Malady of Europe* (1923).

CHAPTER XXXIX

EUROPEAN REVOLUTIONS SINCE 1914 AND THE CREATION OF NEW STATES

1. The Russian Revolution

One of the most interesting historical outgrowths of the World War was the Russian Revolution, which abolished the autocracy of the tsar and apparently started Russia on the path of political and industrial democracy. When this epoch-making event occurred in March, 1917, the democratic peoples of the globe rejoiced exceedingly. No longer did the Entente Allies have to apologize for a despotic partner, since Russia now took her place among other free countries. But the control of the Revolution soon passed from the hands of the liberals and democrats into the hands of the communistic Bolsheviki. This change caused wide-spread alarm and fear. Just as the radical measures and frightful excesses of the French Revolution of 1789 frightened conservative contemporaries and blinded them to many of the constructive effects of that movement, so the tyranny, bloodshed, folly, and novel experiments of the Bolsheviki have aroused the suspicion and hostility of the more stable democratic governments of today. Yet Russia, like a young giant, staggering under a mighty burden, is groping for light and freedom. A century hence, when many of the events of the World War that loom large now will have faded in importance, the Russian experiment may stand out in strong relief as one of the greatest products of the conflict.

French and Russian Revolutions

The Russian Empire in 1914 was the largest continuous empire on earth. It included one sixth of the landed surface of the globe and had 180,000,000 people. In civilization, it was the most backward of all the great powers. Its position astride two continents, its gigantic military machine, and its vast natural wealth, gave it a prominent place in international affairs. Tsar Nicholas II, as autocrat of all the Russias, was the most powerful ruler in the world. In his hands and those of his advisers was vested all imperial power, although, since the Revolution of 1905, a national parliament called the Duma had exercised a shadowy authority. Local government was managed by the *zemstvos* dating from 1864. Socially, the people were divided into classes very much as in France under the old régime. The Industrial Revolution, since 1900, had been making rapid headway. The masses of the people were illiterate and unprogressive. The Orthodox Church was a close ally of the state in controlling the people. A friendly understanding with Great Britain and Japan,

Russia in 1914

and a formal alliance with France, gave Russia protection against Germany and Austria-Hungary, and encouraged a revival of her ambition to dominate the Balkans and to secure Constantinople. The imperialistic project of Pan-Slavism was a factor in precipitating the World War. The part played by Russia in the opening years of that struggle won the admiration of the Entente Allies, and brought consternation to the Central Powers. With the outbreak of the Revolution, however, her war activities slackened, then collapsed, and finally ended in a treaty of peace with the Central Powers.

Disintegration of autocracy

Chief among the forces that perpetuated the tsar's autocratic power were: (1) the devotion of the Orthodox Church to divine-right rule; (2) militarism; (3) a powerful nobility; (4) a large coterie of imperial officials whose pay and promotion forced loyalty to the old order; and (5) the ignorance of the masses of the people. When these props, which upheld the tsar's throne, were removed, it would topple to the ground. Under this autocratic system, corruption and inefficiency were rife in the church and state, and society was honeycombed with inequalities, injustices, and abuses. Among the causes working for the overthrow of autocracy were: (1) the gains of the Revolution of 1905; (2) the influence of the democracies to the westward; (3) the Industrial Revolution, which shifted hundreds of thousands of men from the villages to the cities, where as industrial workers they organized, discussed political and economic problems, and gave ear to German socialism; and (4) the agitation of the liberals among the students, the middle class, and the more intelligent nobility, many of whom had travelled abroad or at least had read western literature, for the modernization of the Empire. The village society in the *mir* governments, which were an ancient and indigenous system of simple democracy, had done much to prepare the people for a freer and better type of national popular government. The *zemstvos* and the Dumas, which were recent imitations of western systems, had already acquainted the nation with some of the forms of representative government, and political parties resembling those of modern states were organizing.

Incompetence of the autocracy in the war

After participating in the World War for two and a half years, the morale of the Russian army in February, 1917, broke down before the old cancers of inefficiency and corruption, and pro-German influences. On top of all this came a shortage of food, fuel, and clothing, and high prices. The gaunt form of famine stalked through the great centers of population. The Special Committee of Defense reported that there was plenty of food and fuel in the country, but that mismanagement had caused the distress. The tsar was asked to remedy the serious situation. The Nobles' Congress held at Moscow criticized the government's indifference to this sad state of affairs, denounced the "dark forces" undermining the state, demanded internal reforms, and requested the calling of the Duma. In the midst of a severe winter the sufferings of the people grew more acute.

On March 7 crowds of starving and freezing workingmen in Petrograd stormed the breadshops. The mounted dragoons, called out to suppress the strikers, refused to fire on the people. Strikes spread rapidly, and all liberal and revolutionary parties began to unite against the autocracy. When the tsar in anger on March 11 ordered the temporary dissolution of the Duma, it revolted and refused to adjourn. Three days of fierce street fighting occurred between the people and the government troops. When 300,000 soldiers went over to the people, the tsar's fate was sealed. His strongest prop was gone. On March 14 the Duma recommended the creation of a provisional government. The next day at Pskov, Tsar Nicholas II, the last Romanov, abdicated. The political revolution was accomplished almost without bloodshed. After three centuries of rule, the house of Romanov came to an end.

March Revolution of 1917

The downfall of the autocracy was directed by the liberals of the middle class, with the coöperation of the Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies in Petrograd. Other large cities approved of the change. Prince Lvov, president of the Union of Zemstvos and a leader among the liberal nobles, became premier of the provisional government, which the leaders of the various revolutionary parties formed. Gutchkov, a moderate conservative, was made minister of war and marine. Terestchenko, a rich democratic business man, was appointed minister of finance. Professor Milyukov, who had spent much time in America and England, took the office of foreign affairs. Alexander Kerensky, a Social Revolutionist, became minister of justice. The new Russia was recognized by the United States and the Entente Allies.

With the Revolution an accomplished fact, the men in authority set about organizing a representative, democratic régime and correcting abuses. The supporters and defenders of the old order, for the most part, were exiled or put in prison, while the political prisoners by the thousands were released from the Siberian and Russian prisons. Freedom of assembly, speech, the press and religion was proclaimed. Finland had her constitution restored. Anti-Jewish laws were annulled. Plans were formed to draw up a new constitution to guarantee the gains of the Revolution, which, apparently, the peasants and soldiers gladly accepted. The speeches of President Wilson were read in Russia as the "gospel of a new era." At the same time the provisional government announced its determination to carry on the war more effectively than had been done under the tsar. Prince Lvov and Milyukov were ardent nationalists, who clung tenaciously to all the tsarist foreign policies, while the Socialists repudiated them. But to transform a vast empire from an autocracy into a constitutional government while waging a gigantic war was found to be an impossibility.

While these things were transpiring under the provisional government, local government throughout Russia passed into the hands

of committees, called *soviets*, composed of workingmen, soldiers and peasants, who were largely Social Revolutionists and Social Democrats, not in accord with the program of the moderate liberals in control at Petrograd. The Russian masses naturally gave their approval to the *soviets* because they were a system with which the people were familiar. The *soviets* demanded an economic and social, as well as a political, revolution. They insisted upon peace, likewise, while the provisional government desired to carry out the imperialistic policies of the tsar. An extra-legal All-Russian Congress of Soviets in Moscow laid down stringent conditions to the Entente Allies before they would consent to continue the war. In May the Petrograd Council of Workingmen's and Soldiers' Delegates, led by Cheidze and Kerensky, forced the reorganization of the provisional government, in which the Social Revolutionists now had three members and the Socialists three. This new ministry announced its intention to remain in the European conflict, but the radical members insisted upon "a peace without annexations, or indemnities, and based on the right of nations to decide their own affairs." This announcement gave the Entente Allies more concern than the loss of battles, and something akin to a panic occurred when they were asked to call a conference for the purpose of revising their imperialistic secret treaties. Kerensky, the conceited minister of war, exerted himself heroically and theatrically to galvanize the war-weary army into new life and sterner discipline.

The Russian people, in fact, were sick and tired of the war, about which they knew so little and in which they had lost more heavily than any of their allies. Moreover German propaganda was gladly received by the people and encouraged this sentiment in every possible way. The *soviets* and Socialists cried so loudly for peace that the army was demoralized by desertions and lack of discipline. Soldiers, under instructions from the national Council of Workingmen and Soldiers at Petrograd, began to elect their own officers. The peasants cared only for the distribution of the lands of the state and the nobles. The workingmen were demanding the right to control the factories themselves. The failure of the drive into Galicia, and the advance of the German army, forced Prince Lvov and the Constitutional Democrats in the ministry to resign. Kerensky on July 16 became the head of the Government of National Safety, and, in the midst of the prevailing disorder, virtual dictator. He still hoped to save Russia for the Entente cause by securing a restatement of the Allied war aims, and to hold the radicals and pacifists in check. But the forces arrayed against his program were too powerful. The armies were weakened by mutinies; disorders and anarchy spread over the nation; and the border states were clamoring for independence. The Entente Allies refused to renounce their imperialistic intentions, especially after the entrance of the United States assured them the victory. General Kornilov led an army against Petrograd in a

Kerensky régime

counter-revolution, but it proved abortive and for the time being helped Kerensky. Riga was captured by the Germans. Kerensky's project for a moderate democratic revolution failed. He fell from power on November 7, 1917, and the Provisional Government came to an end. The chance for a moderate revolution in Russia ended when Kerensky accepted the orders of France and England and attempted an offensive.

The Russian radicals were divided into two branches: (1) The Social Revolutionists, who were intensely nationalistic, advocated the merging of the large estates with the lands held by the peasant communes and urged the establishment of a government based on the local committees, or *soviets*, as the units. Naturally their program made a powerful appeal to the rural population. (2) The Social Democrats, whose ideas were borrowed from Germany, stressed the "class struggle," and believed that eventually the *proletariat* would destroy the capitalists and thus come to rule both Russia and the entire world. They had always opposed the alliance with France, because they believed that French capitalists had loaned Russia money merely to buy an efficient fighting machine.

The Social Democrats in Russia from the time of the Revolution of 1905 began to diverge into two groups: (1) The moderate minority, or Mensheviki, who believed in attaining their ends by education and gradual reforms rather than by revolution, were ready to coöperate with any other party to win their aims. (2) The aggressive majority, called the Bolsheviki, who wanted an immediate revolution — political, economic, and social — were willing to use force to realize their socialistic state. Because of their extreme views and violent practices, they had been excluded from the Provisional Government, and hence were free to make the most bitter attacks on it. Their two most conspicuous leaders were Nicolai Lenine, the son of a Russian school inspector, a college man of extraordinary mental acumen, a lawyer, an author of some note, and a revolutionist to the core, who had lived as an exile in Switzerland most of the time from 1900 to March, 1917; and Leon Trotsky, a Jew of the middle class, eloquent and forceful, who had been exiled to Siberia twice but escaped to live in America, England, and particularly western Europe until his return to Russia in May, 1917. Deprived of a voice in the new government, the Bolsheviki worked through the *soviets* in urging (1) the immediate confiscation of all the large estates; (2) state control of industry; (3) repudiation of the national debt; (4) operation of the factories by the workmen; (5) renunciation of all treaties made by the tsar; (6) immediate peace; (7) payment of the cost of the World War by an international fund; and (8) the restriction of the franchise to the industrial *proletariat*. The Bolsheviki, it should be remembered, used the *soviets* because they saw the tactical advantage of employing a political organ familiar to the people instead of a strange one. Lenin's slogan "All power to the

The Bolshevik Revolution

soviets" captured the peasant and laborer for the reason that they knew what a *soviet* was.

The more radical peasants of the Social Revolutionary party in the autumn of 1917 joined the Bolsheviki in attacking the moderate Socialists. As Kerensky's vacillating rule was discredited by its own evasions, political power was not so much seized by the Bolsheviki as forced upon them by the united strength of their rivals who hoped that their attempt to govern in the disorganized condition would destroy them. Trotsky won the presidency of the powerful Petrograd *soviet*. The Military Revolutionary Committee was formed, and bands of "Red Guards" were recruited to attack Kerensky's ministry. On the evening of November 6, the "Red Guards" occupied the public buildings of Petrograd. The next day all the ministers except Kerensky, who escaped, were placed under arrest. The All-Russian Congress of Soviets of 700 members, of whom a considerable majority were Bolsheviki, ratified the Revolution, and appointed the Council of People's Commissioners to rule Russia. Lenine became prime minister, Trotsky had control of foreign affairs, and Krylenko was put in command of the army. The third All-Russian Congress of Soviets proclaimed the "Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic." From the outset the Bolshevist government repudiated political democracy and was fundamentally a class dictatorship, since to rule it depended, like tsardom, not on the ballot but on force. When the elections to the National Constituent Assembly, held in November, 1917, by direct, universal, secret suffrage, returned a majority hostile to Bolshevism it was first postponed and then in January, 1918, dissolved as too "reactionary."

Numerically, the Communist party formed a minority of about 600,000 attempting to plant communism among the 125,000,000 people. Their enemies were kept under the closest surveillance; hostile newspapers were suppressed; and drastic measures were employed to enforce their will. They had no interest in a National Assembly and relied for their support upon the *soviet*, which probably had its origin in the Russian village. In the Russian Revolution of 1905 the *soviets* appeared more or less spontaneously as strike committees, and then were broken up by Witte. Early in 1917 they reappeared under a moderate Socialist influence. The Bolshevist leaders were quick to detect their possibilities and deliberately made them the basis of the new régime. The fifth All-Russian Congress of Soviets of 1,132 members at Moscow in July, 1918, adopted a novel constitution unlike any in the world for the Soviet Republic. The complicated governmental machinery consisted of (1) the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, which was composed of representatives from the urban *soviets* and the provincial congresses of *soviets*, as the "supreme power"; (2) an All-Russian Central Executive Committee of 200 members, elected by the Congress, as the "supreme legislative, executive, and controlling organ";

The Bolshevik system

(3) the Council of People's Commissars, heads of 18 departments, chosen by the Executive Committee; (4) county, provincial, and regional congresses, chosen indirectly by the people; and (5) the local *soviets*, city and rural, the former composed of delegates sent by the workers in the factories and the latter by representatives of the village meetings and country *soviets*. Thus geographical representation was displaced by "occupational representation." The right to vote and to hold office was given to all citizens over 18 years of age, who earned their living by productive labor and to soldiers and sailors of the *soviets*.

The constitution further decreed that "the division of the people into classes" was abolished; that "all private property" in land, forests, minerals, waters, railways, factories, mills, and banks ceased; that such sources of wealth became "national property"; and that the land was to be "apportioned among the husbandmen" according to "each one's ability to till it," the industries were to be turned over to the workmen under the Supreme Council of National Economy, and the banks were to be managed by the Workers' and Peasants' Government. The annulment of loans made by the tsar was approved. To eliminate the "parasitic strata of society," the "universal obligation to work" was proclaimed. "He shall not eat who does not work" was the national motto. "To eliminate all possibility of restoring the power of the exploiters," all toilers were to be armed, a "Red Army" was organized, and the propertied class was disarmed. Universal military training was introduced. The secret treaties with imperialistic powers were repudiated. Finland was granted independence, Russian troops were withdrawn from Persia, and Armenia was granted the right to self-determination. Neighboring peoples were invited to federate with the Soviet Republic. Freedom of conscience, expression, assembly, and publication were guaranteed to the "toiling masses." The church was separated from the state and the school from the church. "Full and general free education" was supplied to "the workers and the poorest peasantry." Full political rights were given to foreign workmen, and those who fled from religious or political persecution were given shelter. The red flag was adopted and with it a coat of arms consisting of "a red background on which a golden sickle and a hammer are placed and surrounded by a wreath, inscribed: Russian Socialist Soviet Federated Republic. Workers of the World, Unite!" Moscow became the capital. This government Lenine called an "immeasurably higher form of democracy" than any state had yet devised.

Lenine was elected president of the Council; Tchitcherin, commissar of foreign affairs; and Trotsky, commissar of the army and navy. From the day of their advent to power, the Bolsheviki endeavored to secure a general peace in order to be free to carry out their revolutionary program. Failing to end the World War, they signed an armistice with the Central Powers in the face of strong protests

from the Entente Allies. The treaty of peace made on March 4, 1918, under the dictation of the Central Powers, at Brest-Litovsk, recognized the independence of Poland, Finland, Esthonia, Livonia, Courland, Lithuania, Ukrainia, and Georgia — and Batum, Erivan, and Kars were ceded to Turkey. Thus tsarist Russia lost 25 per cent of her land and people, 35 per cent of her industries, and about 75 per cent of her coal and iron mines, and became a truer national state like that under Peter the Great. The Soviet Republic promised to stop all propaganda outside of their own state. Three supplementary agreements signed at Berlin left the new Republic at the mercy of her powerful military neighbor, obligated to economic arrangements favorable to German business men, and saddled with an indemnity of $1,500,000,000. The withdrawal of Russia from the war was regarded as a triumph for the Central Powers. The Entente Allies, eager to restore the eastern fighting front, charged the Bolsheviki with treason to the cause of civilization, and sought in various ways to overthrow them, even after the war itself had ended. The 100,000 Czecho-Slovak prisoners of war in Russia were encouraged to revolt. Counter-revolutions were supported, an economic boycott was imposed, and active military intervention began. In August, 1918, Entente troops, including Americans, captured Archangel, and another force landed at Vladivostok.

Attempts to overthrow the Bolsheviki

The Soviet Republic was opposed by (1) the supporters of the old régime; (2) the Constitutional Democrats, and (3) the moderate Socialists. These hostile forces, with support from the Entente Allies, attempted a series of counter-revolutions against the Bolsheviki: (1) Kolchak in the east; (2) Denikin in the south; (3) Yudenich in the north; (4) Wrangel from the southwest; and (5) the Franco-Greek invasion of the Ukraine and the French bombardment of Odessa. These internal foes called the "Whites" were suppressed with the Red Guards, terror, intimidation, imprisonment, confiscations, and death. The tsar and his family were assassinated in July, 1918. Special "Revolutionary Tribunals" were created to punish the anti-Bolshevists. Russia was thrown into a state of chaos by the Red Terror, on the one hand, and the White Terror, on the other. Butcheries and imprisonments without trial were the order of the day. The counter-revolutionary plots all collapsed, however, and only strengthened the grip of the Bolsheviki on the nation and won to their side many moderate Socialists and Liberals. The Entente blockade of Russian ports, which caused intense suffering and starvation, had the same effect. In like manner the Polish war, inspired, financed and in part officered by the French, did more to unite Russians previously opposed to the Bolshevist régime in support of it than any other factor. Before the end of 1920 all the Entente troops, except the Japanese in Eastern Siberia, were withdrawn. Peace was made by Russia with all the little neighboring states but only after much wrangling and some fierce fighting. By the summer of 1920

Great Britain, the United States, and Italy began an unofficial raising of the blockade, and the British recognized the new régime on condition that Bolshevist propaganda in India be stopped.

By 1921 the Soviet Republic seemed to be fairly well established in Russia and the next year the great powers of Europe invited Russia to participate in the international Economic Conference at Genoa. The Russians asked for formal recognition and for an international loan. The Allies insisted that Russia must first promise to pay a part of her old tsarist debts and to restore the confiscated property of foreigners. Unable to agree, settlement was deferred to later conferences. Meanwhile the new German Republic raised the prestige of Russia by entering into a trade treaty, which irritated the Entente Allies, particularly France, whose bankers had supplied Russia so lavishly with funds in the pre-war days. Up to date the numerous outstanding international problems involving Russia have not been adjusted, and new causes of friction have developed. Russia insisted that her interests entitled her to a participation in the settlement of the Near Eastern questions, and she sent unofficial delegates to the Lausanne Conference, one of whom on May 10, 1923, was assassinated in Switzerland. Great Britain threatened to break off trade relations unless Bolshevist agitation in India, Persia, and Afghanistan should cease, and compensation be made for the seizure of British fishing boats outside the three-mile limit.

The All-Russian Central Executive Committee on July 4, 1923, at Moscow approved a new federal constitution. It included the Soviet Republic, the Far Eastern Republic, the Ukraine, White Russia, and the Transcaucasian Republic. Other republics were invited to affiliate and on July 1, 1925, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics enumerated 36 members. The Central Executive Committee or Congress consisted of two houses — the Federal Council of 414 members on the basis of population and the Council of Nations of about 100 members representing the various states. The supreme governing power was in the hands of federal commissars. A Supreme Court modeled after that of the United States was created. This constitution was ratified on January 30, 1924, by the Second Soviet Congress. The fundamental socialistic ideas of the constitution of 1918 were perpetuated in the revised instrument. The federated republics had their own provincial governments.

The strength of the Communist party on February 14, 1925, was given at 700,000 "members" and "candidates" of whom 73,000 were women. The men in the Red Army were not included. It was said that there were also 900,000 "Young Communists." The party is managed by the Central Executive Committee of 52 members chosen annually. The Third (Red Communist) International on March 5, 1924, celebrated the fifth anniversary of its founding by Lenin.

By 1926 various degrees of recognition had been accorded Soviet

Russia by Germany, Great Britain, France, Italy, Greece, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Danzig, Esthonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Finland, Austria, Mexico, China and Japan.

The commissar of education reported in 1924 that there had been a general decline in education shown in a decrease of the number of schools and in attendance. In 1925 only 50 per cent of the children were receiving instruction. The national and local budget for education in 1924–25 was given as $192,000,000. The decree excluding students of the *bourgeois* class from the high schools and universities was repealed in 1925.

The Communist party members are the active political workers with definite roles in the political and economic structure of the state. They must go where sent by the party and carry out its wishes, and are not free agents. Millions of Russians, not party members, are in sympathy with the general program of the Communist party. If the Communist party were an organization in the American sense it might consist of 75,000,000 members.

Prospects of Soviet Russia

With the cessation of armed opposition within and military and economic intervention from without, a greater degree of political stability and industrial reorganization appeared in the Soviet Republic. Grave responsibilities moderated the Bolsheviki to such an extent that Socialists and some Liberals found it possible to work with them. Peasants insisted upon owning their own land and in 1921 the government gave a *de facto* recognition to private tenure and permitted the peasants to pay their taxes in kind. In 1925 they were allowed free trade and the right to accumulate property. Necessity also forced the government to call in experts to direct the most important industries, while private capitalists were allowed to lease factories, even though communism was retained as an ideal and the big undertakings were kept under state control, and to establish private banks. The new labor code was one of the most advanced in the world. It recognized the contractual relation between the employee and the employer, guarded the right to work, regulated the hours of labor, created labor exchanges, eliminated child labor, provided for the settlement of labor disputes through conciliation boards, and sought to make the workers the guardians of their own welfare by giving the trade-unions the responsibility of administering the labor laws. The serious discontent of the people with the militarism and tyranny of the "dictatorship of the *proletariat*" seemed to be gradually disappearing under the new labor laws and the efforts to improve the lot of the masses of the peasants, through more favorable economic treatment, and the spread of education among the ignorant lower classes. No doubt these transformations will continue until the Soviet Republic becomes materially modified. Eventually unification, peace, freedom, and democracy will triumph. Then Russia will take her place among the emancipated peoples of earth to play the great role destiny has in store for her. Today no country

is confronted with more serious problems of reconstruction. Her government must be stabilized and made to reflect the honest will of her people. Her industrial system must be rebuilt on the basis of justice and efficiency. Her people must be educated. Her social institutions must be developed in the direction of general welfare and equality. And her relations with the rest of the world must be laid on the foundations of trust and friendly coöperation.

Soviet Russia thus far has shown great progress in renouncing the imperialism of the tsarist régime. She has given up the capitulations in Turkey in common with other states; the Anglo-Persian agreement of 1907; her concessions in Persia and China; cancelled the Persian debt and Boxer indemnity; and made treaties with Persia and Afghanistan on a basis of equality.

No event since the French Revolution of 1789 has aroused such strong feelings throughout the world as the Bolshevist Revolution. The hostility of other states was accelerated by the Bolshevist propaganda to overthrow the established political, economic, and social order throughout the world. Bolshevist agents were sent out from Moscow to destroy capitalism and to plant communism everywhere. The misery and suffering left in the wake of the World War led many persons in other lands to turn their minds hopefully to the Russian experiment as the way to the new world order. Uprisings occurred in Germany, Austria, Hungary, Italy, and Asia. Reverberations were felt in France, Great Britain, the United States and other more stable parts of the earth. But nowhere outside of Russia has the movement won more than temporary success.

2. Changes in Germany

During the forty years of peace and unexampled economic prosperity, the German people had developed an unshakable confidence in their strength, particularly on its military side. This profound sense of self-sufficiency continued during the first years of the war, even the great majority of the Socialists supporting the government. But as time wore on and the hardships increased without a decision being reached, opposition to the government's policy began to be voiced. First the most radical Socialists, under the leadership of Karl Liebknecht, refused to vote war credits. Then they broke away from the party and established the Independent Socialist party, in distinction to the Majority Socialists. By 1917 the latter, joined by the Progressives and part of the Catholic Center, appeared in the ranks of the opposition. They fought the unrestricted submarine warfare, and the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, and centered their demands on peace without annexations or indemnities, on the basis of Wilson's Fourteen Points. At home they pressed for a revision of the constitution and the establishment of a liberal government with a responsible ministry.

Party alignment

By the autumn of 1918 the pressure on the government had become

so great that it was deemed advisable to yield, especially as there was no longer any hope of a military victory. The appointment of Prince Max of Baden as chancellor in October, 1918, was practically a victory of the liberal wing, but before the opposition parties could put their ideas into practice the situation was entirely changed by the Revolution which broke out at Kiel and other places in the first days of November, 1918. This movement was almost entirely the work of the Independent Socialists and the Communists, supported by Russian gold. But the liberal parties realized that the die had been cast, and while they had not particularly advocated a republic they now accepted it, in the hope of being able to seize control and thus save the country from communism as well as from militarism.

The chancellor, Prince Max, on November 9 installed Frederick Ebert, a former harness-maker and a Socialist leader, as the acting head of the state and withdrew from Berlin. The various groups of Socialists then formed the Council of People's Commissioners as the head of the revolutionary government, which first formed a new cabinet continuing Ebert at its head, abolished the harsh war-time restrictions, and on November 16 decreed a provisional Republic. In a wave of joy and disorder the imperial emblems were torn down. The princes and kings of the small states fled, or were deposed, and by the end of the month every state had a republican form of government. "The revolution has gained a glorious and almost bloodless victory," said Chancellor Ebert. Workers' and Soldiers' Councils were organized all over Germany in imitation of what had occurred in Russia. The new government steered a middle course between the reactionaries, who wished to continue the Hohenzollern monarchy, and the Sparticists, who desired to copy the Bolsheviki in eliminating the capitalists and landlords and in setting the rich and the intellectuals to work. Chancellor Ebert, and his successor, Scheidemann both hoped in this way to create an orderly democracy, hence both groups were put down by force after much street-fighting and confusion. The Imperial Parliament was dissolved, and in January, 1919, a new National Assembly was elected in secret ballot by all Germans over 19 years of age on the basis of proportional representation. More than 30,000,000 votes were cast for the 421 delegates. The Majority Socialists won 163 representatives; the Center (Catholic), 90; the Democrats, 75; the Conservatives, 42; the Independent Socialists, 22; the German People's Party, 22; and minor parties 7. Of the members, 36 were women and only 45 had served in the Reichstag. The election proved that the German people wanted an orderly Republic, free from monarchy on the one hand, and from Bolshevism, on the other. At last the nation that had failed to set up a popular government in 1848 assumed sovereign power.

The National Assembly met at Weimar on February 6, 1919, and four days later an act was passed which established a provisional form

of government, consisting of a president, chancellor, and ministry responsible to the Assembly. On February 12 the Majority Socialists formed a coalition with the Center and the Democrats and officially elected Ebert as provisional president. A new cabinet consisting of Scheidemann as chancellor and twelve ministers was appointed. While these things were transpiring, the Sparticists or Communists of Berlin, sought to abolish the Assembly and to set up a Dictatorship of the Councils. Local risings occurred all over Germany, and on April 7 a Soviet Republic was proclaimed in Munich. But the movement was suppressed after many encounters in which hundreds were slain and the Congress of Workers' Councils agreed to recognize the Assembly. The first trying ordeal of the Assembly was the ratification of the harsh Versailles Treaty on June 23. Then it turned its attention to a discussion of the new constitution, which was approved on July 31 by a vote of 262 to 75 and on August 11 went into effect.

The German Republic

The constitution created a federal, republican German Commonwealth (Reich) of 18 states, based on the will of the people. It provided for a president above 35 years of age elected for a term of seven years "by the whole German people," eligible for reëlection, and subject to removal by a popular referendum. Extensive powers were placed in his hands in representing the nation in foreign affairs, in the appointment of civil and military officials, as supreme commander of the army and navy, and in exercising pardoning authority. He could make alliances and treaties with the consent of the Reichstag. War and peace were subject to national law. The national ministry consisted of the chancellor, appointed by the president from the majority group in the Reichstag, and his associates recommended by him. Upon losing the confidence of the Reichstag, the ministers were to be replaced by others. The national legislature was made up of two houses: (1) the Reichsrat, which represented the states on the basis of one member for each million people, except that each state should "have at least one vote" and no state should have "more than two-fifths of the members"; and (2) the Reichstag, which was "composed of the representatives of the German people" elected for four years "by the universal, equal, direct and secret suffrage of all men and women over twenty years of age, according to the principle of proportional representation." It chose its own officers, made its own rules, was obliged to meet annually, and could demand the presence of the chancellor or any minister. Its members had free transportation on the German railways and received compensation. Bills might be introduced by the ministry or by members of the Reichstag, and several means were provided for subjecting laws to a referendum of the people. The Reichsrat had a suspensive veto. The constitution could be amended by legislative action. Justice was administered by judges "appointed for life," who were "independent and responsible only to law."

The new German Constitution

The provision of the "Fundamental Rights and Duties of Germans" was the most advanced and comprehensive found in any modern constitution. All were declared "equal before the law," and men and women were recognized as possessing "the same civil rights and duties." Privileges based on law, birth, or rank were abolished, and the conferring of titles of nobility was forbidden. Freedom of assembly, association, opinion, publication, residence, emigration, occupation, person, and ownership of property was guaranteed. Racial minorities were protected. It was the duty of the state "to maintain the purity, health, and social welfare of the family" and to protect and educate the children. Large families and mothers were entitled to state aid. "Complete liberty of belief and conscience" was assured, religious societies were treated like any other organization, and as "public corporations" were authorized "to levy taxes." Sundays were protected as days "of rest and spiritual uplift." The education of the young in art and science was made free, compulsory, and civic by teachers who were state officials. In all schools efforts should be made "to develop moral education, civic sentiment, and personal and vocational efficiency in the spirit of the German national character and of international conciliation." Every pupil at the end of his compulsory schooling was to "receive a copy of the constitution." The economic life was organized on the "principles of justice" and "a decent standard of living." While the right to private property was recognized, its owner must use it to "serve the public good." The state was to distribute the soil so as to assure to "every German a healthful habitation," and reserved the right to "socialize" any private economic enterprise. Labor was to be given a uniform code of laws. State insurance for the sick, injured, unemployed, and aged, and for the protection of maternity was to be provided. Efforts were to be made to obtain for "the working class of the world . . . a universal minimum of social rights." Workers and employers should coöperate "in the entire field of economic development of the forces of production" and, to this end, were given legal representation in Factory Workers' Councils, in District Workers' Councils and in the Economic Council of the Commonwealth for the "execution of the laws of socialization." The Economic Council had the right to present bills for this purpose to the ministry, or the Reichstag. The postal, telegraphic and telephonic systems were placed in the hands of the Commonwealth, and authority was given for state-ownership of the railroads and waterways.

The constitution required that all states within the Commonwealth must have republican constitutions. In the free cities of Bremen, Hamburg, and Lübeck, little change was necessary. In other German states, the princes either abdicated or were deposed, and republics established with model constitutions on a democratic basis. A legislature of one house was elected in the smaller states,

and a cabinet chosen whose head was president of the state, after the Swiss model. Baden provided for the use of the initiative and referendum. In Württemberg one fifth of the voters might demand a popular vote on the dissolution of the legislature. In Prussia a legislature of two houses was created: (1) the *Landtag* chosen for a four-year term by "the entire people" above 24 years of age on the basis of proportional representation; and (2) the *Staatsrat* selected by the provincial diets. A minister-president responsible to the popular house and appointed by it served as the executive. In other respects the new Prussian government was modern and liberal.

The problems confronting the German Commonwealth were most serious. The new government had to suppress stubborn opposition at home from two sources — the autocratic Junkers and the radical Communists — but both of them were held in check and forced to bow to the republican régime. In the next place, it had to comply with the drastic terms of the Treaty of Versailles which went into force on January 10, 1920. A farewell was addressed to "the hundreds of thousands of members of the German nation" who were separated from the Republic. The army was reduced to 100,000 men, and the navy ceased to exist as a fighting force. A financial budget had to be prepared to care for the internal debt of 220 billion marks and to run the national government. The whole industrial life of the nation had to be reorganized on a new basis on account of the loss of valuable coal mines and iron ore fields. And finally in May, 1921, Germany agreed to pay a war indemnity of $33,000,000,000 distributed over a series of years, including a fixed annuity of $500,000,000 and a variable annuity of 26 per cent of the yearly value of German exports payable in materials such as coal and building materials. The general effect of the military defeat and the Treaty of Versailles was the break-down of the currency. The mark fell in value, the country was flooded with paper money, prices increased and the value of property and income depreciated.

Economic conditions after the war

The mark steadily declined and economic chaos resulted in Germany. The Reparations Commission reported that by January, 1922, Germany had paid in cash and kind about $1,622,000,000 on her bill, but the German White Book claimed that up to March, 1922, $11,400,000,000 had been turned over to the Entente Allies. Germany protested her inability to pay the reparations bill assessed against her, and demanded modifications. In a series of conferences the British and Italian governments were disposed to show moderation, while France insisted upon the fulfillment of the letter of the Treaty of Versailles. In August, 1922, Germany defaulted in her payments, and asked for a moratorium of two years, a reduction in the coal deliveries, and an international loan. When the Entente Allies could arrive at no agreement on the penalties to be inflicted upon the Germans for their defalcation, France and Belgium, with the approval of Italy, by military force on January 11, 1923, seized the Ruhr

Basin, the heart of German industry. The Germans adopted the policy of "passive resistance" and appealed to the public opinion of the world, which on the whole condemned the French course. On May 2, 1923, the German government proposed (1) to pay $7,500,000,000 in cash and kind by 1931; (2) to supplement what Germany could pay by an international loan; (3) to give "special guarantees for the payments offered"; and (4) to "leave the whole reparation problem to the decision of an international commission" in accordance with the suggestion of the American government. The British government suggested a joint Allied reply, but France and Belgium refused the British offer, and greeted the German "bargain" with scorn.

Finally, however, both the Germans and French saw the necessity of reaching an agreement. The policy of passive resistance was given up, and the French consented to the institution of the Dawes Committee to investigate methods by which Germany could meet her obligations. Its report was submitted in May, 1924, and was accepted by both the Allies and Germany at a conference held in London in July.

The Dawes Plan

The plan called for an increasing scale of payments, beginning with 250 million dollars annually and increasing within four years to a minimum of 625 million. After that the payments were to be determined by an index of prosperity. Germany was to be given a loan of 200 million dollars immediately, and the reparations payments were to be derived from taxes, railway income and industrial profits, which were to be mortgaged. France and Belgium were to relinquish economic control of the occupied territory and Germany was to be given full economic liberty. Costs of armies of occupation and credits for deliveries in kind were to be credited to the total annual cash payments. Railway bonds totally 2¾ billion dollars and industrial debentures of 1½ billion were to be delivered to the Reparations Commission and the income therefrom was to cover a third of the annual payments. It was provided that a bank of issue be established to stabilize the currency.

This plan was designed to give Germany a chance to recover, by suggesting an easy five-year period of reconstruction, followed by a second five-year period during which Germany was to pay only one half of the returns of her increased prosperity. The plan admitted payments within Germany and in German currency, thus enabling her to stabilize the currency and balance the budget by increased taxation. Only such amounts would be transformed into foreign currency as could be so changed without endangering the stability of the currency.

The legislation necessary to put the Dawes Plan into effect was passed by the German Reichstag in August, and in October the loan promised under the agreement was successfully floated in Europe and America. Since that time the economic situation has become more stable and the return to the gold standard has been carried out.

But the Dawes Plan led to violent opposition on the part of the extreme nationalists. The elections of December 7, 1924, did not materially change the existing party alignment, but the issue of monarchy or republic was brought to the fore more prominently than ever, and the refusal of the Allies to evacuate Cologne in January, 1925, further strengthened the hands of the nationalist group, which insisted on participation in the government. Finally, on January 15, 1925 a new cabinet was formed in which the nationalists were represented and the Socialists excluded. The new government asserted its loyalty to the Republic, but the elections for a new president, following the death of Herr Ebert on February 28, 1925, resulted in a victory of the nationalist candidate Field Marshal von Hindenburg, 78 years of age. On May 12 he was sworn in, after a huge monarchical ovation tendered him on his arrival in Berlin. The constitutional question gradually became the all-absorbing issue in German politics.

Election of Hindenburg as President

Perhaps the most significant experiment of the German Commonwealth was made in "functional representation." During the Revolution of 1918 there arose all over Germany Workers' and Soldiers' Councils, which held national congresses in that year and the next. Indeed these Councils produced the Revolution, and then permitted its fruits to pass out of their hands. The new constitution sought to compromise with them by legalizing local, district, and national Workers' Councils. In April and May, 1920, members of the Factory Workers' Councils were elected, and were soon in successful operation. The National Economic Council with 326 members representing all kinds of business from farming to banking met in June, 1920, to develop a program of action. Although its power is largely advisory, it has already proposed important social and economic laws. The Councils supply machinery through which employers and workers may have the ear of the national government to adjust all kinds of industrial and general welfare questions.

3. The Dissolution of Austria-Hungary

Like the Hohenzollerns, the Hapsburg house was driven from power by defeat in the World War. The dissolution of the Dual Monarchy had long been predicted to take place at the first serious crisis. With the crash of the Central Powers, Emperor Charles was deposed, and a few months later fled from the country. Austria-Hungary fell to pieces and four states resulted from the dissolution — Austria, Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia, and Jugo-Slavia.

A Provisional National Assembly, composed of members of the old lower house, met in Austria on October 30, 1918, to make terms of peace with the victors. On November 11, Emperor Charles renounced his share in the government but not his crown, and the next day the new Republic of Austria was proclaimed, a temporary cabinet was appointed, and laws to meet the new conditions were enacted. A National Constituent Assembly was elected on February 16,

1919, on the basis of universal franchise, with the Social Democrats and Christian Socialists in a large majority. This body, which met March 4, after concluding the treaty of St. Germain with the Entente Allies on September 10, proceeded to draw up the permanent constitution, which went into effect on October 1, 1920.

The new Austrian Constitution

It declared Austria to be a federal, democratic Republic, composed of eight autonomous states. Federal citizenship was based on state citizenship. "Privileges, based upon birth, rank, class, or religious belief" were abolished. The powers of the "Federal State" were more extensive than those of the national government in the United States. In addition to the ordinary functions of government, provision was made for a "labor law" to protect the workers, for social and contract insurance, for public health, for the control of foodstuffs, for the care of the unfortunates, for land reforms, and for popular education. The Federal Legislature consisted of two houses: the *Nationalrat*, elected by all the people according to the principle of proportional representation for a four-year term; and the *Bundesrat*, chosen by the Landtags of the eight states. As in France, these two houses "in a joint public sitting" selected the federal president by secret ballot for a term of four years, with the privilege of reëlection. The federal ministry exercised the "highest administrative functions," and was elected by and responsible to the *Nationalrat*. The administration of justice was prescribed by federal law, and capital punishment was abolished, but a Supreme Constitutional Court was established by the constitution. Of all the new constitutions growing out of the post-war conditions, that of Austria was the most elaborate document.

On October 17, 1920, at the first elections under the new constitution, the Christian Socialists and Social Democrats won a large majority, and on December 9 the two houses elected Dr. Michael Hainisch as the first president. The new cabinet represented the Christian Socialists. The Republic of Austria had an area less than that of Portugal and a population of 6,500,000, of whom 2,000,000 lived in the capital city of Vienna alone. On the verge of financial bankruptcy, and cut off from the sea, the plight of Austria was pitiable. The peace treaty took away from Austria her most valuable mines and industries, and reduced her army to 30,000 men. Lack of employment and food brought the people to the brink of starvation. The sentiment of the people was in favor of annexation to Germany but that was expressly forbidden by the Paris Peace Conference. The terrible conditions in Austria induced the League of Nations to take up the economic rehabilitation of the nation in 1922. An international loan of $130,000,000, based on Austrian railroads and custom receipts and guaranteed by some of the European powers, was authorized. Since 1922 conditions have been gradually improving although the complete recovery of the country still appears distant.

Plight of Austria after the war

King Charles abdicated the Hungarian throne in November, 1918, and the revolutionary forces proclaimed Hungary an independent People's Republic with Count Karolyi as provisional president. A Provisional National Assembly, elected by universal suffrage, replaced the old legislature. An attempt was made in 1919 to win over the support of the peasants by a law to divide up among them all estates above 900 acres. In March of that year, however, the Communists overthrew the rule of Count Karolyi and set up a Soviet Republic under Bela Kun, who had been trained at Moscow in Bolshevist propaganda. An era of terror was instituted, and a complete economic revolution resulted. Private property was taken by the state; trade became a national monopoly; factories were taken over by councils of workmen; and all land was confiscated. Encouraged by the Entente Allies, Rumanian troops invaded the country, overthrew the Bolshevist régime, and plundered the land most shamefully from peasant's hut to palace. When they withdrew, the Hungarian National Assembly in 1920 made Admiral Horthy regent.

Hungary since 1918

4. The War and the New National States of Northern and Central Europe

A. *Introductory*

One of the most important results of the World War was the political emergence and independence of several new national states which had previously been suppressed or denied a separate political existence or the full realization of their national aspirations. These new national states include the Finnish peoples of Finland, Esthonia and northern Livonia; the Letts and Lithuanians of the Baltic provinces of southern Livonia, Courland and their hinterland; the Poles of former Russia, Prussia and Austria; the Ruthenians of the Ukraine, and the Czecho-Slovaks of Bohemia and Moravia.

B. *The Finnish Peoples*

The northernmost of these suppressed national groups were the peoples of Finland, Esthonia and northern Livonia. For six centuries Finland was an integral part of the Swedish Kingdom. In 1809 Sweden ceded all of Finland to Russia. During the six centuries of union with Sweden, the country had been subjected to a social, political and economic development which had made it an integral part of the Scandinavian group of states. By 1809 Finland enjoyed practically independent political life and institutions, although the country was naturally governed by the laws common to the Swedish kingdom.

Union with Sweden

Upon becoming united to Russia, Finland was given guarantees of complete internal political and cultural autonomy. The Diet was granted complete independence in governing the country according to existing laws; no attempt was made to incorporate the country

Acquisition by Russia

politically in the Russian Empire, except as regards the sphere of foreign relations. The autonomy thus established continued, generally speaking, till the eighteen-nineties, when the advocates of Pan-Slavism and Russification induced Nicholas II to extend these policies to Finland. An imperial *ukase* was issued in February, 1899, whereby the Finnish constitution was swept aside. The passive resistance to this and kindred measures which appeared had no other effect upon the policy of Russification than the persecution of leading Finns, many of whom were compelled to leave their country for other lands, whence they continued to labor for the defeat of the policies of Plehve, Bobrikov and other Russian officials. On the eve of the Russo-Japanese War it seemed that Governor-General Bobrikov would succeed in getting dictatorial powers which would have enabled him to disregard completely the Finnish constitution and Diet. But the outbreak of the war with Japan and the subsequent revolution in Russia compelled the tsar to restore the constitution and to consent to the many liberal political reforms proposed by the Finns. Among these was the establishment, in 1906, of a single chamber Diet of 200 members in place of the antiquated Parliament in which representation by estates had prevailed, and the granting of the right to vote to women as well as men. However, a revival of Russification after 1908 precipitated new difficulties and a disregard of the rights of Finland which seemed to suggest, at the time of the outbreak of the World War, that no distant future would witness a complete abrogation of the constitution and a final political amalgamation of the country with the Russian Empire.

Finland under Russian rule

The World War brought with it martial law and the practical cessation of ordinary governmental agencies. The high-handed rule of the Russian *gendarmes* and military officials was checked only in 1917 when the Russian Revolution broke out. The Russian Provisional Government withdrew most of the more important officials from Finland in March. During the spring and summer months the whole government was purged of its Russian elements and on December 6, 1917, the Finnish declaration of independence was issued by the Provisional Government. The Bolshevist government recognized the independence of Finland on December 27, and Sweden, France and Germany did likewise in the following month. Other recognitions followed later.

Finland during the war

Even before the declaration of independence was issued, it was becoming evident that internal difficulties were brewing in the country. Certain extreme radicals considered the time ripe for the establishment, in close coöperation with the Russian Bolshevik government, of a Socialist Republic on the Russian pattern. Taking advantage of the presence of tens of thousands of Russian soldiers who had refused to leave the country after the March Revolution, and receiving guns and munitions from Russia, resistance by force was offered by the radical elements to the Svinhufvud government.

Movement for Independence

The civil war which ensued broke out in January, 1918. Most of southern Finland fell into the hands of the revolutionaries, while the northern part of the country gave effective assistance to General G. Mannerheim, a former Finnish officer in the Russian Army who had undertaken the suppression of the rebellion. The difficulty of saving south Finland from destruction at the hands of the revolutionaries led to negotiations for foreign aid. Sweden was approached but refused to act, partly because of English pressure. Germany, however, was induced to send an expedition under the command of General Rüdiger von der Goltz, who landed in Hango on March 1. The German troops ousted the revolutionaries from Helsingfors on March 13, and by the middle of April the frightful Civil War was brought to a close by the combined efforts of the Finnish and German soldiers. The latter were withdrawn in December, upon the defeat of the Central Powers and the conclusion of the armistice.

The first regular elections were held in March, 1919. The composition of the Diet, which was to make provision for a permanent government, was as follows: 80 Social Democrats, 42 Agrarians, 28 Coalitionists, 26 Progressives, 22 Swedish Nationalists, and 2 Representatives of the Christian Workers' Party. It assembled on April 1 and framed a new democratic, republican constitution which was put into operation on July 17. The constitution vested the sovereign power in the people and subordinated the president, who is chosen by indirect election for a term of six years, to the Diet by denying him the veto power. The Diet is elected for three years by universal, direct and equal suffrage. The constitution included special provisions for the benefit of the Swedish speaking population of the country (who constitute about ten per cent of the population) by establishing Finnish and Swedish as the national languages of the Republic. It also guaranteed individual liberties and established ministerial responsibility. The first president, K. J. Stahlberg, chosen by the Diet on July 15, 1919, was succeeded by the present incumbent in office, L. K. Relander, in February 1925. The area of the Republic is 145,000 square miles and its population, 3,360,000, of whom more than 95 per cent are Lutherans.

Government of Finland today

Since 1919, Finland has added greatly to the body of social and economic legislation which was considerable even before the war. The agrarian problem was partly solved by the enactment of a law in 1918 for the redemption of leasehold properties, whereby about 50,000 independent freehold properties had been created by 1922. It was supplemented by additional legislation in 1921 and by "Lex Kallio," passed in October, 1922. By the latter law in particular, the agrarian question seems to be satisfactorily solved.

In the field of foreign relations, Finland has been able to avoid clashes with her neighbors, especially since 1921. The war with Russia was brought to a close by the Peace of Dorpat on November 14, 1920 whereby Russia recognized Finland's independence while

the latter had to renounce all claims to East Carelia; the district was granted local autonomy. A revolt broke out in East Carelia in the fall of 1921 because of Russia's failure to fulfill the treaty provisions relative to that region. Finland sympathized with the Carelians and appealed to the League of Nations which submitted the question to the Permanent Court of International Justice in April, 1923. Russia being a non-member of the League refused to recognize the competency of the Court, and the Court refused to submit an opinion in the case. The Carelian problem, while at present unsolved, is not likely to disturb seriously the relations between the two states. Relations with Sweden were temporarily marred by the controversy over the Aland islands which Sweden claimed in 1918. The difficulty was finally settled by the League of Nations in 1921. Finland's sovereignty over the islands was recognized and Finland undertook to demilitarize the archipelago. Since 1921, relations with Sweden, Denmark and Norway have served to bring the four states of northern Europe into effective friendly coöperation, as is suggested by the numerous official and non-official inter-Scandinavian conferences which have been held every year, and more especially, by the arbitration treaties concluded by these states in 1924.

Foreign relations

The history of the Esthonians prior to the World War is a long story of conquest and suppression by foreigners. The collapse of Sweden's power in the eighteenth century enabled Peter the Great to take possession of the Baltic provinces, and by the Peace of Nystad, Esthonia was ceded to Russia. Under Russian rule the condition of the people rapidly became worse, and despite prolonged efforts to effect much needed reforms, it was not till 1819 that serfdom was nominally abolished in Esthonia and Livonia. By the close of the nineteenth century, however, some improvement had been brought about despite the opposition both of the aristocratic Baltic barons, who constituted the upper class, and of the Russian government. The provinces broke out in revolt during the Russian Revolution of 1905, but nothing was gained thereby, for the Russian punitive expeditions had little difficulty in putting down the uprising.

History of Esthonia

The World War and the Russian Revolution in 1917 brought unexpected relief. The Russian Provisional Government sanctioned, on March 30, 1917, the convocation of an Esthonian Diet and thus virtually granted Esthonia the right of self-government. The Diet assembled in July and declared itself the supreme power in the country until the convocation of a Constituent Assembly. At its last meeting on November 28, 1917, the Diet created an Executive Committee which was entrusted with full powers to deal with the situation in the country. The Committee declared Esthonia an independent state on February 24, 1918. This independence was hardly more than nominal for several months, for the cessation of hostilities on the Eastern front enabled the Germans to occupy the country by the close of February. Only after the Allied victory was the Esthonian

Independence

Provisional Government able to assume control, in November. Its first task was to defend the country against the Bolsheviks who began an offensive against Esthonia in the closing days of November, 1918. The war lasted for about a year and peace was finally made on February 2, 1920, whereby Esthonia's independence was recognized. Simultaneously a war was fought against the German *Landwehr* who were ousted with the aid of the Allies in July, 1919.

During these struggles, a Constituent Assembly met on April 23, 1919. Its labors were completed June 15, 1920, when it passed a new constitution which established the Republic of Esthonia. The single chamber Diet (Riigikogu) consists of 100 members, elected for three years by universal, direct, equal, and secret suffrage. The president, who is called the "Head of the State" is subordinated to the Diet and has no veto power. He is elected for no specific term, and remains in office only while enjoying the confidence of the Diet. The supreme judicial power is vested in the State Court of Justice elected by the Diet. The present government, elected in August, 1923, has experienced great difficulties in dealing with the existing dozen or more political parties. The chief parties obtained in 1923 the following representation in the Diet: Socialists 15, Labor 12, People's Party 8, Agrarians 23. The area of the Republic is 18,354 square miles and the population, according to the census of 1922, 1,107,393.

Government and parties

Esthonia's foreign policy has enabled the country to maintain peaceful relations with her neighbors. Since 1920, Esthonia has been active in lending support to the establishment of an alliance between Finland and the three Baltic states, Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia. In March, 1922 these states (except Lithuania) and Poland concluded in Warsaw a defensive alliance, designed to weld the participants into a workable political unit in respect to their foreign policies. The treaty was ratified by all the states except Finland which thus prevented the realization of the alliance. However, Esthonia concluded a treaty with Latvia on November 1, 1923 which provided for a customs union and established a defensive alliance. In general, the relations between these two states have brought them into close coöperation along many lines of economic and political action.

Foreign policy

C. *The Letts and Lithuanians*

Living next to the Esthonians are the Letts and the Lithuanians who inhabit the Baltic provinces of southern Livonia and Courland and their hinterland. The Letts dwell in the Baltic coast region and the Lithuanians in the adjacent inland districts. While the Letts and Lithuanians are physically identical and linguistically and culturally closely allied, their history has been at least slightly different. By the Treaty of Nystad in 1721 Livonia was ceded by Sweden to Russia and Courland was obtained by the third partition of Poland. Lithuania constituted the major portion of Poland which went to

Early history

Russia in the partitions from 1772 to 1795. Until 1876 it was allowed a considerable amount of cultural autonomy, but after that date the Russification policy was pursued with the usual result of only increasing the national sentiment of the Lithuanians.

Racially the Letts and Lithuanians are identical, both being branches of the same primordial Nordic race from which the Teutons and Finns were also differentiated. The Lithuanian language is one of the most interesting in Europe, being the best preserved representative of the so-called "Aryan" type.

Latvia

The history of the area included in contemporary Latvia, with the exception of Latgellia, is characterized by the same general development noted above in the case of Esthonia. Similarly, also, Latvia's independence was made possible by the World War and its results. Most of the country was occupied by the Germans from 1915 to 1918. The defeat of the Central Powers saved the Letts from the results of an attempt to include them in the contemplated Baltic principality under German control, although troubles with the Germans came to an end only in 1919. The Russian Revolution created additional difficulties, culminating in a war between Latvia and the Bolsheviks which was brought to a close by the Peace of Riga in August, 1920, whereby Russia recognized Latvia's independence. While these chaotic conditions prevailed there appeared, with Allied and Esthonian help, the Provisional Government headed by K. Ulmanis. The Latvian Republic was proclaimed by a national council on November 18, 1918. The Latvian Constituent Assembly adopted a constitution for the Republic on February 15, 1922 which became operative on November 7 of the same year. It provided for a single chamber Diet (the Saeima) of 100 representatives, chosen by universal secret and proportional suffrage, for a period of three years. The president, elected by the Diet for a term of three year, is denied the veto power and is thus subordinated to the representatives of the people. The population of the republic is about 1,850,000 of whom more than one half are Lutherans. The area of the country is approximately 25,000 square miles or the size of the state of West Virginia, and the population in 1924 was about 2,000,000.

Perhaps the most important aspect of the internal development of Latvia is the Land Act of September 16, 1920. It provided for the transfer of all large estates to the state; management by the state of some 3,500,000 acres of forest land; and liquidation of the large agricultural enterprises. The Act made possible the allotment of about 100,000 family holdings on tillable land to landless agricultural laborers and other needy persons. No compensation was awarded to the former landowners who were left with a maximum of 50 hectares; but a small indemnity was granted them in 1923 for live stock and implements.

Having become a part of Russia as the result of the partitions of Poland in the eighteenth century, Lithuania became subjected to a

vigorous policy of Russification in the nineteenth. Russian law was introduced in 1840; the University of Vilna and most secondary schools were closed; and in 1864, at the very time when serfdom was abolished, the publication of Lithuanian books and newspapers was forbidden. The Russian Revolution of 1905 brought temporary relief. Freedom of the press was once more restored and individual liberties guaranteed, but these concessions were nullified by the renewed Russification policy after 1908. The World War had barely commenced when the movement for Lithuanian independence was begun. Lithuanians abroad met at various conferences for the purpose of propagating the idea, and after the downfall of Russia, German attempts to subordinate Lithuanian agitations to a scheme for the creation of a Lithuanian principality only stimulated these efforts. The Lithuanian representatives in the Russian Duma adopted a resolution demanding independence on February 21, 1917. In November the Supreme Lithuanian Council demanded a free, independent Lithuania, which was formally declared on February 16, 1918. Difficulties with the Poles, who attempted to include Lithuania in the new state of Poland, prevented the establishment of stable government until 1920, when a Constituent Assembly convened on May 15 to draft a constitution. M. Stulginskis was elected temporary president of Lithuania in June of that year, and was elected president for another term in February, 1923. The new constitution was adopted on August 1, 1922. It provided for a single chamber Parliament (the Seimas), elected for three years by universal, direct and secret suffrage. The Seimas elects the president whose term is three years and who has merely a suspensive veto upon legislation. The population of the country is about 2,250,000 and its area approximately 20,000 square miles.

Russification of Lithuania

Independence

The acquisition of Memel and the Vilna controversy with Poland were the two outstanding items in Lithuania's foreign relations after 1920. Vilna, the ancient capital of the new state; was occupied by the Poles in 1920. This forcible seizure and retention by Poland of the capital led to interminable trouble between the two states, and up to the present time (1926) the Lithuanians have refused to acknowledge the legality of Poland's actions, although a decision of the Council of Ambassadors on March 15, 1922, confirmed Poland's rights to Vilna and its district. Memel, on the other hand, was desired by the Lithuanians because it afforded their only outlet to the Baltic sea. Germany had surrendered the city to the Allies in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of Versailles. The Allies had promised to hand the city over to Lithuania but failed to do so despite Lithuania's repeated requests. Acting in the Polish manner, the Lithuanians took possession of Memel by armed force, in 1923, leaving it to the powers to recognize the accomplished fact. The seizure was later recognized by the Allies with certain reservations in favor of Polish trade.

Foreign relations

Lithuania also has enacted important land legislation. The land reform was accomplished by the law passed on February 15, 1922. The act affected 2,500,000 acres and 3,000 landowners and contemplated the establishment of some 35,000 new holdings. The maximum amount of land retained by the landowners was fixed at 80–120 acres; provision was made for compensation, but at pre-war prices.

D. *The Poles*

Of the nations freed by the war Poland can, perhaps, claim the most notable and romantic past. Aside from non-Polish elements, it once included Russian Poland, Posen, East and West Prussia, Silesia, and Galicia.

Partitions of Poland

The first partition of Poland among Prussia, Austria, and Russia in 1772, while unjustified on the part of the partitioning powers, can stir little sympathy, but not so with the second and third partitions in 1793 and 1795. In the twenty-one years that had intervened, the Poles had eliminated many of the fatal economic and political weaknesses that had previously endangered their national existence and had given promising evidence of being on the eve of a far-reaching political renaissance, but the avaricious tsarina, Catherine II, would tolerate no strong Slavic state obstructing Russian contact with the west and she arranged the partitions of 1793 and 1795 which terminated the political independence of Poland. The national hopes of the Poles were temporarily revived by Napoleon's creation of the Grand Duchy of Warsaw, in 1807. Still more promising was the establishment, in November of 1815, of a Kingdom of Poland by the then liberal tsar, Alexander I. This embraced much of the old Kingdom of Poland and was favored with the most liberal political constitution then in existence in Europe, but the Poles desired complete political independence and could not resist the contagion of the revolutionary movement that swept over Europe in 1830. Their revolt was speedily suppressed and the short-lived Kingdom was united with Russia. Encouraged by the growth of nationalism in Germany and Italy and by the attitude of Napoleon III, the Poles made one last desperate attempt in 1863 to obtain their freedom. This rebellion was crushed with even greater ease than the revolt of thirty-three years earlier, and a most brutal and thorough-going punishment was meted out to the gallant rebels. That policy of Russification then began, by means of which the Russians tried without avail to crush the national aspirations of their Polish subjects.

The one extenuating compensation which the Poles enjoyed after 1863 was the fact that the coming of the Industrial Revolution to Russia made Poland the center of Russia's economic life. That part of the Polish nation which was included within the Kingdom of Prussia — a part of upper Silesia, Posen, West Prussia and the Masurian district of East Prussia — met with oppression only less severe

than that which their kinsmen received from Russia. But the rigorous religious, educational, and agrarian policy of Bismarck and Bülow only served to stir the resentment of the Poles and to reanimate their national spirit. Only in Austrian Galicia were the Poles accorded that degree of autonomy and liberal treatment which made them partially satisfied to dwell in political subjection to another state.

The Poles are a branch of the Slavic division of the Alpine race, but are less broad-headed than their Czech and Slovak neighbors on the south, or even the Russians to the east. Their contact with so many different peoples has caused a considerable prevalence of racial intermixture. Their language is a distinct western Slavic dialect. In religion over three fourths of the Poles are Roman Catholic. The only notable exception is to be found in the three hundred thousand Protestants in the Masurian Lakes district of East Prussia.

The plight of the Poles prior to 1914 has been suggested above. At the outbreak of the World War, only Austrian Galicia enjoyed self-government. Nevertheless the Poles tenaciously clung to their language and customs, and continued to hope that their nation might recover its political liberty and territorial integrity. During the war the country suffered frightfully from both Russians and Germans. In 1914 Grand Duke Nicholas announced that one of the war aims of Russia was to secure the autonomy of the reunited Polish territories under the Romanov house. In 1916 the Central Powers proclaimed the creation of a Polish Kingdom, including the Polish regions under Russian rule, to be one of their war aims. Hence a Polish Provisional Council of State was created in that year and in 1917 a Council of Regency was established. After the armistice, General Pilsudski assumed supreme power over the "Polish Republic" and called a Constituent Assembly, but the unsettled conditions prevented the adoption of a new constitution until March 17, 1921.

Poland during the War

The Treaty of Versailles recognized the independence of the new Polish Republic. Paderewski, the famous pianist, became prime minister in 1919. The Constituent Assembly elected by both men and women in that year returned a large non-Socialist majority. Bitter quarrels over boundary lines led to the resignation of Paderewski, and to the outbreak of three wars. Two of them, with Ukrainia over Galicia and with Czecho-Slovakia over Teschen were soon settled. The third and most important war with the Bolsheviks, in which the Poles flew to arms to extend their eastern boundary lines, was waged throughout 1919–20. The Poles soon had half a million men in the field and forged their way eastward as far as Kiev. The Bolsheviks drove them back, however, until Warsaw was threatened. But the capital was saved by a brilliant counter-attack, and on October 12, 1920 a treaty of peace was signed rather favorable on the whole, to Poland. Disputes with the Free City of Danzig and with Lithuania over Vilna were at length adjusted, although Lithuania has refused

Independence

to recognize as legal the Polish seizure of the territory. The new Republic emerged from these conflicts with a territory of 149,933 square miles and a population of 28,000,000.

The New Polish government

The constitution of the Republic of Poland placed sovereign power in the nation and created a strongly centralized state. The national legislature consists of two houses: the Sejm composed of paid members chosen by universal vote for five years upon a system of proportional representation; and the Senate elected by senatorial districts. The president is chosen for seven years by the two houses united in a National Assembly. Among his numerous powers is that of appointing judges, although justices of the peace are elected by the people. The list of "General Rights and Duties of Citizens" included in the constitution, is unusually long. On December 9, 1922, the National Assembly elected Gabriel Narutowicz as the first president of the Republic. He was assassinated a week after assuming the duties of his office, and on December 20 the National Assembly chose as his successor M. Stanislas Woyciechowski. Poland has had a most difficult task in stabilizing her crippled finances, and in recovering from the pitiable economic condition in which the war left her. But with the encouragement of the Entente Allies and the financial backing of France considerable progress has been made in recent years. Poland has assumed her place among the seven largest states in Europe, and enjoys the privilege of an outlet to the sea through the neutralized port of Danzig.

Internal problems

Poland's internal political tranquillity has been disturbed by several problems, the outstanding being that of land reform. Agrarian reform was badly needed in a country 80 per cent agricultural and with an illiterate and unskilled peasantry cultivating lands of which 40 per cent is owned by some 18,000 large landed proprietors. A Land Reform Bill was passed even before the promulgation of the constitution, but it has not been put into operation as yet because of the opposition of the landowners. The problem of land reform still remains to be solved. The country has also been considerably disturbed by the presence of numerous and strong racial minorities. However, the difficulty seems to have been met at least in part by the Minority Bill, passed on July 9, 1924, which conceded complete freedom in the use of the Ukrainian, White Russian, Ruthenian, and Lithuanian languages in the schools and before the courts and administrative authorities.

Foreign relations

The foreign relations of Poland have been conducted along lines which have brought about close coöperation with France and the Little Entente. The Little Entente and Poland have been brought within the orbit of French influence in eastern Europe not only by treaty relations, but even more effectively by military loans, granted by France to her eastern Allies. In 1923 military loans to the amount of over $100,000,000 were made by France to Poland and the Little Entente for the promotion of military defense. All these states are

primarily interested in maintaining unchanged the Versailles settlement; hence the close alliances between Czecho-Slovakia and France and Poland and the excessive military loans mentioned. Poland has attempted to promote the formation of a Baltic alliance uniting to Poland the Baltic states and Finland. These efforts have failed mainly because of the alleged militarism of Poland, but also because of the unwillingness of Lithuania to forget the Polish seizure of Vilna.

E. *The Czecho-Slovaks*

South and west of the home of the Poles and Ruthenians is found the land of the Czechs of Bohemia and Moravia and of the Slovaks of northwestern Hungary. Like the Poles, these peoples have a distinguished past. In the Thirty Years' War, Bohemia lost its independence and there began under Hapsburg rule a period of ruthless Germanization and forcible conversion to Catholicism which for nearly two centuries seemed to have crushed out the national life of the Czechs. *Past history*

In the first half of the nineteenth century, however, this was rekindled by the reaction of the nationalistic aspects of the Napoleonic period upon Bohemia and by the arousing of Czech interest in their national culture and history by a number of brilliant scholars, among them the linguist and philologist Dobrovsky, the philosopher Kollar, the archeologist Safarik, and, above all, the historian Palacky. The national movement in the spring and early summer of 1848 was brought to a speedy and tragic end, but after 1868 the Czechs maintained a steady campaign for the recognition of their national rights and aspirations by Vienna, the old Czech party demanding that Emperor Franz Joseph be formally crowned king of Bohemia at Prague, and the Young Czech party looking forward to the more aggressive and ambitious program of uniting with the Slovaks, Ruthenians, and Jugo-Slavs in the attempt to make the Dual-Monarchy a Slavic state. *Rise of Bohemian Nationalism*

Racially the Czechs are Slavs, being taller and more broad-headed than the Poles and, to a lesser degree, than the Ruthenians. In Bohemia and Moravia, however, there are large minorities of Germans which constitute about 30 per cent of the total population in Bohemia and 25 per cent in Moravia. Czechs and Slovaks use the Slavonic dialect of the Czechs as their national literary language. In religion the great majority of the Czechs are Roman Catholic, while the Slovaks are fairly evenly divided between Catholics and Protestants.

At the outbreak of the World War, the Czechs displayed unexpected loyalty to the Austro-Hungarian Empire. In October, 1914, the Czech Union in Bohemia declared that "we have opposed this or that Government, but we have never opposed the State," and similar pronouncements were issued by the Czechs in Moravia in November.

During the War

But this loyalty was dissipated by the war largely because of propaganda and the activities of Czech leaders at home and abroad. On January 16, 1918, a manifesto was issued at Prague demanding independence for Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia. About six months later a British declaration was issued and confirmed by Japan and the United States in September which showed clearly that the Allies also were contemplating the establishment of an independent Czecho-Slovak state. On October 14, 1918, the Czecho-Slovak National Council, established at Paris early in the war, was constituted as the Provisional Government of Czecho-Slovakia and was recognized as such by the Allies. From its seat in Paris it issued the declaration of independence on October 18.

Independence

The new state of Czecho-Slovakia, about the area of the state of New York, including (according to the census of 1921) 8,760,000 Czecho-Slovaks, 3,123,000 Germans, 75,800 Poles, 747,000 Magyars and 461,000 Ruthenians, or a total population of about 13,611,000, was created in October, 1918, when the National Assembly at Prague proclaimed a Republic, promulgated a provisional democratic constitution, and chose Professor Masaryk as temporary president. The new constitution, adopted on February 29, 1920, provided for an elected president, a Chamber of Deputies chosen for six years, and a Senate renewed every eight years. The two houses in joint session elected Masaryk as president for seven years. The president may declare war without the consent of the national legislature. He appoints all the higher officials in the state. The franchise is open to all citizens over 21 years of age without distinctions of sex, and all citizens over 30 are eligible to hold public office. The people of this state, about one fourth of the size of France, are engaged in farming and manufacturing. In possession of half of the coal and iron mines of former Austria-Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia is one of the most promising of the new states in central Europe. Its financial recovery from the effects of the World War has been marked. All large estates have been divided up and sold to the people, and the serious problem of agrarian reform has thus been solved.

The new government

Reforms

As regards foreign relations, Czecho-Slovakia has established close relations with the "Succession States" and France. France is at present the powerful prop of Czecho-Slovakia; the army is drilled by French officers and many high army officers are Frenchmen. Under French influence was formed the Little Entente in 1920–1921, an alliance between Czecho-Slovakia, Jugo-Slavia, and Rumania, for the purpose of preventing the reëstablishment of the Hapsburgs. A treaty of alliance between Czecho-Slovakia and France was concluded on January 25, 1924. The allies undertook "to concert their action in all matters of foreign policy which may threaten their security or which may tend to subvert the situation created by the Treaties of Peace." The terms of the treaty are directed towards diplomatic coöperation in defense of the peace settlement, specifically against

Foreign relations

Hungary, as well as against attempts to restore the Hohenzollerns in Germany. In May, 1924, a treaty was concluded with Italy whereby the two states agreed to coöperate in maintaining the peace treaties.

F. *The Ruthenians*

The "Ukraine"

Stretching from southeastern Poland to the Sea of Azov is the district of the Ukraine, eastern Galicia, and part of Bukowina, the home of the Little Russians or Ruthenians. Roughly this is the region included between the Dniester and Dnieper Rivers and coincides with the fertile "black-earth" district of Russia, the most productive cereal growing region in Europe. The Little Russians or Ruthenians of the Ukraine have had a most varied history. In the middle of the seventeenth century an unsuccessful rebellion of the Ukraine led to the placing of the eastern portion under the suzerainty of Russia, but most of it remained with the Polish-Lithuanian Kingdom until the partitions. Austria obtained the Ruthenians of eastern Galicia by the first partition in 1772, and Russia secured the remaining portion by the partitions of 1793 and 1795. Within the last forty years there developed a determined Ukrainian movement for independence from Russia which was greatly stimulated by the same Russification policy that was applied to the Finns, Letts, Lithuanians, and Poles.

Its past history

Race and religion

Racially the Ruthenians are the purest of the Russian Slavs and the best Russian exemplification of the Alpine race. They speak the purest of the Slavic dialects. Most of the inhabitants of the western Ukraine adhere to the curious Uniate Church. This was created in 1595 by the Union of Brest-Litovsk, according to the terms of which the Ukrainians of the Polish-Lithuanian kingdom were made to accept the supremacy of the Roman pontiff, while at the same time they were allowed to retain their Greek orthodox liturgy, ritual, ceremonial, and organization. Further east the Ruthenians are divided between the Uniate and the Orthodox Churches. Liberal estimates place the total number of Ruthenians at about thirty millions, of whom some three and a half millions reside in Galicia, seven hundred thousand in the Carpathian district of Hungary and about fifty thousand in Bukowina.

Independence

Ukrainian separatism, while it existed even prior to 1914, was greatly stimulated by the World War. In Galicia, Ukrainians demanded, shortly after the outbreak of the war, an administrative division separating them from the purely Polish parts of the district, and already on November 4, 1916, the Austrian government promised Galicia's independence "in the fullest measure that does not conflict with its allegiance to the State as a whole." Later, the internal disintegration of Austria-Hungary created a favorable opportunity for the assertion of Ukrainian nationalist aspirations. Shortly after the proclamation of the imperial manifesto of October 16, 1918,

which held out the hope of transformation of the Empire into a confederacy of free nationalities, a Ukrainian National Council was set up in Lemberg.

The Ukraine in the War

In the meantime the Ukrainians of Russia were busy asserting their claims. The March Revolution provided the needed opportunity. Early in April, 1917, a Ukrainian National Congress assembled at Kiev and declared for autonomy within the Russian Republic. The Congress elected a Council (Rada) which demanded recognition of Ukrainian autonomy by the Russian Provisional Government. No immediate satisfactory reply to this demand having been received, the Council issued a manifesto on June 26, declaring that the Ukrainians would manage their own affairs. Thereupon the Provisional Government gave way and recognized the temporary government of Ukrainia. The Bolshevist *coup d'état* in November hastened the proclamation, on November 20, of a Ukrainian People's Republic. In February, 1918, Ukrainia made peace with the Central Powers by signing the Brest-Litovsk Treaty. The Germans thereupon entered Ukrainia as allies, but soon turned against the Ukrainians and in April they arrested the government and set up a dictatorship headed by General Skoropadsky, an avowed pro-German. The defeat of the Central Powers in the fall of 1918 removed the German menace, and the Ukrainians proceeded to unite with their kinsmen in Galicia. But the Poles, unwilling to recognize the national claims of the Austrian Ukrainians, embarked upon a war of conquest of which eastern Galicia and chiefly its capital Lemberg was the objective. The war ended in a victory for the Poles, and Galicia was formally awarded to Poland by the Supreme Council at Paris in December, 1919, under a mandate for twenty-five years. A subsequent modification of the decision gave Poland control indefinitely. A union of the Austrian and Russian Ukrainians was thus prevented.

Struggles with Poland

Union with Soviet Russia

The Ukrainian Republic subsequently became one of the federated states of Soviet Russia. On December 30, 1922, a treaty of alliance was formally confirmed at Moscow by representatives of the Soviet government and the republics of Ukraine, White Russia, and Transcaucasia. By the terms of the treaty the four were united into one state, the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics. In this Union, each contracting state retains its individual freedom and institutions, except that foreign affairs, army, navy, taxation, etc. are controlled by the central government at Moscow. The area of the Ukrainian Republic is 174,510 square miles and its population, 26,001,000.

5. Turkey and the Balkan States since 1918

A. *The Near East and the World War*

Between 1914 and 1917 practically the whole of the Near East became involved in the World War. Most of the Balkan states were drawn into the struggle through secret alliances or "bargains"

Turkey and the Balkan states are drawn into the World War

with one or more of the great powers. Montenegro joined Serbia immediately after war was declared at the close of July, 1914, because of nationalist bonds between the two states. Turkey entered the conflict in October, 1914, because she was bound by a secret agreement with Germany. Bulgaria hesitated until October of the following year to choose the side she was willing to aid; then, finding that the Central Powers were ready to promise to her the best bargain for territorial gains in Macedonia, she threw her lot in with theirs. Rumania delayed reaching a decision for almost another year for she desired to secure valuable territories from the great powers on each side in the conflict. At last in August, 1916, after Russia had won brilliant successes over Austria-Hungary, Rumania, accepting Entente promises of a rich reward in Transylvania, joined Russia and her allies. Greece officially remained out of the war until 1917. In June of that year, after Franco-British forces had occupied the Greek capital, had dethroned King Constantine, and had established the pro-Entente statesman Venizelos in control of the government at Athens, she declared war upon the Central Powers. Less direct though equally effective means were employed by British and French representatives to stir up serious opposition to the Turks in Syria, Palestine, and Arabia. Prominent Englishmen and Frenchmen promised on different occasions that at the close of the World War, their countries would champion the establishment of independent national states for the inhabitants of those areas. "His [Britannic] majesty's government," declared Arthur J. Balfour on November 22, 1917, "views with favor the establishment in Palestine of a National Home for the Jewish people and will use its best endeavors to facilitate the achievement of this object, . . ." "The Syrians . . .," declared Sir Mark Sykes a month later, "are about to possess in Syria a régime which will allow the people to develop the country in peace and establish their own civilization without becoming the prey of tyrants, either economically or militarily."

The Entente Allies agree to partition parts of Turkey and the Balkan states

While British and also French representatives were making promises to win the support of a majority of the Near Eastern peoples, the Entente governments were negotiating secret treaties among themselves, to secure territorial adjustments in the Balkans and Turkey which could not be reconciled with some of the promises of their agents. (1) In March, 1915, Great Britain and France agreed that Russia should have Constantinople and the Straits region. (2) By the secret Treaty of London, signed April 26, 1915, Italy was to gain important parts of the Dalmatian coast and a share of the spoils in southern Asia Minor if Turkey should be partitioned. (3) By Franco-Russian and Anglo-French agreements of April and May, 1916, Russia was promised northern Armenia, France was assured important interests in Syria and Cilicia, and Great Britain was conceded the right to establish control over lower Mesopotamia and parts of Arabia and Palestine.

Consequently numerous difficulties arose at the Paris Peace Conference relative to the disposal of Near Eastern territories. President Wilson, favoring the principle of self-determination, urged that Allied commissions be sent to Asiatic Turkey to discover what political adjustments were favored by the emancipated subjects of the sultan. An American commission was actually dispatched to the East for that purpose but its findings were ignored by those who drew up the Paris settlements. President Wilson also urged that Italy should abandon her claims to the Dalmatian coast on the ground that it belonged rightfully to the Jugo-Slavs. This question involved particularly the disposing of the Adriatic port of Fiume. Disagreement over the disposition of the port led on one occasion, through the temporary withdrawal of the Italian representatives from Paris, to a threatened breakup of the Conference. Other questions, for example those involving the disposal of the Banat in southern Hungary and the status of the Straits, also occasioned heated controversies and delays in the proceedings at the French capital. In fact the problem of securing settlements for the Near East proved so difficult that the signing of peace treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary, and Turkey was delayed for months after similar treaties were signed with Germany and Austria.

Near Eastern questions before the Paris Peace Conference

B. *The Kingdom of the Jugo-Slavs*

One of the most extensive Balkan states to emerge finally from the Paris Conference was the Jugo-Slav "Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes." In 1917 representatives of the three important South Slav peoples met on the island of Corfu and formulated a program for union between Serbia and the Jugo-Slav territories of Hungary. In November, 1918, a Jugo-Slav National Council of Zagreb formally proclaimed a similar program to unite territories of the former Dual Monarchy under its control with Serbia and Montenegro. At the Paris Peace Conference these programs were endorsed and the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes under the king of Serbia was created to include practically all the territory in the western part of the Balkan peninsula north of Greece and Albania. The new state thus created extended over an area slightly larger than that of the American states of Illinois and Indiana combined and was inhabited by a population of over 11,000,000 people.

Origin of the Jugo-Slav Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes"

Although Jugo-Slav nationalism triumphed completely at the close of the World War, numerous difficulties continued thereafter to cause trouble for the new South Slav Kingdom. One group of its difficulties arose in the form of boundary disputes with neighbor states. With Rumanians the Jugo-Slavs contested for a time the possession of the Banat, but in 1920, after the latter area had been divided between the two peoples, Rumania and Jugo-Slavia joined forces and with Czecho-Slovakia formed the Little Entente. A far more serious controversy developed between Jugo-Slavs and Ital-

Boundary disputes of the new Jugo-Slav state

ians over control of the important port of Fiume. Indeed for almost five years — from April, 1919, to January, 1924 — this troublesome question persistently threatened to bring war between Italy and Jugo-Slavia. In November, 1920, representatives of the two states drew up a treaty at Rapallo whereby Fiume was proclaimed a free city. However Italians did not abandon their claims to the city and cordial international relations were not established in the Adriatic until after January 27, 1924, when by a new arrangement signed at Rome it was provided that Italy should govern Fiume but that Jugo-Slavs should have free access to the port for commercial purposes. A third boundary dispute developed between Jugo-Slavia and Albania; it was settled in August, 1925, not by the interested parties themselves but through arbitration by the Allied Council of Ambassadors. Equally serious difficulties arose in internal affairs among the Jugo-Slavs.

Rival programs for the organization of Jugo-Slavia

The most serious internal trouble which confronted Jugo-Slavia immediately after the establishment of the new kingdom centered in the organization of the government. One party, led by the political veteran, M. Pashitch, favored the establishment of a centralized type of organization copied after that of France. Numerous other parties urged the adoption of a federal organization like that of Switzerland. Many Croatians and Slovenes were in favor of a republican type of government and some Montenegrins even were opposed to the inclusion of their former state in the Jugo-Slav union.[1]

The Jugo-Slav constitution of 1921

In 1921 the idea of centralization triumphed in Jugo-Slavia and was embodied in a constitution drawn up by a Constituent Assembly which had been elected in November of the preceding year. The new constitution, modeled after the Serbian constitutions adopted in 1889 and 1903, provided for government by ministers responsible to a one-house *Skupshtina* or parliament. Moreover it provided that the *Skupshtina* should be elected by universal suffrage on the basis of proportional representation.

Bitter political strife in Jugo-Slavia, 1921–1925

During a period following the adoption of the constitution bitter political strife prevailed throughout the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. In December, 1924, while a wave of anti-Bolshevist sentiment was sweeping over the country, the government, under the leadership of Premier Pashitch, decreed the dissolution of the Croatian Peasant's party and ordered the arrest of its leaders including the noted M. Raditch. Raditch was arbitrarily imprisoned for over six months; yet before the close of the year 1925, he was released and was invited by his former enemies to help form a coalition ministry in which he became minister of education.

[1] Differences of religion and culture have contributed greatly to the development of political troubles among the Jugo-Slavs in recent times. The majority of the Croatians and Slovenes are Roman Catholics. For centuries they have been under western cultural influences. Most of the Serbs, on the other hand, are Greek Orthodox Christians and have been under eastern (Greek) cultural influences.

C. *Greater Rumania*

The founding of Greater Rumania

Rumania, another Balkan state which gained extensive territories at the close of the World War, did not wait for the sanction of the diplomats at Paris before she seized the districts that she coveted. In April, 1918, a "National Council" in Bessarabia declared for union with Rumania. In November and December of the same year general congresses in Bukowina and Transylvania issued similar declarations. Taking advantage of these proceedings, the Rumanian King Ferdinand promptly "accepted" administrative control over the coveted territories. In 1919 Rumanians threatened to occupy the whole of the Banat; in the same year they actually overran a large part of Hungary and pillaged the Hungarian capital, Budapest. The Peace Conference warned the Rumanian government against the pursuit of an aggressive policy in Hungary and Bessarabia but finding itself faced by a *fait accompli* in the greater part of those areas tardily acknowledge practically all of Rumania's territorial claims. In October, 1920, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan even signed a treaty with Rumania guaranteeing her control over Bessarabia. Hence Greater Rumania with an area over one and one fourth times as great as that of Jugo-Slavia and with a population of over 17,000,000 — a state about which Rumanian nationalists had dreamed before the World War — became a reality.

Problems confronting Rumania, 1920–1925

Numerous problems, many of them similar to those which troubled Jugo-Slavia during the same period, confronted Rumania after the Peace Conference had recognized her extended frontiers. She engaged in a long drawn out boundary dispute with Soviet Russia, encountered opposition from the League of Nations in June, 1925, because of the expropriation of lands of Hungarian farmers in Transylvania, and antagonized western states through the adoption of legislation to restrict the activities of foreign corporations operating on Rumanian soil. Also bitter political controversies and governmental financial troubles developed within Rumania, as in fact they developed within every Balkan state at the close of the World War. So late as April, 1923, serious rioting occurred in Bucharest, and a year later communist unrest led to numerous arrests and the establishment of martial law in Bessarabia. Furthermore, during 1925 the government continued to remain under a virtual dictatorship of the Bratiano brothers — Premier Jean Bratiano and Finance Minister Vintilo Bratiano — a dictatorship which dated from soon after the time when Greater Rumania was created.

Nevertheless between 1917 and 1925 Rumanians successfully initiated important measures to strengthen their state and to make it more like those of western Europe. Beginning in 1917 they adopted agrarian reforms by which all large estates of arable land were broken up for distribution in small plots among the peasants. The state assumed 35 per cent of the burden of payment and the peasants

Economic and political reforms adopted in Rumania between 1917 and 1925

were given a long term of years in which to pay the remaining 65 per cent. In 1922 the Rumanians adopted a new constitution which assured to all classes, even including the Jews,[1] a share in the suffrage and provided for the establishment of a centralized government like that of Jugo-Slavia. Under the new constitution the national councils of Bessarabia, Transylvania, and Bukowina were dissolved; the entire dominion was divided into departments to be administered by prefects appointed directly by the cabinet at Bucharest.

D. *The Eclipse of Bulgaria*

Terms imposed upon Bulgaria by the Treaty of Neuilly, November, 1919

Bulgaria emerged from the Peace Conference with restricted frontiers, heavy financial obligations, and serious domestic problems. In November, 1919, she was induced to sign the Treaty of Neuilly by which she (1) conceded to Jugo-Slavia three bits of territory inhabited entirely by Bulgarians along her western frontier, (2) abandoned her territory in Thrace to Greece, (3) agreed to pay an indemnity of almost a half billion of dollars, and (4) promised to limit her army to 33,000 men. Under the terms of this settlement Bulgaria was limited to an area of about 40,650 square miles, an area slightly larger than that of Bulgaria before the Balkan Wars and inhabited by approximately 4,800,000 people. During a period of over three and a half years following the conclusion of the treaty, Alexander Stambulisky, leader of the Bulgarian Peasant's party, retained control of the government; following a pacifistic anti-urban and anti-capitalist policy, be granted powers over the revenues of his state to the Reparations Commission, strove to establish friendly relations with Jugo-Slavia and the Entente, and obtained the adoption by the *Sobranje* of a law to impose a period of forced labor on all classes in Bulgaria. Naturally his program aroused a storm of opposition in *bourgeois* and nationalist circles. In June, 1923, a party resembling the Italian Fascisti arose and, after it had brought about the downfall and even the murder of Stambulisky, established a dictatorship under Professor Tsankov of the University of Sofia. Henceforth for almost two and a half years a virtual reign of terror existed throughout Bulgaria. Communists and other discontented elements, recruited particularly from among the 400,000 Macedonian refugees within the country, employed terrorist means to exterminate government officials; the government, employing similar means, arbitrarily arrested and condemned scores of suspects. On different occasions during the same period strained relations developed between Bulgaria, and Jugo-Slavia and Greece because of the activities of Bulgarian sympathizers in Macedonia. Fortunately at the close of 1925, however, the situation in Bulgaria began to show signs of improvement. The crops of the year were bountiful, in October a state of martial law was ter-

Problems confronting Bulgaria, 1919–1925

[1] In spite of these constitutional guarantees Jewish and other minority peoples have suffered harsh treatment in Rumania since 1922.

minated, and, in the same month, when Greece attacked the country, the League of Nations intervened. The League on this occasion not only brought about a prompt withdrawal of the Greek troops which had invaded Bulgarian territory but also forced Greece to pay an indemnity to her neighbor.

E. *Albania*

Both during and after the World War mountainous Albania, a state with perhaps 850,000 inhabitants, suffered from almost continuous anarchy. At the close of the world conflict the chances for her survival even seemed doubtful. Italy, Jugo-Slavia, and Greece each aspired to gain portions of her 17,000 square miles of territory. Truly in 1920 the Albanians organized effectively to defend their country. They defeated the foreign troops stationed on their soil, gained outside recognition of their independence, and during January, 1921, secured the formal admission of Albania into the League of Nations. In January, 1925, the Albanian government, consisting of four "regents," a ministry, and a National Assembly chosen through indirect election, announced that Albania was to be a republic. Yet at the close of the year "murder, loot, and rapine" were rife throughout the country; reports indicated that the government had lost such popularity as it once possessed and that a fresh *coup d'état* was "easily possible."

Albania suffers from anarchy during and after the World War

F. *Greece*

Greece, like the other Balkan states which joined the Entente Allies during the World War, received favorable treatment in 1919–1920 at the peace conference, but soon thereafter she lost most of her new possessions. By the settlements of 1919–1920 she obtained a right to extend her control over all of Thrace except a limited area on which Constantinople is located, over an important district in western Asia Minor that included the valuable port of Smyrna, and over the Dodekanese islands which Italy had held since the Turco-Italian War of 1911–1912. These additions of territory were to increase the area of the new Hellas from 41,933 square miles to almost 70,000; in other words they were to transform the Greece of 1913–1918, a state about the size of Ohio, into a Greater Greece, a state somewhat larger than Ohio and West Virginia combined. Also they were to add approximately 2,000,000 inhabitants to the population of Greece. Eager to obtain undisputed possession of the new territories the Greeks attempted to force the Turks to abandon their claims to Thrace and the Smyrna region. This proved to be too difficult an undertaking for the Greeks. In 1921 Greek forces advanced far into the interior of Asia Minor but a year later the Turks, freshly supplied with munitions obtained from the French and the Italians, swept the advancing forces back into the Ægean. By the Treaty of Lausanne (1923) Greece not only ceded to Turkey the right to con-

Greece acquires important territories but promptly loses most of them

trol the Smyrna region, eastern Thrace to the Maritza river, and Imbros and Tenedos at the mouth of the Dardanelles, but also lost to Italy the claims to the Dodekanese islands which Italy earlier had resigned to Greece. Indeed the former Bulgarian territories in western Thrace were almost the only territorial gains which the Greeks retained as a reward for the aid they had given to the Allies during the World War.

Serious political complications developed within Greece during and after the time when the country was being drained of its resources to support aggressive military operations in Asia Minor. In November, 1920, Venizelos, who had just returned from Paris where as the official representative of Greece he had exercised great influence to obtain a legal title to the extensive territories claimed by his countrymen, was beaten in a general election and forced to withdraw from office. He promptly left Greece and on December 5, 1920, the Greeks voted almost unanimously to recall King Constantine. In September, 1922, after the Greek army had been expelled from Asia Minor, Constantine, again, was compelled to abdicate. Henceforth through the year 1922 politics at Athens remained in a very troubled condition. Late in November, 1922, the new government, a revolutionary régime which had placed Crown Prince George nominally upon the throne, shocked the world by the execution of three former premiers and other prominent persons whom the revolutionaries regarded as responsible for the disasters in Asia Minor. Throughout the year 1923 the government, aided nobly by the western Near East Relief organization, struggled with the problem of providing shelter, food, clothing, bedding, and medical attention for the hundreds of thousands of refugees who had fled from Asia Minor and eastern Thrace to Greek soil at the close of the Greco-Turkish War of 1921–1922, or who were later evicted from their homes in Turkey under the terms of the Treaty of Lausanne providing for the exchange of populations between Greece and Turkey. Early in 1924, after King George had been ordered to leave Greece, the veteran Venizelos attempted to bring order out of the chaos in Greek politics but after a futile effort he went into voluntary exile a second time. In a plebiscite held April 13, 1924, the Greek electorate confirmed the establishment of a Republic in new Hellas. Finally in the summer of 1925, General Pangalos deliberately employed military and naval forces to seize control of the government and to establish a dictatorship.

Political troubles in Greece, 1920–1925

G. *The Disposition of Turkey*

The signing of a peace settlement with Turkey at the close of the World War was delayed until August 10, 1920; the delay was due chiefly to international rivalry among the Entente Powers. Great Britain and France quarreled over what should be done with Syria, Constantinople, and the Straits region. Similarly Italy and Greece

International rivalry delays a settlement with Turkey

disputed about questions which involved the disposing of parts of Albania, some of the Ægean islands, and portions of Asia Minor.

Turkey is partitioned by the Treaty of Sèvres, August 10, 1920

By the Treaty of Sèvres which the powers ultimately presented to the sultan, provision was made for the virtual destruction of the Ottoman Empire. The Treaty provided, as has been suggested: (1) that Greece should gain Turkish territories in eastern Thrace and the Smyrna region;[1] (2) that a "Zone of the Straits" including a narrow strip of territory along each side of the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles should be internationalized; Greece and Turkey should possess rights of local administration in their respective portions of the zone but an international commission should perform all the functions necessary to keep the channel of the Straits open on equal terms to the ships of all nations; (3) that Turkey should abandon her claims to Arabia, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Armenia whose boundary in northeastern Asia Minor was to be determined through arbitration by President Wilson; (4) that Cilicia in southeastern Asia Minor should be recognized as a French "sphere of influence," and southern Anatolia including the port of Adalia should be recognized as a similar Italian "sphere;" (5) that Kurdistan should be given a degree of local autonomy; and (6) that Turkey should submit to foreign control of her finances and should pay a heavy indemnity to the Entente Allies. If this treaty had been carried into effect it would have reduced Turkey to a small national state hopelessly bound and subject to the political as well as to the economic dictates of the powers.

Turkish nationalists under Mustapha Kemal prepare to resume hostilities

Even before the Treaty of Sèvres was drawn up the Turks actively prepared to resume hostilities against their enemies. The occupation of Adalia by the Italians and of Smyrna by the Greeks in the spring of 1919 — steps which at least violated the spirit of the armistice terms of October 30, 1918, between the Entente Allies and Turkey — prompted them thus to prepare. They profited by the leadership of Mustapha Kemal Pasha, an able army commander who had won distinction during the World War. Encouraged by the inability of the Allies to reach an agreement promptly relative to Near Eastern affairs, the Kemalists drew up a "National Pact," a program listing the "irreducible minimum" of concessions which they were willing to accept. Promulgating this pact as a sort of declaration of independence from foreign control, they aggressively sought and quickly obtained a numerous following in every part of Turkey. The sultan, who was under close surveillance of Entente representatives at Constantinople, condemned the movement, but the Kemalists, ignoring his ban, established a government of their own at Angora in the heart of Asia Minor.

Steadily Mustapha Kemal and his nationalist followers overcame opposition to their program until in the fall of 1922 the ultimate triumph of practically all of their demands was assured. They over-

[1] Also by the Treaty of Sèvres Greece was promised the right to control the Ægean islands of Imbros and Tenedos.

The Turkish nationalists win numerous successes, 1920–1922

ran Armenia. In March, 1921, they concluded a treaty with Soviet Russia by which the Russians endorsed the Turkish National Pact and ceded the important frontier post of Kars to the Turks. About the same time Turkish forces drove the French from Cilicia and a Turkish representative at London signed a secret treaty with Italy whereby all Italian troops in Turkey were to be withdrawn. As a reward of the recognition of Italian economic rights in Turkey, the Italian government agreed to support the Kemalists against the Greeks in the Smyrna area and eastern Thrace. By a treaty signed at Angora, October 20, 1921, France was pledged to give Cilicia and a strip of territory in northern Syria to the nationalists; in return for extensive economic concessions the French, jealous of British influence in Greece and following the example set by the Italians, promised to aid the Turks against the Greeks. Finally at the close of the Greco-Turkish War of 1921–1922, during which partisans on each side in the conflict perpetrated horrible massacres of helpless non-combatants, Great Britain even consented to scrap the Treaty of Sèvres and to negotiate with the Turkish nationalists a new settlement for the Near East at a congress scheduled to meet at Lausanne in southwestern Switzerland.

Turkey gains by the Treaty of Lausanne, July 24, 1923

By the treaty which was signed at Lausanne July 24, 1923, after long drawn out negotiations in which rivalry among the powers as well as disagreements between the powers and Turkey played a major rôle, the Turks regained extensive territories that had been taken from them by the Treaty of Sèvres, escaped the obligation to pay a considerable portion of the indemnity assessed against Turkey in 1920, and obtained the abrogation of most of the privileges that westerners had enjoyed in the Ottoman Empire under the capitulations. The new Turkish government agreed to demilitarize the Bosphorus and Dardanelles area and to accept the principle of the freedom of the Straits but only on condition that the international commission provided for in 1920 should be abolished. One question, that of fixing the boundary between Iraq under British control and Kurdistan completely restored to Turkish overlordship, was left open to be settled at a later date. After protracted debates between the British and the Turks had failed to produce an understanding, a settlement favoring Iraq was proposed in December, 1925, by the League of Nations, which the two parties had at length called to act as arbiter.

"The Ottoman Empire is dead. Long live Turkey!" This was the cry of the new régime which after the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne held sway over an area one sixth as large as that of the United States of America and over a population estimated by the Turkish department of public health (1924) to number over 13,000,000. When the Turkish nationalists triumphed over the Greeks in 1922, Sultan Mohammed VI fled from Turkish soil; in October, 1923, the Grand National Assembly at Angora unanimously proclaimed Turkey a Republic and elected the *Ghazi*, Mustapha Kemal Pasha,

president. Then with a sincere resolve to bring about the westernization of the country the new government decreed a succession of sweeping reforms. In March, 1924, the Assembly voted to abolish the Caliphate, to make education entirely secular, and to sweep away the ecclesiastical courts. Later a Turkish woman's movement, promising to become an important factor in Turkey, brought about the enactment of laws (1) to make monogamy universal, (2) to require the registration of marriages, and (3) to give women the right to inherit equally with men. Finally in the latter half of the year 1925 orders were issued to force all Turkish laymen to abandon the fez and turban and veil for western garb.[1] Furthermore orders were issued to force the closing of all dervish monasteries. Though she has a long road yet to travel, Turkey at last, it appears (January, 1926), is really to become a thoroughly westernized state.

The post-war situation in Arabia, Mesopotamia, and Syria

Many of the inhabitants of Arabia, Mesopotamia, and Syria failed to gain immediately the coveted independence for which they earnestly hoped and petitioned at the close of the World War. By the Sèvres Treaty, the Hedjaz, an Arab state encompassing a strip of territory east of the Red Sea, gained nominal freedom under a former grand *sherif* of Mecca, King Hussein, but this state was soon destroyed by puritanical Mohammedan Wahabites from the Arabian desert. By the same treaty Palestine, Mesopotamia (the Kingdom of Iraq under King Feisal, a son of King Hussein of the Hedjaz), and Syria were organized as separate states. Great Britain, which was named the guardian or "mandatory" power for Mesopotamia and Palestine eventually granted to them, as she also granted to Egypt, a considerable degree of autonomy. On the other hand France, which was given a mandate for Syria, governed her Near Eastern subjects strictly under a high commissioner. As in the Balkan states and Turkey, so in the states of Syria and Mesopotamia under mandates serious domestic troubles developed in the post-war period. Perhaps the most serious trouble which arose in any state controlled under a mandatory system after the close of the World War appeared in Syria; there, late in 1925, the warlike Druses and other dissatisfied elements, joining in a revolt (the sixth) against French mandatory authority in Syria, seriously threatened to expel the French from the country.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

C. Anet, *La Révolution Russe*, 4 vols. (1918–1919); M. Olgin, *The Soul of the Russian Revolution* (1917); G. Alexinsky, *Russia and the War* (1915); P. Vinogradoff, *Self-Government in Russia* (1915); M. Paléologue, *La Russe des Tsars pendant la grande guerre*, 3 vols. (1922), Eng. transl.; B. Gourko, *War and Revolution in Russia, 1914–1917* (1919);

[1] Forty rioters, it is reported, were arrested in a Turkish town late in 1925 for parading and shouting: "We don't want hats!" Also there is a report that an unfortunate fellow living near Sivas in eastern Asia Minor, who wrote an attack on hats and placarded it publicly, was arrested, tried, and hanged by order of the local court.

T. G. Masaryk, *The Spirit of Russia*, 2 vols. (1919); E. J. Dillon, *The Eclipse of Russia* (1918); P. Miliukov, *History of the Second Russian Revolution* (1920); *Russia Today and Tomorrow* (1922); A. F. Kerensky, *The Prelude to Bolshevism* (1919); L. Trotsky, *The History of the Russian Revolution to Brest Litovsk* (1919); *Our Revolution* (1918); *The Bolsheviki and World Peace* (1918); R. Levy, *Trotzsky* (1920); M. A. Landau-Aldanoff, *Lenine* (1919); A. R. Williams, A. Ransome, R. Robbins, *Lenin, the Man and his Work* (1919); L. Bryant, *Mirrors of Moscow* (1922); B. Russell, *The Theory and Practise of Bolshevism* (1920); R. W. Postgate, *The Bolshevik Theory* (1920); J. Spargo, *The Psychology of Bolshevism* (1919); A. L. Strong, *The First Time in History* (1924); K. Kautsky, *The Dictatorship of the Proletariat* (1920); H. L. McBain and L. Rogers, *The New Constitutions of Europe* (1922); A. Ransome, *Six Weeks in Russia* (1919); *The Crisis in Russia* (1921); E. A. Ross, *Russia in Upheaval* (1919); *The Russian Bolshevik Revolution* (1921); *Russian Soviet Republic* (1923); C. L. Malone, *The Russian Republic* (1919); C. E. Russell, *Unchained Russia* (1918); E. A. Antonelli, *Bolshevist Russia* (1920); S. Zagorsky, *La République des Soviets* (1921); A. Heller, *The Industrial Revival in Soviet Russia* (1922); H. K. Norton, *The Far Eastern Republic of Siberia* (1923); A. L. P. Dennis, *The Foreign Policy of Soviet Russia* (1924).

H. W. V. Temperley, *A History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, 6 vols. (1920–1921); H. A. Gibbons, *An Introduction to World Politics* (1922); I. Bowman, *The New World: Problems in Political Geography* (1921); T. G. Masaryk, *The New Europe* (1920); R. Butler, *The New Eastern Europe* (1919); H. L. McBain and L. Rogers, *The New Constitutions of Europe* (1922); R. Brunet, *The New German Constitution* (1922, trans. by J. Gollomb); R. Lutz, *The German Revolution* (1922); G. Young, *The New Germany* (1920); F. Runkel, *Die deutsche Revolution* (1919); E. Bevan, *German Social Democracy during the War* (1919); G. P. Gooch, *Germany* (1925); P. Schiedemann, *Der Zusammenbruch* (1920); J. Andrassy, *War and Diplomacy* (1920); O. Czernin, *In the World War* (1919); L. Windischgrätz, *My Memoirs* (1920); J. V. Szilassy, *Der Untergang der Donaumonarchie* (1921); O. Jaszi, *Revolution and Reaction in Hungary* (1921); P. Teleki, *The Place of Hungary in European History* (1922); E. Varga, *Die bolschevistische Wirtshaftpolitik in Ungarn* (1920).

V. Nosek, *Independent Bohemia* (1918); A. Broz, *The Rise of the Czechoslovak Republic* (1919); *The First Year of the Czechoslovak Republic* (1920); R. W. Seton-Watson, *The Czechoslovak Republic* (1921); A. Heyking, *The Baltic Provinces* (1919); S. Rudnitzsky, *The Ukraine, the Land and its People* (1918); K. Donner, *et al.*, *Suomen Vapaussota*, 6 vols. (1921–1925); M. G. Schybergson, *Politische Geschichte Finlands, 1809–1919* (1925); R. A. Wredе, *Grundlagen av Finlands Ratts- och Samhallsordning* (1921); K. Zilliacus, *Fran of ärdstid och oroliga ar* (1920); J. G. Grano, *Eesti* (1923); M. Martna, *Estland* (1918); M. Walters, *Lettland* (1923); R. Dmowski, *La Question Polonaise* (1909); R. Dyboski, *Outlines of Polish History* (1924); E. H. Lewinski-Corwin, *Political History of Poland* (1917); Charles Phillips, *The New Poland* (1923); W. A. Phillips, *Poland* (1915); E. Benes, *Bohemia's Case for Independence* (1917); J. Cisar and F. Pokarny, *The Czechoslovak Republic* (1921); Joseph Gruber, (ed.) *Czechoslovakia, 1918–1923* (1924); S. Rudnitsky, *Ukraine: the Land and Its People* (1918); John Buchan, (ed.), *The Nations of Today. The Baltic and Caucasian States* (1923); R. Butler, *The New Eastern Europe* (1919); A. Rumil, *The New Masters of the Baltic* (1921); Graf Rüdiger von der Goltz, *Meine Sendung in Finland und im Baltikum* (1920).

C. H. Haskins and R. H. Lord, *Some Problems of the Peace Conference*, Cambridge (Mass.) (1920); H. A. Gibbons, *Europe Since 1918*, New York (1923); *Venizelos* (1921); A. H. Lybyer, *Turkey under the Armistice* (Journal of International Relations April, 1922); *King-Crane Report on the Near East* (Editor and Publisher, December 2, 1922); Count L. Voinovitch, *Dalmatia and the Jugoslav Movement* (1920); C. U. Clark, *Greater Roumania* (1922); A. J. Toynbee, *Western Question in Greece and Turkey* (1923); G. F. Abbott, *Greece and the Allies, 1914–1922* (1922); E. G. Mears, *Modern Turkey*, (1924); *Current History*, 1918–1926; A. Siegfried, *Post War Britain* (1925).

PART IX

A SURVEY OF CONTEMPORARY CIVILIZATION AND INSTITUTIONS

CHAPTER XL

POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS

1. Nature of Political Institutions

A review of the history of the world for the past century and a half reveals the fact that the greatest single force in human society has been and is today the national, sovereign state. Humanity, as a whole, is divided into a number of permanent groups of people, who are politically organized, occupy a definite territory, and are relatively free from external control. The powers of the state extend to all persons and organizations within its jurisdiction. Its purposes are: to maintain law, order, liberty, equality of opportunity, property rights, and those conditions necessary to individual and social well-being. Legally, the state is indivisible, immutable, and possesses the right to employ force to execute its will. Its authority is supreme and unlimited. It may tax its citizens to the last penny for general welfare; it may draft them for national service and even compel them to sacrifice their lives; and it may regulate their conduct. The church, the school, the industrial institutions, and social usages must bow to the will of the state in case of conflict with it.

The machinery employed by the state to carry out its will is called the government. The form and functions of the government are commonly determined today by an instrument called a constitution, which is created by the state. The persons who enact laws and administer them are known as public officials. The whole body of individuals who constitute the state are "the people," or "the nation," whose members have surrendered their wills to the collective will of the state. Within the state men are not free to act as they please, but their rules of conduct and manner of living are determined by law. Yet through this very restraint comes to the individual greater freedom, more personal liberty, and more security than could be obtained otherwise. It should be born in mind clearly that behind the laws are the public officials, who constitute the government; that back of the government is the constitution, which determines its character; that back of the constitution is the state, which creates it and has the power to change it; and that back of the state are the people, who constitute it as the source of final authority.

State and government

Centuries ago Aristotle classified states into monarchies, aristocracies, and democracies — a division which many persons still accept. When the character of governments is taken into account, however, modern political groups become (1) republican or monarchical, according to the nature of the executive; (2) national or imperial, according to the territory and peoples over which the rule

extends; and (3) democratic or aristocratic, according to the full or limited power of the people to decide political problems. At the present time the last distinction is by far the most important. The practical Anglo-Saxon theory of the state, which regards it as an *agency for the promotion of the welfare of the people as individuals*, quite generally prevails. It concedes the greatest freedom to the individual in determining his own affairs, but does not hesitate at governmental interference in that freedom, when required by public well-being. Officials are morally responsible for their conduct of national affairs. The rights of weaker states are, as a rule, respected. In sharp contrast, the autocratic theory of the state, which prevailed in Russia, Germany, Austria-Hungary, Japan, and Turkey before the recent revolutions, made the state more than the agent of the people to promote their common interests. It was regarded as a super-human institution with ambitions and a will quite distinct from its citizens. Hence in advancing its own particular interests, such a state might ignore individual rights and those of weaker states. *In 1916 a German, Professor Eduard Meyer, said:* "*The State* is of much higher importance . . . than the sum of all the individuals within its jurisdiction. For it has a life apart; its mission is unending. . . . This conception . . . is quite foreign to English thought and to that of America as well."

Types of states and governments

As a result of many forces the 1,700,000,000 people on earth are organized politically into about sixty sovereign states. In size they range from little Monaco, Luxemburg, Panama, Cuba, and Liberia to the United States, Brazil, China, Russia, and the vast British Empire. They represent various stages of civilization from that of Abyssinia, Afghanistan, Persia, Hedjaz, and Turkey to that of France, Holland, and Norway. Of these 50 odd states at least 33 are republics, and include more than half of the population of the earth. *The remaining states are monarchies, more or less limited by* constitutions and parliaments. Some of the monarchies, like Great Britain, Norway, and Italy, are more genuinely democratic than some of the republics. Everywhere there is a tendency to replace autocratic by democratic states. Kingship by divine right has practically disappeared from the face of the earth. The forty hereditary rulers of Europe in 1910 have now been reduced to fifteen. The United States, France, Germany, Poland, Russia, and China now form a belt of powerful republic girdling the globe. All the states of the New World are republics; and about half of those of Europe are republics. This new principle of government has been introduced into Asia, where four republics exist, and into Africa, where Liberia is a republic. The Dominions of the British Empire are self-governing.

2. Extension of the Franchise

Nothing better illustrates the growth of political democracy than the extension of the right to vote. For centuries the Christian

religion kept alive the conception of the brotherhood of man, but not until the American Revolution in 1776 and the French Revolution in 1789 — one in the New World, the other in the Old — did agitation for popular government set in throughout most of the world. The political results of the Industrial Revolution, first in England and then elsewhere, led to the widening of the right of men to vote. The revolutionary waves of 1830 and 1848, the Jacksonian democratic wave in the United States; the American Civil War; the unification of Italy and Germany; the Russian Revolutions of 1905 and 1917; the Chinese Revolution of 1912; the Balkan wars; and numerous minor movements, established universal male franchise in the progressive and enlightened nations. But it should be remembered that it has been attained only since the Revolution of 1848, and that it was not secured until 1871 in Germany, 1918 in England, and 1912 in Italy. Belgium, Spain, and Austria had compulsory voting. Proportional representation was widely used. Plural voting has been practically abolished. Democracy was still in the experimental stage.

Manhood suffrage

The extension of the right to vote to women made comparatively slow progress. When the French women presented the "Declaration of the Rights of Women" to the National Assembly in the French Revolution, it received scant attention. In England Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin, an ardent disciple of Rousseau, in 1792 wrote *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*. It was dedicated to Talleyrand and made a plea for equality of education, but met with little more than ridicule. The Industrial Revolution increased the importance of the common woman, as it did that of the common man, but failed to enfranchise her. John Stuart Mill in his *Subjection of Women*, printed in 1869, urged an amendment to the Reform Bill of 1867 to give women the right to vote, but it was defeated. Woman suffrage societies kept up the agitation, which won its first victory in far-away New Zealand in 1893 and Australia in 1902. In 1903 the Woman's Social and Political Union was formed by Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst and her two daughters to employ militant methods for the cause. Public speakers were "heckled," outrages committed, and riots incited to attract attention and to win supporters. Arrests and imprisonments only increased the converts. Finally in 1918 the British Parliament granted suffrage to women. In 1919 Viscountess Astor was elected to Parliament from Plymouth and in 1921 Mrs. George Wintringham from Louth. The immediate effect of the victory of the women was the passage in Parliament of numerous welfare measures pertaining to women and children particularly. The Sex Disqualification Removal Act of 1919 gave women the right to study and to practice law. In 1920 the Lambeth Conference of the Anglican Church recommended the ordination of women to the diaconate. Oxford University opened its doors to women and admitted them to degrees. Meanwhile Canada in 1918 gave women a full vote, and in 1921 a woman was chosen as the speaker of the legislature of British

Woman suffrage

Columbia. She refused the office but took a seat as a member of the cabinet. Although women voted in Australia since 1902, the first woman members of the parliament were chosen in 1921. Between 1919–20 Jamaica, Rhodesia, and British East Africa gave women the right to vote.

The British movement was imitated in other countries. In the United States the first Woman's Suffrage Convention was held in 1848, and soon annual conventions were in session. In 1869 the National Woman's Suffrage Association was organized in New York, and the American Woman's Suffrage Association in Cleveland. These two societies were united in 1890 under Mrs. Carrie Catt as president. In 1900 over 200 petitions signed by millions of men and women were presented to Congress. Labor and Socialist parties supported the cause. Between 1869 and 1910 five states permitted women to vote, and twenty-five states gave them suffrage on school questions. In 1912 Theodore Roosevelt in his campaign for the presidency favored woman suffrage and in 1916 all candidates were committed to the proposition. At last in 1920 the nineteenth amendment to the constitution provided for universal franchise without regard to sex, and a victory had been won after seventy years. Prior to the World War only four states had adopted woman suffrage. Following the example of New Zealand and Australia, Norway was the first nation in Europe to admit women to full parliamentary suffrage. In 1906 Finland gave women the right to vote for the national Diet and 19 became members of that body. A similar measure was defeated in 1909 in Sweden. The movement in Russia to enfranchise women failed in 1906, but succeeded in 1917. Poland and the republics formed from Russia granted equal political rights to both sexes, as did the new states formed from Austria-Hungary. The German Revolution resulted in the enfranchisement of women, and of the 397 members of the National Assembly 28 were women. By 1920 suffrage had been granted to women by 28 states. It is only a matter of time until other countries will yield to the pressure. The League of Nations provided that "All positions under or in connection with the League, including the Secretariat, shall be open equally to men and women," and several women have already been appointed to important posts. These democratic changes signify a more complete realization of Lincoln's "government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

3. New Conception of the Function of Government

The conception of the scope and functions of government has been completely revolutionized during the past century. The old idea of government made it something mysteriously holy beyond the ken of ordinary mortals. To encourage this impression, it was surrounded with pomp and display, with brilliant colors and gilded equipages, with solemn ceremonies, and with gorgeously uniformed guards and

attendants. It was housed in splendid palaces set in large estates. All this pageantry was intended to create awe in the people and thus prevent them from wishing to become too familiar with the affairs of state. This old government of kings and queens was conducted for the benefit, not of the people, but of the ruling class. Many political terms, such as the "coat of arms," "subjects," the "royal army," "his majesty's navy," the "king's highway" and the use of the flag, recall these earlier days. Indeed nothing but the public debt was "national."

A century and a half ago a rigid constitution fixing the powers of government was practically unknown. Great Britain had a constitution partly written and partly unwritten. The North American states drew up the first written constitutions. France soon followed with a whole series of constitutions. From the British, American and French models, constitutions multiplied until today every state possesses one. Most modern constitutions have been created deliberately by the members of a constituent assembly chosen by the people. Many of the earlier constitutions were characterized by more or less distrust of genuine democratic government. The later ones combined stability with flexibility, and provided for comparatively easy amendments to meet new conditions. Perhaps nothing in recent world history measures more correctly democratic, political progress than these constitutional changes. In addition to the national constitutions, the numerous political subdivisions and the cities also have their constitutions and charters, which provide for local government to meet the needs of the various communities more efficiently and economically.

Rise of constitutionalism

The World War resulted in the creation of at least a dozen new constitutions in Europe, and numerous amendments to old ones. These more recent instruments of government all provide for popular government with a responsible parliament. The executive as a rule does not follow the rigid American type, but rather the French model. Germany has a president elected by the people with large powers in legislation, but no veto except that he may order a referendum on any law he opposes. In Austria the president has much less power. In the local German states and in Esthonia the Swiss "collegial executive" is followed. Poland's president has no veto and no power to initiate legislation. Czecho-Slovakia has the strongest executive of any of the new states. Jugo-Slavia alone provides for a king. The legislatures are mostly bicameral, but the upper house is given secondary importance. Finland, Esthonia and Jugo-Slavia have only one house. Little power is given to the federal states where they exist. All the new constitutions provide for proportional representation to protect minorities — an arrangment now in operation in nearly all the European states. "Functional representation" of occupations, special interests, and classes marks an innovation. A general tendency is revealed to subject diplomacy to legislative

New constitutions

control. All the constitutions provide bills of rights and duties. Socialization and nationalization are stressed. In general, the new states of Europe put their trust in "parliamentary government, geographical representation, and decision by majorities."

The positive theories of the state

With the growth of the new idea of government in the decades immediately past, peoples have discovered that they can perform their duties and secure their rights more effectively through coöperative political machinery than they can alone. Hence government has come to be regarded as the people's servant instead of their master. In modern society, where individuals are mutually inter-dependent, government enables them to do a great many things in common to their advantage. It helps, where the individual cannot, in securing justice, in educating the children, in promoting the comforts of life, in regulating food, clothing, and shelter; in protecting health; and in safeguarding property rights. A democratic government is merely the coöperation of many individuals for the common good. The purposes of modern government were never stated better than in the preamble of the constitution of the United States: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, 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."

State and modern problems

To deal with the diverse social problems of today, governments are confronted by many serious tasks scarcely thought of formerly. The progress in civilization has demanded more public services. Not only does the government safeguard property rights, and insure freedom of speech, assembly, petition, religion, and the press, but it also secures justice, equality before the law, the right to vote and hold office, and the opportunity of each person to make the most of his life. Government brings water into the city; makes gas and electricity for lighting and cooking; builds sewers and collects garbage; carries the mails and operates railroads; preserves natural resources; aids commerce and business; protects the rights of the laborers and children; looks after the poor and unfortunate; stamps out disease; and performs a thousand other services for the safety, happiness, and general welfare of the people. Government has ceased to be a big policeman and tax gatherer, and has become a foster-mother to all its citizens. At the same time modern tendencies have made the government itself one of the greatest capitalists and land owners for the good of all. "No government demands so much from the citizen as Democracy, and none gives back so much."

4. International Political Organization

The political organization of the world has gone a step farther than the national state. National imperialism has reached out to include distant peoples. Through economic imperialism capital

finds opportunities for investments in foreign lands as easily as at home. Just as the national government has secured order, justice, and security within the state, so the growth of internationalism seeks to establish world order, world justice, and world security. A consciousness of the necessity of world organization has already created many agencies for world control. Before the World War about 30 official international boards and commissions were in successful operation, and more than 750 unofficial international organizations existed. But these institutions were inadequate to meet world needs, hence before 1914 numerous plans and projects for a better world organization had been proposed. A start was made in that direction at the Hague Peace Conferences, but it took the jar of the costly World War to awaken the peoples of earth to the dangers of world anarchy and immorality. The warring nations learned both the necessity and the value of international coöperation. The Entente Allies proclaimed as one of their war aims the creation of a League of Nations to look after the interests of organized humanity and the Treaty of Versailles called such an organization into existence and provided for its operation.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

R. Muir, *National Self-Government* (1917); F. A. Ogg, *The Governments of Europe* (2d edition 1920); F. A. Ogg and C. A. Beard, *National Governments and the World War* (1919); J. Bryce, *Modern Democracies*, 2 vols. (1920); *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*, 2 vols. (1901); J. Macy and J. W. Gannaway, *Comparative Free Government* (1915); W. B. Munro, *The Government of European Cities* (1909); K. H. Porter, *History of Suffrage in the United States* (1918); E. Jenks, *The State and the Nation* (1921); P. B. Potter, *Introduction to the Study of International Organization* (1922); W. F. Willoughby, *The Problem of Government* (1921); *The Government of Modern States* (1919); H. J. Laski, *Authority in the Modern State* (1919); W. A. Dunning, *History of Political Theories*, Vol. III (1920); E. Barker, *Political Thought in England* (1915); C. E. Merriam, *American Political Ideas, 1865–1917* (1920); H. K. McBain and L. Rogers, *The New Constitutions of Europe* (1922); H. E. Barnes, *Sociology and Political Theory* (1923); A. N. Holcombe, *The Foundations of the Modern Commonwealth* (1924).

CHAPTER XLI

THE GROWTH OF INTERNATIONALISM

1. Diplomatic Machinery

After many centuries of change, the people on the earth today are divided into about sixty political groups called states. A state consists of a number of civilized persons with common laws, customs, and ideals, living on a fixed territory, permanently organized for governmental purposes, and fully independent and sovereign. It has power to make law and to enforce its will on individuals. The state is not the government, but the power back of the government that creates the governmental machinery through which its will is carried out. The whole body of citizens who make the state, are "the people," or the nation. The body of laws and customs that define the powers of the government is the constitution. The terms "country" and "land" refer to the territory over which the state extends. Thus the sovereign state is neither the people, the nation, the country, the government, nor the constitution, but the abstract concept of political unity.

Sovereign states

The number of sovereign states has varied during the past century. A glance at the map of Europe in 1815 will show that Belgium and Holland formed one state, and Norway and Sweden another. There were seven independent states in Italy then, whereas there is now one. *All the small Balkan states were parts of the Turkish Empire.* None of the Latin-American states had been recognized as independent. Neither Africa nor Asia had a single state recognized by the western powers. The German Confederation was composed of 38 independent states. The 55 states in Europe at the conclusion of the Congress of Vienna were reduced in number by the process of consolidation and disruption. For instance the 45 states in Italy and Germany were unified into three states — Italy, Austria, and the German Empire; while out of European Turkey were formed five new Balkan states. As a result of these alterations, in 1914 there were 25 sovereign states in Europe; 21 in America, 6 in Asia; and 2 in Africa. The World War created a number of new states. Out of Austria-Hungary were formed Austria, Hungary, Czecho-Slovakia, and Jugo-Slavia which absorbed Serbia and Montenegro. The old state of Poland was restored. Five other states besides Poland — Ukrania, temporarily, Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia and Finland — broke away from Russia. Today the number of states in Europe has been increased from 25 to 31. In Asia the Kingdom of Hejaz, the Kingdom of Iraq, and the Republic of Armenia were born out of the World War conditions.

Modern civilization has greatly multiplied inter-state relations. To facilitate their intercourse with other powers, most states have delegated this function to the executive branch of the government. The political machinery for managing foreign affairs consists of (1) the head of the state; (2) a minister of foreign affairs; (3) ambassadors, envoys, ministers, and *chargé d'affaires* representing the state abroad; and (4) consuls-general, consuls, vice-consuls, and consular agents, who are sent out to look after business interests. The absolute rulers, like the tsar of Russia, were accustomed to monopolize all foreign relations, but with the creation of republics and the establishment of the parliamentary system of government, the legislatures have their own committees on foreign affairs, which coöperate with the executive in inter-state dealings. Thus autocracy in diplomacy has been broken down to a considerable degree, but just what balance should be preserved between the executive and legislative powers is one of the "insoluble problems of practical politics." In the newer constitutions framed since the World War, the tendency has been to increase parliamentary supervision.

Relations between states

In the United States, the president, with the aid of his secretary of state, supervises transaction with other nations. With the consent of the Senate, he makes treaties and appoints diplomatic and consular agents. Congress exercises the power to regulate foreign trade, to control immigration, and to declare war and make peace. In France the president sends and receives foreign agents, but important treaties and the declaration of war must receive the sanction of the chambers, while the details of international relations are in charge of a minister of foreign affairs. In Great Britain all intercourse with other states is conducted in the name of the king, but the actual work is done by the prime minister and foreign secretary. Frequently able rulers like Queen Victoria and Edward VII, who was known as "the great international statesman," exercised a considerable influence in diplomatic matters. Treaties do not require the sanction of Parliament, but the treaty made after the World War was submitted to it for approval. In Italy the king concludes treaties, appoints foreign agents, and declares war, but only through his ministers, who are responsible to the Chamber of Deputies. A minister of foreign affairs conducts the routine of business. In Germany and Austria before the World War, the rulers took the initiative in all foreign relations, but today in those countries legislative committees in coöperation with secretaries of foreign affairs control such matters. In Japan the emperor declares war, makes peace, concludes treaties, and appoints foreign representatives, although all his orders have to be signed by a minister. There is not "even a pretense of popular control." In Norway all treaties are submitted to parliament for sanction, while in Sweden a commission, like that in France, confers with the executive on international questions. In no state, except Switzerland, are foreign policies submitted to the people for approval or rejection

Conduct of foreign relations

and in 1920 entry into the League of Nations was sanctioned by a referendum.

2. Official International Agencies

The greatest single force in the world during the past century or two has been nationalism. It captivated the heart and mind of groups of men around the globe. By establishing constitutions and free government; by fostering popular education; and by encouraging economic development, it helped to produce a high civilization. At the same time, in its exaggerated form, it burdened the peoples of earth with a crushing militarism; cultivated an aggressive imperialism; encouraged a false type of patriotism; and produced a crop of quarrels and wars. While statesmen recognized the constructive service of nationalism in domestic affairs, many of them were appalled by the immorality, injustice, and anarchy in international relations. International Law lagged far behind the needs of the world for peace and justice. There was no permanent international legislature to enact laws to meet inter-state problems as state legislatures met national needs. Congresses were held not so much to prevent conflicts as to adjust them after they occurred. The network of treaties guaranteed national security and power rather than international order and protection. Alliances assured the predominance of certain groups of nations instead of preserving the rights of all peoples. Disputes within states were settled in stable courts of law, but differences between states had to be adjusted by diplomacy, arbitration, or war.

Early absence of international agencies

Meanwhile three principal influences, among many others, were stimulating the growth of internationalism: (1) The improvements in transportation and communication gave the world a new sense of unity by bringing distant peoples into closer touch with each other. (2) The growth of world business cultivated mutual confidence and more intimate inter-state relations. (3) The spread of Christianity through many agencies tended to create a common civilization among the different peoples of the earth. These forces were breaking down the old barriers and prejudices that separated different races and nationalities, and were teaching the modern spirit of coöperation and brotherhood. Hermit nations ceased to exist, and a community of interest and world public opinion emerged. About 750 unofficial and voluntary international organizations were formed for all sorts of purposes. In addition to these bodies, official agencies were created: (1) International Law received more consideration as a body of positive rules carrying definite duties and obligations, and was accepted by all civilized states as binding on them. (2) International treaties were multiplied to regulate international relations, and thus restricted the contracting powers' freedom of action while stressing a general welfare. (3) International congresses became more numerous in settling world affairs, which otherwise might have led to

Forces promoting the growth of internationalism

armed conflicts. (4) The League of Nations was created in 1919, with two houses having some of the functions of an international government, as the latest experiment in official organization to manage international affairs in such a way as to avoid war.

In addition to these general agencies working for the betterment of world conditions, numerous special, public, international organizations have been established to handle specific problems. The most important examples of these are the following: (1) The Universal Postal Union, formed in 1878, and now including every civilized state, has its official bureau at Berne, Switzerland. Through it uniformity of postal laws was secured, remarkably low rates were obtained, and the delivery of international mail became speedy and certain. In 1910 over 905,000,000 letters, 278,000,000 postcards, 29,000,000 money orders, and packages equal in number to all the people on earth, were sent through the Union. (2) Patterned in many particulars after the Postal Union are the Telegraph Union, the Union for the Protection of Industrial Property (patents, trademarks etc.), the Metric Union, the European Union of Railway Freight Transportation, the Union for the Protection of Submarine Cables and the Union for the Repression of the White Slave Trade. (3) A number of River Commissions have successfully controlled international rivers like the Rhine, Danube, and Congo. (4) Special boards have been created at various times to govern regions like Albania, Fiume, Dantzig, Constantinople, the New Hebrides, and the Samoan Islands. (5) The International Sanitary Commission formed in 1903 deals with dangerous epidemics, such as cholera and the Bubonic plague, and seeks to prevent their spread. In 1914 the "Central Office of International Institutions" at Brussels in a public list of interstate organizations enumerated thirty-two that dealt exclusively with "international science." The International Research Council was formed in 1919 at Brussels and had 19 nation-members within two years. (6) The International Suez Canal Commission was created to keep the canal "free and open in time of war as in time of peace." (7) The Permanent Sugar Commission was organized by fourteen states in 1902 to establish free trade in sugar, while the International Institute of Agriculture, with headquarters at Rome, seeks to promote agriculture. (8) The International Labor Organization, created in 1919, attempts to establish social peace based on social justice, by bringing about a coöperation of the state, capital and labor in the sphere of industry. Two world conferences were held by representatives of 48 states, one at Washington in 1919 and the other at Genoa in 1922, and a permanent International Labor Office was located in Geneva.

International agencies

In general, wars both create and destroy a more intimate relation among nations. The World War, in its immediate effect, divided the peoples of earth into two bitterly hostile groups based upon the rival Triple Alliance and Triple Entente in Europe, but within each warring

International coöperation in war

group there was a closer military, economic, and political coöperation than had ever been known. Germany dominated one side, and France and Great Britain led the other. The Allied and Associate Powers created certain international executive commissions, which had much to do with winning the conflict. These included such bodies as the Supreme War Council, the Allied Naval Council, the Inter-Allied Council on War Purchases and Finance, the Allied Maritime Transport Council, the Food Council, and the Munitions Council, which enabled the victorious Allies to utilize their common efforts more effectively towards their one objective. After the defeat of the Central Powers, the Allied states sought to capitalize the spirit of coöperation by creating the League of Nations for the purpose of enforcing the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and of preventing future wars. The League of Nations, in turn, made provision for a number of international commissions to deal with many difficult problems growing out of the World War.

The past century saw the birth of a new world — a world largely uniform in its manners and ideals. Economically, nations were no longer independent, but vitally dependent upon the products and resources of each other. The growth of world business led to the exchange of goods and raw materials on a wide scale. The industrial nations scoured the earth for markets, and sent out thousands of agents to sell their wares. The capitalists and bankers of Great Britain, France and Germany invested billions of dollars in their colonies, and in foreign lands. International credit and exchange facilitated world business by cultivating mutual confidence. Socially, peoples were no more isolated units, but consciously interdependent and striving to advance humanity to a higher plane of well-being. Science, travel, communication, the printing-press, the physician, the missionary, and the teacher were raising the standards of living in the backward parts of the world. Culturally, nations freely exchanged their ideas, learning, inventions, and discoveries. In the midst of the keen national rivalries and of class and industrial competitions in modern society, there was emerging a new watchword, namely, coöperation. Thousands of agencies were ministering to the international needs of the new age. Thousands of forward-looking men and women were fostering an international spirit, not merely by paying lip-service to catch-words like "the brotherhood of man" or by seeking to revive the shadowy and poetical idealism of Rousseau, but by beginning practically and prosaically to demonstrate that there are more ties, economic, social, and human, which "bind nations together" than there are conflicting interests and antagonisms which separate them. Hence it was in the course of progress that men should talk about the next step in the political and economic organization of mankind to eliminate the causes of international strife and misunderstanding. Proposals for the federation of the nations of the world became more insistent as the decades of the

The modern world international in its basis

last century passed by, and their discussion was accelerated by the outbreak of the World War.

3. Projects for World Peace and the Federation of the World

The United States in 1789 gave the world the first successful experiment of a stable, democratic federation of independent commonwealths — a task almost as difficult for that day as the federation of the self-governing states of the world in this day. Meanwhile the Industrial Revolution was laying the economic foundations for political internationalism. While the French Revolution was raging *Kant* in 1795, Immanuel Kant, a German philosopher, wrote his treatise, *On Perpetual Peace*, in which he urged (1) the establishment of popular government; (2) the "universal Union" of free republican states under the "reign of right"; (3) the doctrine of non-interference; and (4) the surrender of national liberty to international control. After the overthrow of Napoleon, who also dreamed of a congress to settle Europe under his power, the autocratic states of Europe formed the Holy Alliance "to protect Religion, Peace and Justice." "International conservatism", organized in the Concert of Europe as an alliance against revolutionary tendencies, sought to control world affairs, but autocratic rulers could not create a durable union of European states because its "morality was based on bayonets."

Proposals for European federation

Mazzini, the Italian patriot, in 1831 attempted to organize a "Young Europe" movement under the control of a "College of intellectuals" located in Switzerland as an advisory body. With the rise of socialism about the middle of the nineteenth century, there resulted the International Working Men's Association, commonly called "The First International," which was formed in 1864 at London for the purpose of uniting the workers of all nations. After holding several international congresses, its power waned, but in 1889 "The Second International" was revived at Paris and lasted until disrupted by the World War. In 1910, the Socialists' Congress at Copenhagen rejected James Keir Hardie's motion for the declaration of a general strike of all workers in case of war by a vote of 131 to 51. Among those who voted with the majority were 20 Germans, 18 Austrians, 15 Italians, and 14 Americans. In the minority were 20 Englishmen, 12 Frenchmen, 7 Russians and 5 Poles. Both the vote and the allignment of the delegates were significant. In 1913 the German Socialists grumbled about the Zabern affair, but took no effective action. On July 28, 1914, when the outbreak of war seemed certain, the German Socialists held 28 public meetings in Berlin alone to protest against war. The next day in a great gathering of Socialists at Brussels, the German Socialist, Haase, declared that the demands of Austria on Serbia were a provocation of war, and said that Germany should not intervene even if Russia did. It was decided to hold a great International Congress in Paris on August 9 to prevent the out-

break of a general war. The Socialist newspaper *Vorwärts* protested against both the war and the barbarities committed by the army in it. Liebknecht asserted that the war was imperialistic and capitalistic, and intended for the conquest of the markets of the world. In the Reichstag 16 of his comrades joined him. The attitude of British workers was seen in the fact that in 1915, 698 strikes occurred. The attempt of the Bolsheviki in Russia to create "The Third International" in 1919 found the Socialists of the world split into numerous hostile factions — a condition which has continued to 1926.

The Peace movement

The "Peace Movement" was organized in many different societies and had diverse programs during the past century, and was distinctly a form of propagandism that covered the world. The first society was formed in 1815 in New York City, and was soon followed by others in the chief American cities. In Europe, a peace society was established in London in 1816 and at Geneva in 1828. From these beginnings, similar associations increased until in 1914 there were 55 in Italy; 36 in France; 22 in Great Britain; 17 in the United States; 8 each in Austria and Sweden; 7 in Latin America; 4 in Australia; 3 each in Hungary, Norway, Russia, Spain, Japan, and Denmark, and 1 in Canada — a total of 160 organizations with many branches and an enormous membership. Out of these local peace societies grew international peace congresses, the first being held in 1843 at London and attended by 337 delegates. At the third international peace congress convened in Paris in 1849, Victor Hugo read his epoch-marking address on "The United States of Europe." After 1889 such congresses met annually and in 1891 the "Permanent International Bureau of Peace" was established at Berne. A powerful sentiment for universal peace was engendered by these agencies through the publication of newspapers, tracts, and books and large endowments of money were secured to advance the cause. The Swedish chemist, Alfred Nobel; the Scotch-American, Andrew Carnegie; the French publicist, Baron D'Estournelles de Constant; the Russian novelist, Count Leo Tolstoy; and other eminent men and women became ardent champions of the movement.

The Church and peace

Thousands of pacifists throughout the world denounced war as a relic of barbarism, a contradiction of Christianity, subversive of modern culture, dangerous to business prosperity, and destructive of political democracy. As the twentieth century approached, they argued that the international bankers and capitalists would prevent wars to save investments; that the working classes would not support their governments in armed conflicts because they would be the chief sufferers; that socialism had become sufficiently strong to prevent the settlement of disputes by force; that the intellectual classes were powerful enough to secure the adjustment of international conflicts without human slaughter; and, finally, that the Christian churches would exert their tremendous influence against wars between civilized nations. To give official recognition to the peace idea,

Great Britain and France in 1889 invited other states to join The Interparliamentary Union, which in 1912 had 3640 members with headquarters at Brussels. The First Pan-American Congress was held in 1889 to promote friendly relations among the American republics. The most progressive pacifists ceased to be emotional, and took up the scientific study of history, politics, law, and psychology to discover the causes of war. They challenged the supposed benefits of war, and pointed out its economic, moral, and biological evils. They revealed the collapse of International Law before an aggressive nationalism. They proclaimed the dangerous consequences of huge armaments both to national groups and to the human race. And out of all this discussion, they presented constructive plans for a new world order based on law, reason, and justice.

Arbitration

Arbitration of inter-state disputes was one of the first practical measures proposed to avoid war. The United States took the initiative in this means of adjusting international conflicts. In 1835 the senate of Massachusetts favored such a method, and in 1853 the Senate of the United States took similar action. By 1873 nine national states had adopted the principle. The Pan-American Congresses and the two Hague Peace Conferences sought to perfect the machinery necessary for the successful employment of arbitration. Between 1821 and 1909 about 300 treaties providing for arbitration were formed, of which 80 made arbitration compulsory. From 1800 to 1914 perhaps 250 disputes over all sorts of problems were arbitrated. In 1899 the First Hague Peace Conference created the Permanent Court of Arbitration and 18 important cases and numerous minor ones were settled up to 1914 by the process prescribed. The Second Hague Peace Conference in 1907 favored compulsory arbitration, but disagreement over the selection of judges prevented the institution of such a court, and actually established an International Prize Court. In the same year the Central American Court of Justice was set up to adjudicate "all controversies" at home and abroad. Finally the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 provided for a Permanent Court of International Justice, which was organized in 1921 by 26 nations and is in successful operation with 48 nation-members (1925). It consists of 11 judges and 4 deputy-judges elected by the League of Nations for a period of nine years. The Court frames its own rules, elects its own officers, and resides at The Hague. It is empowered to hear "suits between states" on written application and cases are decided by a "majority of the judges present." The decision "is final and without appeal" although new facts may permit "an application for revision of a judgment" after the lapse of five years.

Numerous proposals were made to create adequate machinery — legislative, executive, and judicial — to meet international needs. International Law presupposed the existence of a loose "Society of Nations," but the new super-state world organization proposed was called by such high-sounding titles as the "World State," "The

Organizations to enforce peace

Parliament of Man," and "The United States of the World." The federationists suggested a genuine coöperative union of the sovereign states, with the nation as a basis, but with sufficient power to secure peace, order and the reign of law throughout the earth. They contended that just as the individual with his selfish impulse cannot live without working with and for his fellow-men, so the self-centered nation cannot exist without coöperating with other nations. Internationalism, rightly understood, does not mean the destruction of the nation with all its virtues and fine impulses, but its complement, the "pooling of the spiritual resources of all nations "to bring mankind to a higher level of happiness and culture. They urged the development of a world point of view as a supplementary corrective of the narrower national standpoint. The cosmopolitans and the Socialists, on the other hand, were disposed to urge the obliteration of all national boundaries in order to create a genuine world government and a world citizenship. Organizations advocating the ideas of both the federated and the unified world state were found in nearly if not all of the advanced nations of the globe. Perhaps the most conspicuous movement towards world organization was that of the League to Enforce Peace, formed at Philadelphia in 1915, which proposed: (1) to submit all questions involving law to an international judicial tribunal; (2) to submit all other disputes to a council for conciliation; (3) to employ both economic and military force against any nation that refused to negotiate before going to war; and (4) to hold international conferences to formulate International Law to meet new world conditions. This drive in the United States, which was supported by many of the ablest men in the nation, found a counter-part in Great Britain, France, Italy, and other countries, and had much to do with the creation of the League of Nations.

The outbreak of the World War had the immediate effect of intensifying the peace efforts, more especially, of course, in the neutral countries. But as one nation after another was drawn into the conflict, the pacifists divided into two camps: (1) the irreconcilables and "conscientious objectors," who denounced the war as an evil from which no possible good could come, and suffered vilification and imprisonment for their convictions; and (2) the compromisers, who believed that the struggle was a "War to end War" and a crusade against Prussian militarism, and consequently gave it either whole-hearted or half-hearted support. With the defeat of the Central Powers, the forces working for universal peace were undoubtedly strengthened, but many obstacles to its realization still survived. Many of the pacifists hailed the League of Nations as the goal of all their hopes, because they believed that it would bring about disarmament, provide adequate legislative, judicial, and administrative machinery to settle disputes, and possess sufficient authority to enforce its will. Other pacifists of the groups of irreconcilables denounced the League as merely a means of perpetuating the selfish

League of Nations

nationalism and imperialism of the victorious Allies. From the standpoint of world history, however, the results of the World War may measurably advance the cause of peace and friendly understanding among the nations of earth.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

J. Bryce, *International Relations* (1922); A. J. Grant, A. Greenwood, and others, *An Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (1916), A. S. Hershey, *Elements of International Public Law* (1912); L. Oppenheim, *International Law*, 2 vols. (3d edition 1921); E. C. Stowell and H. C. Munro, *International Cases*, 2 vols. (1916); J. W. Foster, *Practice of Diplomacy* (1906); E. Satow, *Guide to Diplomatic Practise* (1917); P. B. Porter, *Introduction to the Study of International Organization* (1922); A. Ponsonby, *Democracy and Diplomacy* (1915); F. Nielson, *How Diplomats Make War* (1916); G. Young, *Diplomacy Old and New* (1921); P. S. Reinsch, *Secret Diplomacy* (1922); *International Public Unions* (1911); A. L. Kennedy, *Old Diplomacy and New, 1876–1922* (1923); J. M. Mathews, *The Conduct of American Foreign Relations* (1922); E. S. Corwin, *The President's Control of American Foreign Relations* (1917); Q. Wright, *Control of American Foreign Relations* (1922); G. Hunt, *The Department of State* (1914); D. P. Heatley, *Diplomacy and the Study of International Relations* (1923); E. Satow, *International Congresses and Conferences* (1921); C. Dupuis, *Principe de l'equilibries et de concert européen* (1909); W. A. Phillips, *The Confederation of Europe* (1914); E. Krehbiel, *Nationalism, War, and Society* (1916); R. Muir, *Nationalism and Internationalism* (1917); G. M. Fiske, *International Commercial Policies* (1907); N. M. Butler, *The International Mind* (1912), J. C. Faries, *Rise of Internationalism* (1915); P. M. Brown, *International Society, its Nature and Interests* (1922); W. P. Merrill, *Christian Internationalism* (1919); F. B. Sayre, *Experiments in International Administration* (1919); J. B. Scott, *The Hague Peace Conferences* (1909); W. I. Hull, *The Two Hague Peace Conferences* (1908); *The New Peace Movement* (1912); J. H. Choate, *The Two Hague Conferences* (1913); W. Schucking and H. Wehberg, *The Work of the Hague*, 2 vols. (1918); P. M. Ogilvie, *International Waterways* (1920); B. E. Lowe, *International Protection of Labor* (1921); R. W. Postgate, *The Workers' International* (1921); H. Davis, *Among the World's Peacemakers* (1907); A. H. Fried, *Die moderne Friedensbewegung in Deutschland und Frankreich* (1918); J. Moritzen, *The Peace Movement in America* (1912); N. Angell, *The Great Illusion* (1910); F. C. Howe, *Why War?* (1916); C. C. Collin, *War against War* (1917); B. A. W. Russell, *Why Men Fight* (1917); T. B. Veblen, *The Nature of Peace* (1917); O. T. Crosby, *International War; its Causes and its Cure* (1919); G. L. Dickinson, *The Causes of International War* (1921); B. F. Trueblood, *Federation of the World* (1899); J. Novikov, *Federation de l'Europe* (1901); R. L. Bridgman, *World Organization* (1905); C. E. Hooper, *The Need of the Nations, an International Parliament* (1907); R. L. Jones, *International Arbitration as a Substitute for War* (1908); J. A. Hobson, *Toward International Government* (1916); H. N. Brailsford, *A League of Nations* (2d ed. 1917); R. Goldsmith, *A League to Enforce Peace* (1917); E. Barker, *A Confederation of Nations* (1918); R. C. Minor, *A Republic of Nations* (1918); A. F. Pollard, *League of Nations in History* (1918); F. C. Hicks, *The New World Order* (1920); G. N. Clarke, *Unifying the World* (1921).

CHAPTER XLII

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC INSTITUTIONS

1. The Industrial Revolution and Modern Social Conditions

The present social and economic conditions of the earth have been determined largely by the rapid expansion of the Industrial Revolution over the globe. Perhaps more than any other force, it has modernized the world and made it different from the past. The factory system changed the mode of living and the conduct of business in a thousand different ways. The new means of travel by land, sea, and air obliterated the barriers of space and opened markets everywhere. An improved mail service, the telegraph, cable, telephone, and wireless brought the most distant peoples into intimate relationships, and made all humanity one great neighborhood. Many factors were busy transforming this neighborhood into a brotherhood. Innumerable inventions, discoveries, and new processes multiplied the joys and comforts of life. Thus within the lifetime of men and women still living, a new civilization appeared on earth. It attained its highest perfection in western Europe and in the United States, and from those two centers spread to southern and eastern Europe, to Latin America, to Asia, to Africa, and to the islands of the seas. Large areas of the backward regions still remain industrially undeveloped, but the awakening is making giant strides.

Industrialization and rise of cities

In general the effects of the newer Industrial Revolution have been both beneficial and detrimental. It has stimulated democracy socially, politically, and industrially. It led first to the rise of a powerful middle class to a commanding position of wealth and political authority. Then came the gradual enfranchisement of the male workers, followed by the extension of suffrage to the women. Political democracy, in turn, encouraged the workers and reformers to advocate the democratization of industry. Numerous experiments in that direction were made in America and Europe; and were in operation for some years in Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. Men and women were called from the farms and villages to live together in more intimate relationships in the great industrial centers. Forty-five years ago (1880) 75 per cent of the people of the United States lived in the country; now less than half live in rural communities. Old nations like the British and French ceased to be provincial in speech, social usages, and laws, and built up a national solidarity unknown in the earlier days. The new industrial classes, both capitalists and wage-earners, became the champions of a strong

nationalism — the capitalists, because they needed a strong government to protect their business interests at home and their investments abroad; the workers, because they believed that their prosperity depended upon industrial success. Common economic interests developed nationalistic aspirations in divided countries like Italy and Germany. In the United States, a great Civil War not only abolished slavery but also killed the doctrine of states rights, and stressed national sovereignty. Thus everywhere peoples took patriotic pride in seeing their nations increase in wealth, advance in power, and become "great" among other nations. Capital increased tremendously, even billionaires appeared, and thousands of new business enterprises were started. More coal, petroleum and iron ore were produced in the decade from 1911–1921 than in the whole of the nineteenth century.

Imperialism

The same forces that encouraged the growth of nationalism likewise applauded the rise of national imperialism. The annihilation of distance, the need of new markets for surplus manufactures, the demand for fresh sources of raw materials and food supplies, the desire for opportunities to invest accumulated capital in paying enterprises, and pride in seeing the map of the country grow larger and larger, produced national imperialism — one of the most significant features of modern world history. This new national imperialism soon became contagious among the leading powers and found champions among business men, patriots, and religious zealots. The exchange of goods among the different nations also led to the exchange of ideas. Foreign travel increased at a tremendous rate, and immigration set in on a gigantic scale. Peoples came to understand each other as never before. Thousands of students left their homes to study in foreign lands. Numerous movements sought to bring about a friendlier understanding among the nations and to lay the foundations for world peace. Arbitration treaties became common, and international societies of all sorts were seeking to create a coöperative spirit in the world.

2. Growth of Commerce

During the century following 1819, when the first steamship crossed the Atlantic, the total value of the trade of the world multiplied sixty times or from $2 to $37 for every person living on the earth. For a long time Great Britain has stood first among the commercial countries, and British maritime supremacy is still acknowledged. The British Empire controls half of the gold mined, a third of the wool and coal, a fourth of the cotton, a fifth of the wheat, and a sixth of the pig iron of the world. Great Britain imports most of her foodstuffs and raw materials and pays for them out of her exports of textiles, machinery, leather goods, cutlery, chemicals and pottery. In 1914 Germany ranked next to Great Britain as a commercial power, but the World War left her industries disorganized, her foreign trade

ruined, and her merchant marine destroyed. By 1925, however, Germany's recovery was pronounced. In the volume of foreign trade, France now takes second place among the nations. The French excel in producing millinery, laces, gloves, silks, wines, and china, which are exported. The French merchant marine, however, is not extensive. In proportion to her wealth and population, the foreign trade of the United States has been small. This country is more independent, industrially, than any other great state, produces nearly all of the necessities of life and owns most of its own raw materials. Within the past twenty years, foreign markets have been eagerly sought for the products of the farms, mines, and factories. Before 1914 only 10 per cent of the foreign commerce was carried under the American flag, but the World War greatly increased the merchant marine. Japan likewise has been making giant strides in world commerce and her merchant fleet in 1925 exceeded that of France.

Modern commercial methods

Today world business is so thoroughly organized that there is a steady stream of commodities from producers to consumers through wholesalers and retailers. Much of the world's business is carried on by the great exchanges dealing in wheat, corn, cotton, wool, sugar, stocks, and bonds. Although producers are thus saved from ruinous fluctuations, nevertheless such evils as "corners" and "squeezes" grow out of speculation on the stock exchanges. The organization of insurance companies to guarantee business men against losses by hail, wind, water, fire and theft takes the risk out of most commercial enterprises. Banks also aid business men with loans, and a convenient system of checks, drafts, and foreign bills of exchange. Governments either charter or own mighty banking institutions. The Bank of England, the Bank of France, and the Federal Reserve Bank of the United States serve to stabilize the financial system. Commercial banks are supplemented by savings banks and trust companies. Most of the nations of the world have now adopted gold as the standard of all business transactions. Mexico made the change in 1918, thus leaving China as the only state of industrial importance that retains silver as a basis. The years following the World War left Europe unsettled economically by the flood of paper currency.

International finance

The growth of world business necessitated the development of international finance. In normal times the system of credits and foreign bills of exchange enabled men in one country to engage with ease and safety in business all over the world. Enormous loans of money were made by the richer countries to the poorer ones. Capitalists in progressive lands invested billions in backward parts of the earth, and in other countries. In 1914 it was estimated that British capitalists had $20,000,000,000 invested abroad — half of it in the colonies and the rest in foreign countries. French investments abroad totalled $10,000,000,000. Those of Germany were also high. The United States, prior to the World War was a debtor nation, but after that conflict Europe owed her about $11,000,000,000. New York, rather

than London, Paris or Berlin became the center of international finance. The total debt of the world, it is estimated increased during the past ten years from forty to four hundred billion dollars.

With the gradual increase in the gold supply there has been a steady increase in the price of commodities. The abundance of gold has supplied more money with which to buy goods. With the greater demand for goods, the supply of goods grows scarcer and the prices become higher. With the scarcity of goods and higher prices, industry expands to meet the need. This means more work and higher wages for the laborers. Since salaries rise more slowly than wages, the salaried workers have benefited less during a period of high prices. In like manner those who depend upon incomes from stocks and bonds suffer. When bad banking, or the over-issue of cheap paper money, or speculation, or overexpansion in business, or unwise investments, or crop failures, produce an unsettled and nervous condition, a financial crisis results. Bankers refuse to lend money; merchants cancel their orders or refuse to buy; factories are closed; bankruptcies result; and hard times come. Prices fall, wages are lowered, unemployment follows, and suffering is general. After a time confidence returns, a wave of prosperity begins, and times are "good" once more. Economists and financiers are studying methods to stabilize prices and to avert panics. *Business cycles*

The first great modern nation to adopt the policy of free trade was Great Britain. She removed restrictions on exports and exacted import duties on such articles as coffee, tea, tobacco, liquors, and sugar merely to secure a revenue. "To buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest," was her trade motto. Other powerful industrial states, however, adopted the protective system, which sought, by high tariffs on competing imports, to build up "infant industries" until they became self-supporting and able to compete in world markets. This policy was the logical outgrowth of an intense nationalism. The United States, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and other states were the champions of protectionism. Many political economists were disposed to contend that free trade was the ideal goal towards which nations should direct their efforts. In recent years there has also been much talk about the freedom of the seas. In time of peace, the seas are open to all nations alike. In time of war, however, the Suez and Panama canals observe this rule, but the navies of the belligerents, through the use of the blockade, close portions of the high seas to neutral shipping. Under the League of Nations it is hoped that a freer commercial intercourse may develop and that the complete freedom of the seas may be assured to neutrals in time of armed conflict. *Free trade* *Protectionism*

3. The War on Poverty

The Industrial Revolution produced a class consciousness between the wage-earners and the capitalists. In the past the poor had been

serfs in the country and low-grade laborers in the cities. The factory developed a new type of a poor man — the "hand" or "workingman," who sold his labor to the capitalist. The craft guilds of an earlier day were crowded out by the new machinery placed in the mills and by the keen competition which resulted. Many a riot occurred against the "iron men" as the machines were called. But the modern inventions won, and the artisans were forced to find places in factories and mines, where they labored as equals in driving the new slaves of iron and steel. As the factories grew in size, employing hundreds and thousands of workers, the earlier personal relationship between employer and employee was lost. The individuality of the wage-earner was submerged in that of the multitude. Ofttimes the owner of a factory was not a single person, known to all his helpers, but a corporation of capitalists unknown to the workers, employing superintendents and "bosses" to run the "plant." Under such conditions there was no sense of responsibility for the welfare of the workers on the part of the employer, and no sympathy for the success of the factory on the part of the workers. In too many cases greed for large profits caused the exploitation of the laborers and indifference to the serious evils springing up in the new industrial society.

Labor in the machine age

Thus it was that a new type of a rich man, the capitalist, began to displace the old aristocracy of blood, land and privilege. He invested his money in factories, mines, railroads, and steamships. He took advantage of the new discoveries and inventions to use the natural resources of the world for profit. He employed labor as he did machinery — to make money. His large gains were invested in larger enterprises. In this manner the capitalists formed a class that controlled the agencies of production and distribution upon which millions depended for their livelihood. Further, this new aristocracy of wealth gained control of the government, and hence were able to enact laws to further their own interests. As a result a hostile barrier separated the workingmen from the capitalists, and as time passed, the two classes became more and more conscious of the gulf dividing them.

Capitalism

To protect their rights and interests under the new industrial régime, the laborers began to organize. The workers in one branch or trade, or in one establishment, formed a "trade-union." At first these unions were forbidden by the governments, but as the workers gained political power and awakened sympathy, they forced the legalization of the trade-unions. This recognition occurred first in Great Britain, and later in other industrial countries. The British trade-unions by 1921 enrolled over 6,500,000 members and served as a model for labor organizations in other parts of the world. They elected their representatives to Parliament, and exercised much influence in securing labor legislation. They have numerous coöperative societies, which include retail shops, wholesale houses, factories, and even banks, for the purpose of reducing the cost of living for the

Labor unions

workers. On the continent of Europe the workers have trade-unions and coöperative societies, but they are not so powerful as in Great Britain. Germany had 8,000,000 members in 1921; Italy 2,600,000; France 1,500,000; Austria 1,000,000; Belgium 700,000; Poland 950,000; Spain 800,000; Mexico 500,000; Australia 630,000. In the United States the skilled workmen are organized in trade-unions, but they constitute only 15 per cent or over 4,000,000 of the male wage-earners. In 1925, 107 of the unions were affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, which was started in 1886. With the exception of mutual life insurance companies and building and loan associations, the coöperative movement has made comparatively little progress in America. The International Federation of Trade Unions, consisting of 19 countries and 7,500,000 members before the World War, had increased by 1921 to include 24 countries and 24,000,000 members. The total number of organized workers in the world in 1925 was given at 41,000,000. In Great Britain during the past century wages have increased two and one half times; and in the United States they have advanced 116 per cent since 1910.

In spite of the wonderful increase in wealth and the advance in invention, science and education, and in the face of laudable efforts of governments to improve the lot of the working classes, a large portion of the population of even the most highly civilized nations spend their lives in poverty and wretchedness. Economically speaking, poverty does not mean starvation and beggary, but a condition that prevents a man from living in a decent, sanitary home with modern comforts; that makes the clothing and proper education of his children difficult; and that leaves neither leisure nor funds for suitable recreation and recuperative vacations. The causes of this state of affairs are chiefly low wages, uncertain employment, overcrowding in the great cities, sickness, intemperance, thriftlessness, and lack of ambition on the part of the workers. Booth's survey in London revealed the startling fact that in the East End of that city one third of the families were forced to live on $5.15, or less, a week; that 42 per cent of the families earned from $5.50 to $7.50 a week; and that only 13 per cent of the families enjoyed a weekly income above $7.50. The investigation revealed a frightfully congested situation in the overcrowded, badly-lighted, unsanitary, and poorly ventilated tenement houses. The alarming conclusion was reached that fully 33 per cent of the people of London lived in a state of poverty. Similar conditions were found in other British cities and on the continent. The slums of New York and Chicago are notorious. These conditions breed vice, disease, immorality, and crime, and are now generally recognized as a menace to the nation.

Poverty

Only a few years ago it was assumed that poverty is inevitable. Today, however, forward-looking persons in all classes believe that it is possible to abolish poverty. "Some remedy," said Pope Leo XIII, "must be found, and that quickly, for the misery and wretchedness

which press so heavily at this moment on a large majority of the very poor." "I believe," said John D. Rockefeller Jr., "that every man is entitled to an opportunity to earn a living, to fair wages, to reasonable hours of work and proper working conditions, to a decent home, to the opportunities to play, to learn, to worship, and to love; as well as to toil, and that the responsibility rests as heavily upon industry as upon government or society, to see that these conditions and opportunities prevail." And so the hope has been aroused in the minds of many students of society that by the reorganization of industry so as to promote the greatest efficiency and to eliminate waste, by setting the idle to work, by a more equitable distribution of wealth, and by the use of science and invention, all persons may live in comfort and develop the best type of intelligent, industrious, creative manhood. War has been declared on poverty, not alone by the workers, but also by the leaders of the state, the church, education and industry.

Prevention of poverty

Much has been done already to solve this vital problem. Governments permit their citizens to improve their lot by removing from one country to another. Numerous laws provide free agencies such as the public schools, night schools, continuation schools, trade schools, adult education, state colleges, libraries, and reading rooms to educate all the people. Recreation and amusements are supervised by the government to make them wholesome and morally uplifting. Legislation for improving the condition of the workers includes provision for shorter hours, minimum wage scales, safety appliances, compensation for accidents, old age pensions, insurance against enforced idleness, sickness and disability, sanitary surroundings for work and living, safeguards against disease, suitable housing conditions, playgrounds, parks and places for play for adults and children, pensions for mothers, employment bureaus, and the regulation of work for women and children. A century ago such laws would have been howled down with derision. Today it is taken for granted that poverty is a social disease, which may be materially reduced if not eradicated altogether.

Thoughtful men are coming to see that one of the chief problems of the day is how to prevent anyone from getting an undue possession of property without making adequate returns to society. The earth is fairly bursting with natural resources for the sustenance of humanity. The vast stretches of agricultural lands, the rich areas of the tropics, and the seas and streams teeming with life, should supply an abundance of food and clothing for every human being on the globe. The gigantic forests, and the vast supplies of iron, coal, oil, and electricity are sufficient to house mankind and to heat and light the homes. With an abundance of labor and machinery to till the soil, work the mines, run the mills and factories, cut the timber, and manage communication, transportation and distribution, there is no longer any reason why people everywhere should not live in

comfort and happiness. It is a disgrace to modern civilization that hundreds of thousands of men and women in India, or China, or Europe, should die of famine, when the rest of the world has a superabundance of food. It is a disgrace to western civilization that millions of adults and children should live and perish in the squalor and wretchedness of the slums of its large cities, while others live in luxury and idleness. The World War demonstrated clearly what might be done through scientific charity, altruistic coöperation, and the efficient distribution of food, clothing, and other human necessities, in saving a starving Belgium and central Europe, in rebuilding the ruined homes of northern France, and in caring for the millions of victims of the conflict. The lessons learned in saving human life in time of war must be utilized for times of peace.

Humanitarianism

A new social and industrial age is dawning — an age in which human welfare is paramount and humanitarian activities are engaging the attention of the world's leaders. The provision of farms for the poor, and homes for the orphans, deaf, dumb, blind, insane, and aged, who are unable to take care of themselves, reveals a new sense of social responsibility. Laws to prevent unfair prices and rates, to forestall the private monopoly of natural resources which should be conserved for the common good, to regulate business in the interest of all the people, to curtail vice and immorality, to solve the liquor problem, to reform the criminal classes, to improve city government so as to afford adequate protection against crime, disease, ignorance and poverty, and to tax large fortunes for the general good, all reveal a public opinion aroused to the necessity of solving these vital problems. A better world is gradually emerging as a result.

War on disease

Perhaps no tendency of the new age is more significant than the war on disease — human, animal, and plant. Governments and rich men are appropriating millions of dollars to enable thousands of trained experts to discover the causes of diseases in order to abolish them. Human life has taken on a new value, and medicine, surgery, sanitation, new instruments and devices, and antiseptics are all used to lower the death-rate. Listen, Pasteur, and Semmelweiss are looked upon as saviors of the human race. At the beginning of the nineteenth century infant mortality in some countries like Russia exceeded 27 per cent; today it is under 10 per cent in the most advanced states. Hospitals, sanitoriums, and free clinics now cover large portions of the globe. The number of physicians, surgeons, and nurses has multiplied. As a result of these various agencies many lives are saved annually; mothers are preserved for their children; and wage-earners are spared for their families. Periods of enforced idleness on account of sickness are greatly reduced. The maimed and crippled are repaired and sent back to work. The human race is improved physically to the profit of society and industry. At the same time the scientific attention devoted to diseases of animals and plants tends to augment the food and clothing supply of the world. Quarantine,

sanitation, and preventive measures receive much attention. Disease is regarded as something more than an individual and local concern — it is a national and a world problem. Hence local boards of health are supplemented by national boards; and national boards by international commissions. Laws to insure the purity of foods and drugs are common. Every precaution is taken to prevent the spread of contagious pestilences and plagues among human beings, animals, and plants. It is even hoped that the time will come when the knowledge gained from science will eliminate these scourges of mankind.

4. Socialism

Basis of socialism

Without doubt the lot of the masses of the people today is greatly improved over that of a century ago. Man is freer to come and go. He may sell his services to those who wish it, and is free to leave his job when dissatisfied. He lives in a better home, as a rule, has more of the comforts and conveniences of life, is more intelligent, has greater opportunities to educate his children, and has gained a more commanding status in the world both industrially and politically. His opportunity to make the most out of his life is greater than ever before. This advance in the status of the common man has come about in large measure through the enlargement of the franchise, social legislation, and economic reforms. At the same time a great change has taken place in the point of view of the employing class and of men of wealth. In general they seek to improve the lot of the toilers, feel their obligations to society, and wish to do good with their money. Still many workingmen are not satisfied with the present organization of society and industry, and desire to bring about a transformation through various projects.

Socialism has attracted millions of enthusiastic followers who hope through it to secure a better world order. Many others, not its unconditional adherents, accept some of its teachings as the new gospel, which will emancipate the world from economic servitude. Socialists are disposed to repudiate the present social organization and the economic system, which are based on private ownership of wealth, and on competition in industry. They claim that, while wealth has multiplied many fold, the masses of the people still live in dire poverty, comparatively speaking, because many workers produce and the few employers reap and distribute the profits. They say that the social and industrial reforms are good so far as they go, but that they do not remedy the fundamental evils. Hence they advocate the overthrow of the present industrial system, which exploits the workingman, who is really not free but must sell his labor at the price offered or starve. Many of them do not stop there but go on to attack established institutions of all kinds — religion, property, marriage, nationalism, and patriotism. Their objective is the Coöperative Commonwealth, in which all means of production and distribution

of wealth will be by public authority under one vast civil service, graded and paid according to ability. People will still continue to possess private personal property such as clothes, homes, furniture, and books, but not industrial property such as mines, mills, railways and land. Under this scheme it is hoped to abolish poverty and misery, and usher in a golden age of justice and human happiness.

Varieties of socialism

The Socialists do not present a united front throughout the world, nor indeed are they unified in any one country. One group desires forthwith to create a ready-made and complete socialistic state, either by peaceable means or by force. Another group is willing to accept the socialization of industry under the present democratic state. Still another group believes that the socialistic era will come by a gradual evolution of the present system of society. Some want the national or the international state to become the source of authority; others look to commune or municipality as the unit of final power. These various sects are known as the Utopians, the Marxians, the Christian Socialists, the State Socialists, the Social Catholics, the Guild Socialists and the Communists. The various types of socialism were stimulated by the World War. When railroads, steamship lines, mines, and factories were taken over by the governments, it was pointed out that state socialism had increased to an unbelievable degree, and that old, private ownership would never be fully restored. Guild socialism also received a new impetus, when the workers were taken into partnership in the management of industries. But it was Marxian socialism that felt the greatest stimulus. In Russia, the radical wing of the Marxians, known as the Bolsheviki, by the Revolution of 1917, gained control of the government and set up the Soviet Republic. Private ownership of land and factories was abolished. For democracy, they substituted a "dictatorship of the workers." In Germany, Austria, Hungary, and some of the new states created by the war, similar groups played prominent roles in overturning monarchical government. In Italy, France, Great Britain and the United States, they made considerable noise, but accomplished little. There remained in the popular mind the world over, however, the conviction that social reforms and readjustments of a sweeping character were imperative, and that somehow coöperation must be substituted for competition. The British Labor Party in 1918 expressed the sentiment thus: "The individualistic system of capitalistic production . . . may, we hope, have received a death-blow. With it must go the political system and ideas in which it naturally found expression. . . . If we are to escape the decay of civilization itself, we must insure that what is to be presently built up is a new social order, based not on fighting, but on fraternity, — not on the competitive struggle for the means of bare life, but on a deliberately planned coöperation in production and distribution for the benefit of all."

The historical significance of socialism lies in the fact that it has popularized the newer positive conceptions of political economy as an ethical conception. It brought the cause of the poor before the world as one of the burning questions of the age. It laid its accusing finger on the sores of society and called loudly for remedies. Through political organization, it elected its members to legislative bodies and even to premierships. By 1914 the Socialists in Germany comprised 40 per cent of the voters and elected 25 per cent of the members of the Reichstag; in France with 25 per cent of the voters they sent 20 per cent of the members to the Chamber of Deputies; in Italy they constituted one third of the voters and chose 16 per cent of the deputies to the lower house; and 6 per cent of the British House of Commons was socialistically inclined. In Russia it gained complete control of the state either for weal or woe. It has likewise forced a large amount of excellent social and industrial reformatory legislation. Whether or not it will be the goal of the future, depends upon the wisdom and sympathy with which statesmen honestly seek to meet the serious issues of the day. The abandonment of *laissez-faire* indifference, at all events, has become general.

Criticisms of socialism

The opponents of socialism, in pointing out its weaknesses, call it an enemy of progress and raise the cry of "red terror" against it. They assert that the remedy for present social and economic evils is not socialism, but social reforms. They contend that socialism would kill all individual ambition and initiative; that it would reduce mankind to a "common herd"; that it would result in the tyranny of the strong and the shrewd over the ignorant and the weak; and that it would end in revolutions and anarchy to the destruction of civilization. They hold that socialism rests upon false foundations; that other classes than the workingmen are important to society; that the welfare of all the classes and not the laborers alone should be taken into consideration; and that these conditions may be accomplished best under the present order. They accuse all Socialists of being dangerous revolutionists, who would destroy all that the world has built up after centuries of struggle, and hence, in many instances, have had them outlawed and imprisoned. They point out the incompetence of labor, as a class, in managing industry, and quote experience and Darwin's "natural selection" as proofs. The champions of the old order and the new are thus in hot conflict, and the struggle seems to grow fiercer every day. The outcome is in the hands of the future.

ism

Among the most bitter opponents of socialism are the radical workingmen, who charge the Socialist leaders with insincerity and lead a new movement called "Syndicalism." It appeared first in France and then spread rapidly to other parts of the world. It accepts the socialistic charges against industrial society, but does not believe in parliamentary action to advance the welfare of the working classes. "Direct action" is the policy of the Syndicalists. The trade-union

is their unit of organization, and the strike and "sabotage" are their weapons. They hope to organize all workers, skilled and unskilled, into one gigantic union, so that a strike will prostrate the industrial life of a nation. They declare that a relentless warfare exists between capitalists and laborers, and that this will continue until all factories, mines, mills, and means of transportation have passed into the hands of the industrial union, which in turn will replace the present state. They urge an immediate, violent and revolutionary attack on the capitalists. In the United States the Syndicalists are organized as the "Industrial Workers of the World," and have won many converts from socialism. In 1919 their number was estimated to be about 70,000 and in 1925 only half that number. Closely allied with syndicalism is revolutionary anarchy, which is likewise an offshoot of socialism. It advocated secret conspiracy, terrorism, bombs, fire and murder against tyrannical governments, but has not been very active outside of Russia. In 1917 there were over 4,000 strikes in the United States.

The Socialists and Syndicalists prior to 1914 were foes of militarism. They contended that standing armies and navies were employed to uphold the capitalistic governments, and advocated the substitution of international arbitration for them. In 1907 and again in 1910 the Socialists in their international congresses proposed a general strike of all labor in the event of the declaration of a general war. German delegates, however, defeated the resolution. While the French Socialists consistently refused to vote for a restoration of the three-year term of compulsory military service, the German Socialists at length gave way and voted for the huge military budget of 1913. When the World War threatened to break out, the Socialists in every country organized peace demonstrations. Jaurès in a great speech at Brussels threatened Europe with a gigantic general strike, but fell a victim to his pacifism. When the German and Austrian Socialists under pressure voted for war, the power of the Socialists for peace was broken. The Socialists of the Entente countries, for the most part, likewise ardently supported their nations in the conflict. Nationalism proved to be stronger than socialism. Those who refused to support the nationalistic war aims were imprisoned.

Since 1850, historically speaking, despite the growth of socialism, the capitalistic system has been stabilized by the following forces: (1) The general incorporation laws, which have made it easy for the concentration of capital to promote business, have widened ownership to include many thousands of small investors. (2) Social and labor legislation has removed many of the evils of an earlier day. (3) The trade-union by dealing directly with capital has obtained one concession after another to improve the lot of the wage-earner and thus to lessen the clash between capital and labor. (4) The common law of society or custom, as a rule, tends to establish good practices in place of bad and to improve the industrial system.

5. The Woman's Movement

The woman's movement is a new factor in contemporary world civilization, and is having far-reaching effects on society, industry, education, and politics. In 1800 the earth was a "man's world." Revolutionary "feminism," as woman's effort to emancipate herself was dubbed, carried with it no threat of an armed uprising, hence met with little encouragement and much ridicule. Everywhere, at that time, women were denied equal rights and opportunities with men. Secluded in their homes, and supposed to have "inferior brains," they reared their children, and "kept house" for their male lords. In the eyes of the law woman was inferior to man, had no property rights, and was little more than a domestic serf of her husband. She could make no legal contract, could neither sue nor be sued in court, could make no will disposing of her property, had few rights over her children, and could be beaten legally by her spouse for disobedience. If she injured the person or property of another, her husband was held for damages just as if his cow had committed the injury. Such education as girls received consisted of fancy needlework, training in household affairs, music, dancing, dressing, and etiquette. Woman's supreme goal was a husband and a home.

Women in the "man-made world"

The Christian religion included woman in the brotherhood of the world, but did little to secure for her a social and political equality with man. The American and French Revolutions did much for man in proclaiming "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," but excluded woman from these blessings. Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin was assailed as a "hyena in petticoats" for demanding equality for woman in 1792, and Frances Wright was ridiculed for advocating "woman's rights." After the Industrial Revolution women began to clamor for suffrage, to knock at the doors of colleges, and to seek admission to the learned professions. Oberlin College in Ohio in 1841 was the first to graduate a woman. In 1848 Queen's College was founded in Great Britain to educate young women. Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell was graduated from Geneva (N. Y.) Medical College in 1849 as the first woman physician. In 1861 the study of surgery and dentistry was opened to women in Sweden. Two years later the University of Zürich admitted women to all its departments. Dr. Elizabeth Garrett in 1865 was the first woman to receive a medical diploma in Great Britain. Miss Antoinette Browne was graduated from Oberlin Theological Seminary in 1853; today eighteen different religious denominations permit the ordination of women as ministers. Law was the last profession to admit women, but in 1869 Miss Belle Mansfield was admitted to the bar in the state of Iowa. During the past fifty years the institutions of higher education in Europe and America, and even in the Orient, have gradually opened their doors to women, and today thousands of them are graduating annually.

Women in the professions

The ten-year period from 1910 to 1920 witnessed an advance in

the status of woman unparalleled in world history. Her claim to equal citizenship was generally recognized. The World War demonstrated beyond question her ability to do man's work, and to fill positions of leadership, trust, and responsibility. In Great Britain, for example, hundreds of thousands of women joined numerous organizations for (1) military service in uniformed and disciplined bodies such as the "Emergency Corps," the "Voluntary Reserve," the "Army Service Corps," and the "Woman's Legion," which had 40,000 members; (2) nursing at home and abroad, relief work, medical and surgical service, and aid in connection with the Y.W.C.A. and the Salvation Army; (3) industry in manufacturing shells, amunition, gas-masks; farmers and foresters; tram-conductors and motor-drivers; engineers and cooks; and (4) the "Naval Auxiliary" and the "Royal Air Force." Similar activity was shown by the women in other belligerent countries. As a result, industry welcomed women after the war as efficient workers, and in many forms of employment there was a tendency to make no discrimination in wages on account of sex. By 1920 nearly 4,000,000 women and girls were employed in Great Britain as wage-earners, and of this number 1,500,000 were stated to be replacing males. In 1916 about 10,000,000 women were employed in gainful occupations in the United States.

Progress of the Woman's Movement

The census of 1900 revealed the fact that in the United States only three occupations — that of the sailor, and soldier, and linesman — had not been invaded by women. After 1910 the last of these three was opened to women, and the "Battalion of Death" in Russia demonstrated their fighting ability on the battlefield. The war broke down barriers of civil service and the learned professions. The grille in front of the ladies' gallery in the British House of Commons was removed without debate. In Great Britain all public offices except membership in the House of Lords were opened to women, and in 1922 even this restriction was removed. Women were appointed justices of the peace after 1920, and also served as jurors. Only service in the regular army and navy is closed to them. It was reported in 1920 that in the United States there was practically no profession which women had not entered. With the repeal of many obsolete laws, and the general enfranchisement of women, the "man's world" has ceased to exist, for woman now shares it. Since 1920 there has been, practically, no difference in the legal status of men and women in Great Britain. In the United States, the legal emancipation of women has gone far towards placing woman on an equal footing with man. Other progressive nations are following in the footsteps of these two states.

The cry is raised that women are deserting the homes and flooding the professions and industries. The number of marriages, however, steadily increases, and the percentage of divorces slowly declines. The birth-rate is lowering, but at the same time the death of infants is rapidly dropping. The new woman marries, makes her home and

Women in the new age

rears her children, but at the same time reads more, thinks more, and does more to make the world better. Modern democracy has found it impossible to exclude her from its benefits and obligations. Victor Hugo predicted that the last century would be "Women's Century." It looks as if his prophesy would come true in the twentieth century. Women see the social evils of the day more clearly than men, and are more deeply concerned about their reformation. Less combative than man, they have proclaimed the sacredness of human life and have organized to prevent war. They oppose militarism; advocate democratic control of foreign affairs; urge the removal of the causes of economic conflict; and champion the new internationalism. Their interest in educational improvement, in social progress, in charitable and relief work, in all moral questions, and everything for the betterment of the human race, encourages one to believe that their influence will mark a new era in world history.

Attention has been called to the fact that woman's new position is developing a new type of home. Hundreds of thousands of mothers now find employment outside of the home, and of course that means that less time and attention are devoted to the children and to household duties. But certain industrial and social changes make this altered condition possible. The cooking, cleaning, sewing, baking, canning, mending, and washing, which the housewife used to do, are now turned over to established industries such as laundries, bakeries, restaurants, tailor shops, and cleaning concerns. Babies are sent to public nurseries, and the children to the public schools and to supervised public playgrounds. The old-fashioned "housekeeper" has almost disappeared in the large cities. The wives have become the equals and indeed the rivals of the husbands in the field of industry and in the professions. Just what effect this domestic revolution will have on society of the future remains to be seen.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

F. W. Taussig, *Principles of Economics*, 2 vols. (3d ed. 1921); L. Marshall, *Readings in Industrial Society* (1918); C. A. Ellwood, *Sociology and Modern Social Problems* (rev. ed. 1913); W. H. Hamilton, *Current Economic Problems* (1914); C. Day, *History of Commerce* (ed. 1923); L. S. Woolf, *Economic Imperialism* (1921); F. L. McVey, *Modern Industrialism* (1904), new edition (1923); F. A. Ogg, *The Economic Development of Modern Europe* (1917); *Social Progress in Contemporary Europe* (1912); A. P. Usher, *The Industrial History of England* (1920); W. J. Ashley, *The Economic Organization of England* (1914); I. Lippincott, *The Economic Development of the United States* (1920); H. Withers, *The Case for Capitalism* (1920); W. K. Wallace, *The Passing of Politics* (1924); C. Gide and C. Rist, *History of Economic Doctrines* (1915); L. Haney, *History of Economic Thought* (1920); J. A. Hobson, *The Evolution of Modern Capitalism* (1910); *The Problems of a New World* (1916); R. H. Tawney, *The Acquisitive Society* (1920); P. A. Parsons, *Introduction to Modern Social Problems* (1924); B. L. Hutchins and A. Harrison, *A History of Factory Legislation* (1911); J. R. Commons, and others, *A History of Labour in the United States*, 2 vols. (1918); R. H. Hoxie, *Trade Unionism in the United States* (1919); H. Gaston, *The Non-Partisan League* (1919); S. and B. Webb, *Industrial Democracy* (1911); *History of Trade-Unionism* (ed. 1920); *The Decay of Capitalist Civilization* (1923); G. D. H. Cole,

The World of Labour (1913); *Self-Government in Industry* (1918); *Guild Socialism Restated* (1920); A. Gleason, *What the Workers Want* (1920); Niles Carpenter, *Guild Socialism* (1923); C. H. Douglas, *Economic Democracy* (1921); N. Angell, *The British Revolution and the American Democracy* (1919); J. G. Brooks, *Labor's Challenge to the Social Order* (1920); T. Kirkup, *History of Socialism* (1913); H. W. Laidler, *Socialism in Thought and Action* (1920); W. E. Walling, *Socialism of Today* (1916); B. L. W. Russell, *Proposed Roads to Freedom* (1918); *Bolshevism—Its Practise and Theory* (1920); M. Hillquit, *Socialism in Theory and Practise* (1909); R. H. Hunter, *Violence and the Labour Movement* (1914); J. Spargo, *Socialism* (1910); *Syndicalism, Industrial Unionism and Socialism* (1920); L. Levine, *Syndicalism in France* (1912); E. Bernstein, *Evolutionary Socialism* (1909); R. W. Postgate, *The Bolshevik Theory* (1920); P. W. Brissenden, *The I.W.W.: a Study in American Syndicalism* (1919); J. Hughan, *American Socialism of the Present Day* (1911); C. P. Gilman, *Women and Economics* (1910); O. Schreiner, *Women and Labour* (1911); B. L. Hutchins, *Women in Modern Industry* (1915); R. Hecker, *Short History of Woman's Rights* (1910); K. Anthony, *Feminism in Germany and Scandinavia* (1915); M. G. Fawcett, *Woman's Suffrage* (1912); *The Woman's Victory and After* (1920); C. C. Catt and N. R. Shuler, *Woman Suffrage and Politics* (1922).

CHAPTER XLIII

EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS

1. The Growth of Information and Literacy

The dissemination of enlightenment over the world is one of the big problems of contemporary civilization. A glance at the peoples of the globe shows what large numbers covering vast areas are still living in a state of savagery, or in barbarism, or at least in a low degree of civilization. Among the larger portion of the human race, ignorance, superstition, and low standards of morality prevail. Such a survey reveals the tremendous educational task confronting the world. Those parts of the earth that might be called highly civilized are confined to central and western Europe, the white sections of the British Empire, the United States and Japan. While commendable progress in education has been made in Latin America, eastern and southern Europe, and in China and India, nevertheless in all these regions the great majority of the people, numbering about three fourths of the inhabitants of the globe, can neither read nor write, and consequently know little about modern civilization, or other peoples, or the earth on which they live. The major portions of the great continents of Africa and Asia are steeped in intellectual darkness and exist in an atmosphere of semi-civilization.

Illiteracy

The most highly civilized peoples of earth number about 400,000,000, which is less than one fourth of the total population of the globe. Even in these countries illiteracy is a serious problem. For instance, in Italy in 1911 about 37 per cent of the population above ten years of age were illiterate; in Hungary over 33 per cent above 6 years of age; and in Austria 14 per cent beyond 11 years. With all her fine institutions for education, 14 out of every 100 persons in France above 10 years of age in 1906 could neither read nor write; in Belgium 13 per cent were illiterate; and in the United States almost 8 per cent, although in some of the southern states illiteracy ran as high as 29 per cent. In the British Empire, the illiterates of Scotland numbered 1.6 per cent, Ireland 9 per cent, England somewhere between the two, Canada 11 per cent, Australia 1.8 per cent, and New Zealand only .9 per cent. In Holland but .8 per cent of the army recruits are illiterate, in Switzerland .3 per cent, in Sweden and Norway .2 per cent, and in the German Empire .05 per cent. Among the less highly civilized peoples illiteracy is alarmingly high. Thus in Latin America it ranges from 54 per cent in Argentina to 85 per cent in Brazil. In Europe it is 60 per cent in Bulgaria; 57 per cent in Greece; 69 per cent in Portugal; 60 per cent in Rumania; 70 per cent in Russia; 78 per

cent in Serbia; and 46 per cent in Spain. In Asia the illiterates are estimated at 87 per cent in Siberia; 92 per cent in India; 55 per cent in the Philippine Islands; and 95 per cent in China. In Africa they number 92 per cent in Egypt; 70 per cent in the Union of South Africa; and in other parts nearly 100 per cent. These figures reveal to any thoughtful person the gigantic proportions of the educational problems confronting modern civilization.

To improve these conditions, numerous agencies are at work. The more progressive states provide free education at public expense, and make school attendance compulsory for all children. Special schools meet the needs of adults. The newspaper and library encourage all persons to read. The church, platform, the moving picture, and innumerable organizations of all sorts spread intelligence. Industry more and more encourages education by making promotion depend upon intellectual ability. The less progressive countries are making commendable efforts to imitate the more progressive communities. Although handicapped both for funds and for efficient teachers, they are introducing free public schools, and opening their doors to all helpful educational influences. The church is manifesting unprecedented activity in educational and missionary work in foreign lands. Organizations like the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. have spread to distant places with their programs of a higher morality and better cultural facilities. The printing-press is carrying knowledge around the globe. The postal system, telegraph, and cable bring all parts of the earth into easy communication with one another. Foreign travel and study are acquainting the people of each land with the ideas and institutions of others. The new imperialism is sending civil and military officials and business agents to the backward parts of the earth to spread the news of a higher civilization. Internationalism in a hundred different ways is drawing the nations of the world into closer relationships. The forward-looking peoples are developing a greater sense of responsibility towards the backward groups. And as a result of all these forces a higher civilization is gradually spreading over the world.

Progress of free public education

2. Education the Corner Stone of Civilization

Contemporary civilization regards education as a necessity for a realization of the highest life of the human race both collectively and individually. Education teaches the young what man has accomplished, and induces them to transmit what they receive, together with such additions as they are able to make, to those who follow them. Thus the thing called society is continued through the consciousness of the individuals who are educated to play their parts in it. The function of the school is to direct and guide, as well as to instruct, the youth in the role he should play in his social group. Hence education means a growth in capacity, ability, power, and knowledge — in habits, thought, and initiative — in preparation, ma-

Democracy and education

turity, and discipline. The perpetuation of civilization depends upon education as a social function, which directs the immature members of society to a full participation in the life of the social group. Therefore democracies insist upon the democratizing of education for all the people. They set up as their goal the training of citizens, social efficiency, culture, the capacity to think clearly, and the creation of a man interested in human progress. Modern education insists upon teaching geography and history because they deal with man in the process of his development; upon science, because it creates an intelligent belief in the improvement of human affairs and a capacity for generalization; and upon vocational training because it prepares for a more useful career and, by combining liberal with technical training, seeks to solve the present industrial problems.

Regarding education as a social need, the tendency in education today is to bring it more and more under the control of the state. A century ago free, compulsory, public education did not exist, for the training of the young was in the hands of private individuals, chiefly the clergy. The French Revolution placed education among the natural rights of man. The constitution of 1791 decreed that primary education should be free and obligatory. Napoleon centralized all forms of education under the Imperial University. His overthrow, however, once more turned the schools over to the church. Guizot in 1833 secured a law to establish schools for boys in the various communes, and Duruy in 1869 provided similar schools for the girls. But none of these were wholly free. The Third French Republic in 1878 extended the system of public schools, and the Ferry Laws of 1881, 1882, and 1886 made the schools and training colleges free and compulsory under lay teachers. From that time to the present, the educational system has been extended until today France has the most complete type of a state system of education in the world.

State and education

France

It was Prussia that led in the state control of education in Germany. After the defeat of Prussia by Napoleon in 1807, the semi-church schools were abolished and all placed under the jurisdiction of the minister of the interior. Compulsory attendance was enforced. The Constitution of 1850 declared elementary education to be free and national. After 1870 the Prussian system was extended to the Empire, but put under the exclusive control of the separate states. Protestants, Catholics and Jews all had their own schools, although they were supervised by the government. Under the German Republic the school system was nationalized and secularized, although some concessions were made to denominational schools. Educational institutions were all made public with uniformly trained teachers and state supervision and inspection. Special provision was made to have the children taught citizenship, handicrafts, and religion. Attendance at the elementary school for four years was made compulsory for all children and provision was made for abnormal children and or-

Germany

phans. Parents' Advisory Councils were created in connection with the schools. An educational movement among the workers sought to establish particular "Academies of Labor" to train a new class of leaders to meet the industrial problems. The republican educational system went into operation in 1921.

Following the example of France and Germany, all the states of continental Europe now provide for free, secular, compulsory education. Unfortunately, the provision is not enforced in southern and eastern Europe. Switzerland affords, perhaps, the best type of a democratic system of education under local control. Belgium and Holland still have a large number of private religious schools receiving state aid. The Soviet Republic of Russia promulgated a comprehensive system of popular education, which sought to train all the children "through the various forms and stages of application of human energy to productive work." From the age of 8 to 17 they were to be prepared for a life in which manual work was honored and not despised. The course of study reproduced the cultural history of mankind and was supposed to prepare the pupils for any tasks successfully and intelligently. The management of the school should be an introduction to civil life by placing the administration of the school in the hands of the older pupils, the teachers, and the representatives of the workers of the commune. The new states created by the World War all made liberal provisions for free public schools, but the chaotic conditions following the war have prevented much progress. *Russia*

British education, like the British constitution, is the product of many historical forces. Not until 1832 did Parliament grant aid for elementary schools under religious control. About the middle of the last century agitation began for a national system of public schools. The Elementary Education Act of 1870 only filled the gaps in the "voluntary system." In 1880 under Gladstone a system of general, compulsory school attendance was put into operation, and for the first time Great Britain had a national system of elementary education. In 1891 the elementary schools were made free, but church schools still formed a part of the system. In 1915 there were 8,604 public schools and 12,042 "voluntary" or church schools. The World War brought about a movement to break down the powerful aristocratic and religious influence in education and to create a genuine system of popular education under government control. The Education Act of 1918 aimed at the creation of a "national system of public education available for all persons capable of profiting thereby." In Scotland "burgh" schools with compulsory attendance were established in 1872 and they were made free twenty years later. An act of 1918 centralized the entire Scotch system. The self-governing British colonies all have model systems of free public schools. *Great Britain*

In the United States neither the Declaration of Independence nor the constitution of 1789 made any reference to education. The

feeling prevailed that schools should be left to the local communities rather than to the national government. The Ordinance of the North-West Territory in 1787 set aside generous portions of land in order that "the means of education shall forever be encouraged."

United States

This example was followed by the states quite generally. In 1862 the national government began to appropriate lands for colleges of agriculture and mechanical arts. The national Bureau of Education was created in 1869. The constitutions of the states all provide for systems of free public schools. New York in 1826 laid the foundations for a system of public elementary schools, and by 1860 the northern and border states had generally adopted the principle. The southern states, on account of the Negro, were not friendly to free schools. The American system stands for the complete separation of the public schools from sectarian control. Private schools exist, but as a rule public funds are not open to them as in many of the European states.

Latin-American republics have adopted the principle of popular, secular education, but have done relatively little in putting it into practice. Japan has an excellent system of compulsory elementary education. China is remodelling her education after western types. Small progress is being made in India. In the greater portion of Asia as in Africa schools for the masses are almost unknown.

3. Higher Education and Other Cultural Influences

Supplementing the elementary schools, which affect the masses of the people, are: (1) The secondary schools, many of which as private institutions antedate the popular schools, are pretty well established throughout the world. They give boys and girls advanced training for industrial and professional life, and prepare them for college.

Higher education

(2) The colleges and universities, numbering about a thousand throughout the world, to which young men and women of ambition and intellectual promise go to prepare themselves for a more useful career, are found in nearly every state. The United States alone has more than 600 institutions of higher education with nearly 726,000 students in attendance. In France, Germany, Italy, and some other countries these higher educational institutions are under the jurisdiction of the government; elsewhere many of them are controlled privately. (3) Industrial, technical, and professional schools are increasing so rapidly that probably they are more widely patronized than the colleges. (4) Public and private libraries, museums, and art galleries are now quite generally located in large centers of population. (5) The press, theater, moving pictures, and the church extend their influences around the globe as educational agencies.

The rise of democratic political institutions, the Industrial Revolution, and the progress of science, reacted powerfully upon the literature and art of the world during the past century. They have

Literature

ceased largely to be national and, like science, are cosmopolitan. In Great Britain Sir Walter Scott popularized the historical novel;

Dickens and Thackeray forced reforms by holding up the shams of contemporary life; Byron was a foe of the nationalism of his day; Shelley was a critic of his times and an apostle of political anarchy. The names of Keats, Lamb, De Quincey, Carlyle, Macaulay, Kingsley, and Ruskin made that nation famous in the field of letters during the early Victorian period. *The literary output of the past fifty years has* been too voluminous to even catalogue here. Literature had developed into a profession. The successful essayists, editors, novelists, and poets find readers all over the globe. On the European continent the four men who have attained greatest fame are: the Frenchman, Victor Hugo; the Norwegian, Ibsen; the Russian, Tolstoy, and the Pole, Sienkiewicz. Among American authors, who were widely known outside of their own country were: Irving, Holmes, Hawthorne, Cooper, Whittier, Longfellow, Poe, and Mark Twain.

The theater as a source of instruction and amusement has come into wide popularity all over the world. In France it is regarded as a branch of public education. In many countries state theaters, patronized by the rich and poor alike, are established. The spread of *Theater* *the moving picture is something extraordinary.* *Music has come to* take a prominent place in modern life as both a national and an international force, and is now commonly taught in the public schools. Of all the fine arts it attained perhaps the highest development in the nineteenth century. The names of Bach, Handel, Beethoven, Schubert, Mendelssohn, Schumann, Wagner, Rubenstein, *Music* Liszt, Grieg, MacDowell, Rossini, and Verdi, to mention only a few, will make the period famous.

Like music, sculpture and painting represent the internationalism of art. The four greatest sculptors of the last century were: the Dane, Thorwaldsen; the Italian, Canova; the Frenchman, Rodin; and the American, St. Gaudens. The first two were strictly classical, and sought to express beauty in form. Rodin drew his inspiration *from nature, and aimed at true expression without regard to elegance* *Art* or form. The last reproduced the pure Greek spirit and had a powerful influence in the development of art in the New World. In painting, France excelled with David and Ingres as representatives of the classical school; Delacroix and Delatoche, the romantitists; Corot and Rousseau, the landscape painters; Rosa Bonheur, the painter of animals; Millet, the artist of peasant life; and Manet, the impressionist. Tadema in Belgium; Overbeck, Kaulbach and Lenbach in Germany; Millais, Hunt, Burne-Jones, and Watts in Great Britain; and West, Trumbell, Stuart, Sargent and Whistler in America constituted a galaxy of great names.

No period in world history has been more active in building churches, city halls, court houses, theaters, schools, and colleges, *capitols, business houses, and private homes.* *But there has been* little creative genius and originality shown in anything but the materials used and methods of construction employed. The models *Engineerin*

of Greece, Rome and the Middle Ages have been copied or adapted to modern needs. With the use of concrete and steel, the "sky-scrapers" have appeared as a new style. It is criticized, perhaps unjustly, as being "not architecture, but engineering with a stone veneer." *These great buildings now characterize all modern cities*, particularly in America, and some of them have a distinct beauty and individuality of their own. The building genius of the modern world has been exhausted upon railroads, steamships, bridges, subways, and factories.

Architecture

Architecture, sculpture, painting, landscape gardening, and engineering have been employed to beautify the cities of the world. Berlin, New York, Boston, Washington, Chicago, San Francisco, London, Paris, Rome, Vienna, Rio Janeiro, and Leningrad have spacious streets and attractive boulevards; numerous parks large and small; fine public buildings and attractive homes; churches, libraries, schools, museums, art galleries, theaters, play grounds, open squares, beautiful bridges, historical monuments, statuary, factories separated from the residential quarters, enticing shops, and comfortable hotels — mostly the product of the last hundred years. Even the cities of South America, and far away China, Japan, and India are adopting the types of building, water systems, sewage plants, transportation, and electric lighting of the western world.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

P. Monroe, editor, *Cyclopædia of Education* (1911–13); F. P. Graves, *A History of Education — In Modern Times* (1913); R. E. Hughes, *The Making of Citizens* (1902); E. G. Dexter, *History of Education in the United States* (1904); C. F. Thwing, *Higher Education in America* (1906); *Education in the Far East* (1909); M. Caullery, *Universities and Scientific Life in the United States* (1922); L. Lewisohn, *Up-Stream* (1920); G. Balfour, *The Educational Systems of Great Britain and Ireland* (1903); H. B. Binns, *A Century of Education, 1808–1908* (1908); W. MacDonald, *The Intellectual Worker and His Work* (1924); D. E. Cloyd, *Modern Education in Europe and the Orient* (1917); G. S. Hall, *Life and Confessions of a Psychologist* (1923); F. W. Roman, *The New Education in Europe* (1923); J. Drury, *Democracy and Education* (1916); J. K. Hart, *The Discovery of Intelligence* (1924); A. Tilley, *Modern France* (1922); E. B. Bax, *German Culture Past and Present* (1915); G. Pellissier, *Le mouvement littéraire au XIX^e Siècle* (1912); T. Tebben, *The Higher Learning in America* (1919); G. Saintsbury, *A History of Nineteenth Century Literature* (1912); A. Henderson, *European Dramatists* (1913); G. H. Mair, *Modern English Literature* (1911); K. Francke, *A History of German Literature* (1901); R. Muther, *A History of Modern Painting* (1895); M. S. Anderson, *The Study of Modern Painting* (1914); J. H. Robinson, *The Humanizing of Knowledge* (1923).

CHAPTER XLIV

THE NEW SCIENCE

1. The Theory of Evolution

Perhaps nothing in the entire realm of human knowledge is more significant in modern world history, or more indicative of contemporary civilization than the new science. It touches every phase of human life and thought — the earth on which man lives, man himself in all his relationships, and the universe of which man and the earth are only particles. The scientist, in his laboratory, or digging in his library, or roaming over the globe, or scouring the heavens with his telescope, or studying the ruins of an ancient people, or delving into the mysteries of the human mind, and publishing the fruits of his investigations, does not impress the people like the dashing soldier, or the able statesman, or the successful business man. Nevertheless his work has more influence in shaping present civilization than military victories, the accumulation of a fortune, or fervid oratory. Science belongs to all men, and its goal is additional knowledge and truth. In its scientific output, no age can match the past century, although the beginnings run back into previous periods.

Science in modern civilization

For centuries Jewish and Christian people accepted the Bible story of the creation of Adam and Eve as the first parents of the human race. It was even figured out by the pious Archbishop Usher that that momentus event occurred in the Garden of Eden 4004 B.C. — the date printed in the King James version of the Bible. According to this theory, man's life on earth spanned a period of about 6,000 years. Hence the early peoples from the Egyptians and the Babylonians to the Greeks and Romans were called "ancients" in contrast with the "moderns." At the same time, until the nineteenth century, it was believed that the earth on which man lives and all the animals and plants, together with the sun, moon, and stars, had been created by omnipotent God in six days. After this colossal task, He rested on the seventh day, and thus made it a sacred day of rest for His creatures. This account was given in the Bible in the first book called Genesis.

The Creation story in Genesis

This explanation of the origin of the earth, of man, and of the many forms of life with which the globe abounds, was challenged by the thinkers of the eighteenth century. When in 1795 the Scotch geologist, James Hutton, announced that so far as he had studied the earth, he found "no traces of a beginning and no prospect of an end," he raised a storm of protest among the theologians. The new theory

of the origin of the earth, which has been slowly growing, was first set forth systematically by the Englishman, Sir Charles Lyell, in 1830 in his famous *Principles of Geology*. By a careful study of volcanoes, earthquakes, rivers, tides, and the rising and sinking of lands, he concluded that the earth was the product of slow and constant changes extending backward countless ages. The gradual contraction of the earth, he held, threw up the mountain ranges. The valleys were dug out by rains and floods. The frost and storms decomposed the rocks into soil on which plant life appeared. Decayed vegetation became coal. New strata of limestone, sandstone, and clay were slowly

Lyell deposited, and these processes are still going on. In 1863 Lyell published his renowned book on *The Antiquity of Man*. He sought to prove from the discovery of human remains and implements in the lower strata that man had lived on the earth possibly 100,000 years. He also advanced the belief that the earth had slowly developed, and with it man and all the forms of life. His theory soon displaced all others and is quite generally accepted today. Buffon, the French naturalist, first suggested the idea of the gradual evolution of the earth and all life forms. Careful observation of the family resemblances between one species and another led him to conclude that nature might "have evolved all organized forms from one original type." His countryman, Lamarck, boldly maintained that the whole animal world including man had developed throughout a long period of time.

It was left to the Englishman, Charles Darwin (1809–1882), however, to present the complete theory of evolution in its early form. In his celebrated book, *The Origin of Species*, printed in 1859

Darwin he asserted that the different species of animals and plants — such as elephants, mice, crows, whales, alligators, spiders, pine trees, cherries and daisies — were not descendants of original types, which had been perpetuated without change, but were the products of many modifications, which had been going on for millions of years. He called attention to the fact that the individuals of a given species, like the cat, vary greatly. Some are fleeter of foot and more cunning; others have sharper claws and teeth; still others are colored to escape attention; and still others have heavier fur which enables them to withstand the cold. Moreover, animals and plants multiply so rapidly that if left undisturbed their members would shortly overcrowd the *earth. For instance, if unmolested, a single pair of hawks would* multiply to more than 10,000,000 in ten years; or a single pair of rats would soon endanger the food supply of the world. But accidents, disease, the lack of food and drink, cold and heat, rain and drouth, and the preying of one kind on another destroy millions of forms of life. Thus there is a continual struggle for existence and survival. By the process of "natural selection," the unfit perish and the fittest survive. By heredity the qualities of the fittest are continually perpetuated. In this way the species is constantly changing in color, in

form, in size, in anatomy, and in other characteristics. According to the Darwinian theory man himself sprang from the lower forms of animal life and attained his high estate through variation, selection, and heredity. "Prehistoric" archeology and anthropology soon proved the antiquity of man by uncovering human skeletons which date back at least 150,000 years. There are a large number with an antiquity of 50,000 years.

Darwinism created a storm of bitter discussion and called forth a host of opponents, chiefly theologians, who feared that it would undermine the Christian faith. Among its defenders in Great Britain was Wallace, who in 1870 published his *Natural Selection*, which set forth the theory more convincingly than Darwin had done. It was left to Huxley, however, to become the ablest expounder of evolution. Herbert Spencer, in his *Synthetic Philosophy*, extended the doctrine of evolution to psychology, sociology, and ethics. He popularized the terms "growth," "development," and "progress," and first used the phrase "survival of the fittest." He held that everything organic and inorganic — the universe, the earth, and all forms of life on the earth — had been evolved out of a more simple state. In Holland the naturalist, Hugo de Vries, attempted to prove that new species sprang from existing forms, not by small variations, but by sudden and pronounced departures. In Germany the biologist, Haeckel, became the apostle of evolution. He worked out a diagram showing the descent of man through twenty-six stages from protoplasm to the chimpanzee. In America, the botanist, Asa Gray, and the historian, John Fiske, used their gifted pens to defend the new ideas. In France, Ernest Renan applied the theory to comparative religions, and reached the conclusion that the Bible and the Christian theology were but an evolution of primitive religious ideas. This revolutionary conception of evolution soon came to be accepted by an overwhelming majority of scientists as confidently as the law of gravitation. The fiery assaults of the clergy did not quickly subside. Pope Pius IX declared that Darwin's theory was the product of a depraved nature and a silly effort to make a monkey out of man. Others asserted that Darwin might accept the ape as his ancestor, but that they would not. But the opponents of evolution gradually decreased until today the leading Protestants, and not a few Roman Catholics, accept it as supplying a higher conception of God's purposes than the older ideas.

Evolution

During the past fifty years intense researches in the field of embryology, heredity, variation, and selection have tended, on the whole, to confirm evolution as a fundamental principle. Mendel's interesting experiment in crossing different varieties of peas has opened the way for many observations by later scientists. As yet, however, the process by which evolution has come to pass has not been wholly discovered.

2. The Study of Matter and Power

While the theory of evolution was growing, the chemists, physicists, mineralogists, and astronomers were using their laboratories, microscopes, and telescopes to study matter and power — such problems as light, heat, and electricity; the sun, moon, and stars; and the composition of various substances. Lavoisier, towards the close of the eighteenth century, decomposed air and water, and analyzed combustion. John Dalton advanced the atomic theory of matter by showing that all forms of it acted as if made up of atoms, which unite to form molecules. He discovered that carbon and oxygen unite in proportions of one to two to form carbonic acid; and that hydrogen and oxygen combine two to one to make water. Furthermore he found the relative weight of the different properties in combinations. The atomic theory became the basis of modern chemistry. A Swede named Berzelius and an Italian called Avogardo elaborated the theory. The belief that molecules of matter are in vigorous but irregular motion has been proved. The number of atoms in one gram of any element can be determined. It is now believed that the atom is composed of minute particles called protons charged with positive electricity surrounded by negative electrons. The electrical effect of a single electron has been measured. With the discovery of uranium the number of elements is now listed as 92, but five of them have not yet been discovered.

Chemistry

The German chemists, Wöhler and von Liebig, laid the foundations of synthetic chemistry which created artificially fertilizers, alcohol, indigo, ice, perfumes, rubber, leather, aniline dyes, drugs, and numerous other useful articles. Today the chemist analyzes the soil to see just what it needs for various crops; and the water to see whether it is pure or not and to tell what salts and minerals it contains. Applied chemistry gave the world illuminating gas, matches, explosives, beet sugar, aluminum, and has become a necessity to the housewife, the manufacturer, the miner, and the farmer. Chemistry is helping to supply the food and drink of the world; it guards the public health; and it is increasing the wealth of the world. Electrochemistry has become indispensible in the metal industries.

Towards the close of the eighteenth century, two Italians, Galvani and Volta, discovered the electric battery. The Englishman, Davy, produced a bright light from two points of carbon by using an electric battery, and thus laid the foundations for the use of the arc lamp. He also employed the battery to decompose potash and discovered a new metal called potassium. The Dane, Oefsted, showed the connection between electricity and magnetism by moving a magnetic needle with an electric current. The Frenchmen, Ampère and Arago, proved that electricity could produce magnetism. These experiments gave the world the telegraph, the cable, the telephone, wireless, electric lighting, and other devices. After Faraday in-

Electricity

vented the dynamo to generate electricity, the way was paved for the utilization of electric power to run street cars, trains, elevators, and all kinds of machinery. Improved batteries now supply the ignition, light, and even power to propel automobiles. Electricity has become one of the most important forces in modern civilization. It has helped to solve the servant problem in the home by performing much of the hard drudgery of earlier days. It is man's swift messenger to carry information over the globe. It lightens the labor of the farmer and is indispensable in business. It helps to clean the cities and to illuminate them by night. And the uses to which it may be put for man's comfort and happiness have just begun.

It is now believed that light and radiant heat are transmitted by minute waves in the ether, a medium which exists throughout the universe and sends light to the earth from the sun and the most distant stars. Light is supposed to consist of electric forces emanating from the luminous body through this ether. In 1887 the "Hertzian waves," or the electro-magnetic vibrations in the ether, were discovered. This led to wireless telegraphy, telephony, and the radio. In 1895 the German, Röntgen, discovered the "X-rays" now so widely used in surgery and medicine. Three years later the Frenchman, Curie, and his talented Polish wife, obtained from pitchblende a new element called radium, which has mysterious powers, produces an intense X-ray, and yet seems almost indestructible. The infinitely small "alpha" particles thrown off by radium have been counted. Physicists have discovered also that many other substances are radioactive. Since radium gives out heat and light without materially diminishing its own substance, some optimistic scientists believe *Physics*
that it will be eventually the source of light, heat, and power on earth. The German, Mayer, and the Englishman, Joule, have proved that energy cannot be annihilated; and Lord Kelvin's researches have resulted in the revolutionary theory of "the conservation of energy." The idea has been advanced that all matter, whether solid, liquid or gaseous, is one, and that its difference in form depends upon the degree of heat to which it has been subjected.

The astronomers, in scouring the heavens, have discovered a new planet, Neptune, and added new moons to other planets. The distances of the fixed stars and even their diameters have been measured. The first star ever measured was Betelgeuse in 1920 with a diameter 32,000 times larger than that of the earth. The gigantic task of *Astronomy*
photographing and cataloguing the billions of suns that form the universe is under way. In 1910 Boss published a list of 6,188 stars and the Greenwich catalogue contained 12,368 stars. The period of rotation of Uranus around its axis has been determined. Several new stars have been discovered. Einstein's epoch-making theory of gravitation, known as "relativity," was advanced in 1915. The spectroscope determines the substance of the sun and the stars. Powerful telescopes are used by learned men to discover the very

foundations of the universe. The Hooker telescope put into service at the Mount Wilson observatory in 1919 was the most powerful instrument in the world, having a lens weighing over four tons.

3. Medicine and Surgery

Among the startling results of biological researches, in 1838 the Germans, Schleiden and Schwann, reached the conclusion that all living things are composed of minute bodies called cells, which von Mohl in 1846 called protoplasm. In this protoplasm all life seems to have its origin. The cell in living things corresponds to the molecule in inorganic matter. Indeed many forms of life, as for instance the bacteria, consist of a single cell. The human body is composed of about 26,000,000 cells, like bricks in a brick wall bound together by a thick mortar. This cell theory now underlies the science of biology,

Cell Theory

helps to explain many diseases, and points the way to remedies. The term bacteria came into use in 1863. They consist of minute plants of various shapes so small that 4,000 of the larger ones put end to end would make only an inch, while it would take 400,000 of the smallest ones to cover the same space. The air, water, soil, and all plant and animal life are filled with them.

The Frenchman, Pasteur (1822–1895), devoted his life to a study of bacteria. He first gained international fame as a chemist by proving that of the two tartaric acids deposited from wine-lees one was sensitive to a ray of polarized light while the other was not, and that

Pasteur

the latter action was due to the presence of a new inactive acid. After much difficulty he succeeded in producing this inactive form of the acid by artificial means, and showed that in certain forms of mould it had the power to destroy the sensitive acid. He next turned his attention to the diseases of beer and wine. Happening to visit a brewery, he examined the good and stale beer with his microscope and found that the former had round bacteria while the latter had an elongated type. Turning his attention to fermentation, he demonstrated that it was caused by the presence of minute organisms called ferments. The notion of spontaneous generation was exploded. The discovery of the "germ" was at first of great commercial value to brewers and wine makers. In 1865 Pasteur studied the disease of the silk worm, which threatened to destroy the silk industry in France, discovered

Bacteriology

the germ, and destroyed the plague. Then he discovered a cure for chicken cholera and for anthrax in cattle. Next he turned his attention to man and after much experimentation with dogs found a remedy for hydrophobia.

With the methods of technique devised by Pasteur and later by Koch bacteriology became an exact science. The character, habits, and results of bacteria have become better known. The fermentation industries are dependent upon this knowledge. The productivity of the soil has been increased. Sewage and waste have been disposed of and rendered harmless. Drinking water and milk have been purified.

Many diseases of plants have been eliminated. Much has been done to improve sanitation and to safeguard public health.

Biology, embryology, chemistry, bacteriology, and physics have revolutionized medicine and surgery, and led to more progress in the past fifty years than in the previous twenty centuries. Since 1880 the "germ theory" has been generally accepted to account for many diseases, such as cholera, influenza, pneumonia, typhoid, scarlet fever, tuberculosis, and common colds. These germs, or bacteria, enter the body through food, drink, and the air in countless numbers. If the body is healthy, the germs are rendered harmless. The Russian, Metschnikoff, proved that the white corpuscles in the blood kept up a constant warfare on the germs that enter the blood and tissue, and that disease may be averted by increasing these white friends. If the body is unhealthy, the germs multiply with great rapidity, and form poisons called toxins, which cause illness and death. It is estimated that a single bacillus would by division amount to 17,000,000 in a single day and night. The German physician, Dr. Koch, in 1882 discovered the germ of tuberculosis, and since that time the germs of other diseases have been isolated. While the white corpuscles devour the germs in some diseases, in others the germs themselves generate a substance called anti-toxins, or antidotes, which strange to say tend to counteract the power of the toxins. This knowledge led to a new treatment called serum-therapy, which consists of taking anti-toxins from persons or animals sick with the same disease to inject into the patient to build up his resistance to the poisons. Pasteur first successfully employed this treatment for anthrax and hydrophobia. The German, von Behring, in 1892 discovered an anti-toxin for diphtheria, and today this treatment is used for many of the germ diseases.

Germ theory of disease

Koch

The germ theory has encouraged preventive and hygienic measures to wage war on disease. Water and milk are boiled to kill dangerous germs. Ice and heat are used to keep bacteria out of food. Spitting in public places is forbidden because it spreads germs from the dry sputum. Sewage and garbage are destroyed. Sanitary surroundings are required by law. Much attention is given to ventilation of homes, public buildings, and factories. Public drinking cups are abolished. In many ways people are being educated to give more attention to diet, exercise, and normal living. Better medical colleges, clinics, hospitals, research laboratories, and devoted physicians and nurses are gradually solving the great world problem of the elimination of human disease, and also the diseases of animals and plants. The methods of diagnosis have been greatly improved by the invention of instruments such as the clinical thermometer, the stethoscope, the test tube, and the microscope. In 1800 the majority of persons were pitted with smallpox; today many physicians have never seen a case. Yellow fever and typhoid have almost disappeared, and the dread of other terrible maladies and plagues with thousands

Hygiene and sanitation

of victims has been allayed. The discovery of the germ which causes syphilis by Schaudinn in 1905, together with the development of several prophylaxes, seems likely to abolish the plague of venereal disease. Erlich in Germany has discovered an effective remedy for syphilis.

Pain has been relieved and life prolonged by the revolution in modern surgery. In 1846 the American, Dr. Warren, by the use of ether, performed a painless operation, and the next year chloroform was employed in Edinburgh. Prior to this innovation an operation was an agonizing procedure for both the patient and the surgeon. In a Boston hospital, before Dr. Warren made his successful experiment, only 37 persons in a year were brave enough to risk an operation. Fifty years later in a single year 3,700 persons submitted to the ordeal. Today an operation may be delayed an hour or more, while limbs are amputated, the abdomen opened to repair or remove the organs, the eye given better vision, or the brain relieved. Indeed the miracles of modern surgery are scarcely believable. The discovery of antisepsis in 1876 by Lister was as epoch-making as anaesthesia. By sterilization and antiseptics the danger of infection was removed, and the germs that might poison the blood were killed. With improved surgical instruments skilled surgeons now perform the most difficult operations. The X-ray enables the surgeon to locate the presence of foreign substances in the body, the fracture of bones, and the condition of internal organs. The skilled work of the oculist and the dentist supplement the labors of the physician and surgeon to increase the efficiency of the human machine. Infant mortality is decreasing, life in general is prolonged, and the capacity of man for work and for happiness has been greatly increased.

Surgery

The work of the brilliant Viennese psychiatrist, Sigmund Freud (1856-), and his followers has revolutionized medical psychology and made possible the successful treatment of hitherto incurable forms of insanity and nervous disease. His work ranks with that of Koch, Pasteur, and Lister.

Psychiatry

4. The New Social Sciences

The new physical sciences resulted, in turn, in directing attention to the study of human society. As a result there appeared the newer social sciences — political economy, political science, sociology, pragmatic philosophy, psychology, and the new history.

From the sixteenth to the latter part of the eighteenth century the "mercantile system" prevailed throughout the western world. It sought to augment the wealth and power of the state as a whole by (1) increasing the nation's supply of precious metals; (2) holding a favorable balance of trade; (3) exploiting the colonies for the benefit of the home country; (4) multiplying the population; (5) fostering manufacturing even at the expense of agriculture; and (6) supervising the whole system by paternalistic laws. About the

Mercantilism

time of the American and French Revolutions, the Physiocrats in France and Adam Smith in Scotland led a reaction against mercantilism. They set forth the *laissez-faire*, or non-interference theory, which (1) urged the application of natural laws instead of state laws to industry; (2) stressed agriculture as the source of wealth; (3) made "consumption the end and purpose of production"; and (4) laid the foundations for free trade and cosmopolitanism in industry. These individualists of Smith's day were followed during the first half of the nineteenth century by the "classical school," which set forth economic principles as fixed as the laws of physical science. Malthus, a graduate of Cambridge University, asserted that the population in most countries tended to increase faster than the food supply and was checked only by disease, famine, and the limitation of offspring. This idea had something to do with the development of Darwin's theory of natural selection. Ricardo, an Englishman descended from a Portuguese Jewish family, sought to solve the problem of the distribution of wealth. Bentham worked out the theory of the greatest happiness for the greatest number as the true ideal of society. John Stuart Mill, called the "father of political economy," advocated the diffusion of property through the taxation of inheritances, the confiscation of the future "unearned increment" of land by the state, and stressed the distinction between the laws of production and distribution. Mill called himself a Socialist of a conservative type.

Physiocrats

Malthus

Bentham

John Stuart Mill

The rise of socialism was a protest against the *laissez-faire* doctrine and private property with an idealistic, middle-class spirit. Godwin, Saint-Simon, and Fourier led the attack, which was followed up by Owen, Louis Blanc, and others. The "scientific" socialism of Marx made a revolutionary assault on the social order upheld by the classical school by emphasizing the theory of social evolution and the class struggle. As a proletarian movement, it had a marked influence on the growth of political economy. Rodbertus and Lassalle were "state socialists"; Marx and Engels, "international socialists." Comte insisted that economics could not be divorced from history, and laid the foundations for the "historical school," which denied the existence of universal laws, and stressed the inductive method of study. The Ricardian and the Malthusian theories were opened to doubt. Later Socialists such as Bernstein in Germany and the "Fabians" in England, called "revisionists," rejected the materialistic interpretation of history. The socialistic conceptions of political economy were bitterly assailed and the existing order defended by orthodox economists who favored free trade in Great Britain and protection in the United States, France, and Germany.

Socialism

Economic thought today is broadly eclectic. Economists employ any theory, any method, and any facts that may help to solve the mighty problems of this industrial age. Thousands of trained economists are at work in libraries and laboratories to improve the lot of

man. Never has such a large number of economic laws and principles been so widely accepted. The science of economics has become more exact. The recent period of world history has seen a revival of paternalistic and nationalistic mercantilism. Governments encourage corporations to develop export trade. Business men are forming associations "more and more guild-like in character." Against the present economic organization of the world the most significant protest after the World War came from the British Labor Party: "The individualist system of capitalist production, based on the private ownership and competitive administration of land and capital, with its reckless 'profiteering' and wage-slavery; with its glorification of the unhampered struggle for the means of life and its hypocritical pretense of the 'survival of the fittest'; with the monstrous inequality of circumstances which it produces and the degradation and brutalization, both moral and spiritual, resulting therefrom, may, we hope, indeed have received a death blow. With it must go the political system and ideas in which it naturally found expression. . . . What has to be reconstructed is . . . not this or that piece of social machinery; but society itself."

Economics

Just as biology takes life for its field of study, so the new sociology seeks to understand society as a whole. The term was first used by Comte in 1839 and is now generally accepted. The goal of sociology is to understand the principles of human society in the process of evolution. Herbert Spencer, more than any other single person, opened up the possibilities of sociology by extending the principle of evolution to the "social organism" — to government, religion, law, language, customs, industry, and education. Sociology seeks to ascertain the laws of social progress, the sense of human responsibility, the standards of social efficiency in modern civilization, and therefore claims to rank as the "master science." The field is so broad and the science is so new, that it is not surprising to find many divergent schools. Meantime applied sociology through many agencies, public and private, is seeking to improve humanity in a scientific fashion.

Sociology

The new science of politics devotes itself to the study of the political institutions of the world past and present. By employing the comparative method, it points out the significance of the differences in governments and tries to find the best forms. It seeks to have peoples realize the basic principles upon which governments rest. It aims to set forth all sides of every political and legal issue in order that citizens may think intelligently and come to sane conclusions about political problems in their own and foreign countries. It concerns itself with questions about local government, the national state, and the international organization of the world.

Spencer's ten volumes of *Synthetic Philosophy* in which he sought to explain the universe as a whole from the molecule to the distant stars and from the cell to man, laid the foundations for the new

philosophy. Pragmatic philosophy, seeking to be of practical service to man, has for its central question, "What is truth and how is it to be distinguished from error?" The new psychology is delving deeply into the mental process of both man and the lower animals, and now has its own laboratory for experimentation. Applied psychology seeks to aid business, to help develop standards of education, and to explain human actions in terms of the mind. The new ethics is shedding more light on the problem of conduct, and the questions of right and wrong.

Among the epoch-making forces of the nineteenth century was the new history. Until fifty years ago, historians concerned themselves largely with the political side of man's life. The pages of history were filled with the exploits of kings, queens, noblemen and ladies, generals and statesmen, and popes and bishops. The rise of democratic governments broadened the scope of history. The Industrial Revolution, the rise of socialism, internationalism, and the new science have made history mean something more than mere civic and military happenings. Today history includes everything man has done, felt, said, and been throughout his whole life on earth. It comprehends his social, intellectual, industrial, and religious, as well as his political life. It includes the savage as well as the civilized man. There are no longer any "pre-historic" peoples. The Darwinian theory of evolution and the germ theory of disease are perhaps more important historical forces than Magna Charta and the Declaration of Independence. Great scientists, eminent educators, inventors, explorers, business men, and writers deserve recognition as well as great generals and prominent rulers. In 1906, when a French newspaper asked its readers to vote for a list of great Frenchmen, the name of Pasteur came first and that of Napoleon I fourth. The new history accepts the conception of the evolution of human life, and attempts to visualize the whole story of man for the past 250,000 years as one continuous whole, although the remains of his civilization reach back only a mere 7,000 years. The new history not only stresses the continuity of civilization through institutional growth but also emphasizes its unity.

History of civilization

5. Achievements of the New Science

Science has made the past half century preëminently a period of experimentation, of exploration, of invention, and of discovery. At an early stage in man's development, he learned to supplement his hands, feet, back, teeth, and nails by inventing and using crude tools and machinery. The axe, hammer, knife, and spear point were first made of stone or bone. Baskets were formed of reeds and twigs, and clothing fashioned from skins. The discovery of fire and metal led to great advances. The earlier sun-dried pottery was now hardened and glazed by heat; metal implements devised; and food

Slow progress of science to 1800

cooked. The use of wedges, rollers, and levers marked progress. Buildings were erected and adorned. The horse and cow were domesticated. The bow and arrow, the sling, the lasso, and the machines for hurling stones at enemies were employed. The soil was tilled with crude plows; fish caught with nets; the cart used for travel and transportation by land and boats propelled by paddles and sails on water; and the distaff, spindle, and hand-loom made linen and woolen cloth. These early inventions were improved by the Greeks and Romans, but not materially increased. Not until the close of the Middle Ages, when the manufacture of paper, the mariner's compass, and the printing-press came in, was notable advance made over the ancient inventions. The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries produced the telescope, microscope, clocks run by weights, watches, sawmills driven by water, the windmill, and the wheelbarrow. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were epoch-making in the inventions that led to the Industrial Revolution.

It took Sir Francis Drake two years and ten months in the sixteenth century to travel around the earth. Columbus was 70 days in crossing the Atlantic; and the Pilgrims 66 days. When George Washington in 1789 went from his home at Mount Vernon to New York to assume his duties as the first president of the United States, it took him twelve long days by horseback to make the journey. At Philadelphia he might have changed to the slow, jolting stage-coach, but he stuck to his horse because he was in a hurry. Today the same journey may be taken in a comfortable hotel on wheels in a single night. In less than ten days one may travel from San Francisco to London by train and steamer. In twelve days it is possible to go from Berlin to Pekin, China, in a luxurious passenger coach. Space has been almost annihilated. A complete circuit of the globe was made by land and sea in 36 days in 1913. It is said that the journey could be made now by air in a week. Commodities are shipped all over the earth with equal dispatch and ease. Man power was supplemented first by the ox and horse, then by the wind and water, then by steam, and now by gas and electricity. These new forces are applied to locomotives, steamers, street cars, elevators, automobiles, tractors, and airplanes. In 1924 over 22,500,000 motor vehicles were in use throughout the world. Of this number 80 per cent were in the United States; 70,000 were in India; 11,000 in China; 128,000 in Argentina; 13,000 in Egypt; and 400 in Iceland. The factory, mill, mine, farm, and home use these new slaves of man. Two British aviators, Alcock and Brown, in June, 1919, made the first non-stop flight across the Atlantic Ocean from Newfoundland to Ireland in less than sixteen hours. The British Zeppelin, *R-34*, on July 2–6, with a crew and passengers crossed from Scotland to Long Island, a distance of 3,200 miles, in 108 hours, and made the return trip in three days. In 1925 the Zepplin *Los Angeles* made the passage from Germany to the United States in a little over 81 hours. Today a

Contemporary science

regular air service is found between the largest cities in Europe and America. The submarine came into prominence during the World War and demonstrated its ability to cross the ocean under the water. Thus man has by his inventive genius shown himself master of the land, sea, and air.

As a boy Abraham Lincoln knew no better artificial light than the pine-knot and tallow candle. Not until 1802 was it demonstrated that gas made from coal could be used for lighting purposes. By 1816 gas lighting was beginning in London. Natual gas from the earth was used for light in 1821 at Fredonia, N. Y. The first oil well was sunk in Pennsylvania in 1859. Today tens of thousands of oil wells in the United States, Mexico, Russia, Burmah, and other parts of the globe produce millions of barrels of oil. In America alone in 1918 more than 413,000,000 barrels of oil were used — a quantity equal to the water pouring over Niagara Falls for three hours. Oil and its numerous by-products are utilized for a hundred different purposes. It is rapidly displacing coal as a fuel on ships and locomotives. Gasoline runs engines, automobiles, and airplanes. In country districts and in backward countries like China oil is still the chief source of light. Coal, as the source of heat and power, is now supplemented by gas, oil, and electricity. *Applied science*

The diplomats who sat in the Congress of Vienna never dreamed of the telegraph, telephone, and wireless as means of communicating ideas. The ancients had only a vague idea of the mysterious force of electricity. Gilbert in 1600 experimented with electricity, and Benjamin Franklin first identified lightning with the electric spark. Volta in 1799 produced the first electric current. A host of scientists took up the study of this new force, and soon it was serving man's needs in many different ways. Morse invented the first telegraph; the Brett brothers laid the first cable across the English Channel in 1845; and twenty-two years later a cable was stretched across the Atlantic's bottom. The first dynamo to produce electric light was put on the market in 1867 and a dozen years later Edison invented the first incandescent lamp, which was soon used in New York and London. Bell devised the first speaking telephone in 1876 and soon telephone exchanges sprang up in America, Europe, and the rest of the world. The first electric street car appeared in 1881 in Paris, and in 1891 it was proved that electricity could be transmitted over long distances. By 1904 railways began to exchange steam for electric power, and electro-chemistry was transforming industry. Marconi sent a wireless message from France to England in 1899 and across the Atlantic in 1907. Today electricity brings the peoples of the world into almost instant touch, and is a source of light, power, and heat to perform thousands of tasks. There seems to be no limit either to its quantity or its usefulness. *Communication*

If our great grandfathers could return to earth, they would rub their eyes in surprise at the spread of democratic institutions and at

The "Empire of machines"

the transformation of life and industry through multitudinous applications of science. A net-work of railroads girdles the continents over which giants of steel draw millions of tons of freight and hundreds of thousands of passengers. Ocean greyhounds nearly a thousand feet long plow across the oceans in a few days carrying many passengers and huge cargoes of goods. The automobile whirls along the roads and the hum of the airplane is heard in the sky. The heavens are darkened by the smoke of factories, and mining has been improved by hundreds of inventions. Steel is used for a thousand purposes, from a hair spring to bridges spanning the Mississippi. It would take a large volume to catalogue the recent inventions, discoveries, and new processes such as printing and book-making; cheap paper and electrotyping; radio, phonograph, stereopticon and moving pictures; sewing machines and electric washers; the vacuum cleaner and dishwasher; the steam and hot-air furnaces, and refrigerators; the typewriter and multigraph; the fountain pen and books for the blind; photography and improved firearms; concrete constructions and asphalt streets and shingles; devices to fight fire, burn sewage, and clean streets; matches and india-rubber articles; safety appliances and automatic restaurants; lawn mowers and combined reapers and threshers; cheap watches and instruments for the deaf; incubators and safety razors; piano-players and sanitary drinking fountains; patent medicines and artificial eyes and limbs; steel fishing rods and luring artificial bait; and false teeth and the thermos bottle.

Importance of social science

These and innumerable other devices aid man in work and pleasure, in sickness and health, on the farm and in the city, in the mine and in the mill, in the home and in the store, to live a larger, happier, and more useful life. What we have yet to learn is to be able to live together in a peaceful, coöperative, and efficient manner in the exploitation of the new technique of science and engineering. To teach us this indispensable lesson is the task of social science.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

A. J. Thomson, editor, *The Outline of Science*, 5 vols. (1920); W. T. Sedgwick, and H. W. Tyler, *A Short History of Modern Science* (1917); A. D. White, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology*, 2 vols. (1895); W. Libby, *An Introduction to the History of Science* (1917); A. R. Wallace, *Progress of the Century* (1901); J. T. Merz, *A History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century*, 4 vols. (1896–1914); J. W. N. Sullivan, *Aspects of Science* (1925); A. Dendy, editor, *Problems of Modern Science* (1922); O. W. Caldwell and E. E. Slosson, *Science Remaking the World* (1923); E. E. Slosson, *Creative Chemistry* (1921); *Easy Lessons in Einstein* (1923); *Keeping up with Science* (1924); W. C. Curtis, *Science and Human Affairs* (1922); W. A. Locy, *Biology and its Makers* (ed. 1915); J. W. Judd, *The Coming of Evolution* (1910); H. F. Osborn, *From the Greeks to Darwin* (1894); G. J. Romanes, *Darwin and after Darwin*, 3 vols. (1906–1916); W. Bateson, *Mendel's Principles of Heredity* (1909); F. Darwin, editor, *Life and Letters of Charles Darwin*, 2 vols. (1887); H. Dingle, *Modern Astrophysics* (1925); G. N. Nasmyth, *Social Science and the Darwinian Theory* (1909); J. Dewey, *The Influence of Darwin on Philosophy* (1910); *Reconstruction in Philosophy* (1919); A. W. Benn, *The History of English Rationalism in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols. (1906); F. S. Marvin, *Science and Civilization* (1924);

(editor) *Recent Developments in European Thought* (1920); A. C. HADDON, *A History of Anthropology* (1912); R. EUCKEN, *Main Currents of Modern Thought* (1912); E. FUETER, *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie* (1911); G. P. GOOCH, *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* (1913), J. H. ROBINSON, *The New History* (1912); *The Mind in the Making* (1921); J. S. SHOTWELL, *The History of History* (1922); H. E. BARNES, *The New History and the Social Studies* (1925), (editor) *The History and Prospects of the Social Sciences* (1925); E. C. HAYES, editor, *Recent Development in the Social Sciences* (1926); W. F. OGBURN and A. A. GOLDENWEISER, editors, *The Social Sciences* (1925).

CHAPTER XLV

RELIGIOUS INSTITUTIONS

1. Religions of the World

NOTWITHSTANDING the primacy of the modern, democratic, national state, the power of industry, the spread of education, and the revelations of science, religion has continued to be one of the most powerful factors in world civilization. All peoples, from the most primitive to the most advanced, believe in a higher power called God or gods, whom they worship, and love or fear. The conduct of individuals and groups has been determined in large measure by their religious beliefs, and the course of civilization itself has been shaped by this force.

Variety of world religions

The 1,700,000,000 people on earth are divided into distinct religious groups. The Christians include more than one-third of the human race, and number 576,000,000 of whom 274,000,000 are Roman Catholics, 122,000,000 eastern Orthodox, and 180,000,000 Protestants. In numbers the Confucianists and Taoists rank next to the Christians, with 310,000,000. Then come the Mohammedans with 229,000,000 adherents. The Hindus have 215,000,000 members and the Buddhists 140,000,000, while the Shintoists claim only 25,000,000 and the Animists 161,000,000. Of all the great religions the Jews make the poorest numerical showing, with their 16,000,000 followers. The remaining 30,000,000 people are devotees of various primitive religions.

Europe and America are predominantly Christian, and the various Christian churches claim 47,000,000 members in Asia and 19,000,000 in Africa. The Roman Catholics predominate in Europe, in Latin America, and in Australasia; the Protestants in North America and Africa; and the eastern Orthodox in Asia. The Confucianists and Taoists outrank all other religions in Asia and have about a million members outside of that continent. The Mohammedans are strongest in Asia, where they have 145,000,000 adherents, and in Africa, where 52,000,000 exist. About 28,000,000 Mohammedans live in Australasia, 4,000,000 in Europe and 40,000 in the New World. The Buddhists are restricted almost entirely to Asia, with only 47,000 elsewhere. The Hindus, likewise, with the exception of 325,000 in Africa, 150,000 in the New World, and 35,000 in Australasia, all live in Asia. The Animists have 99,000,000 in Africa, 43,000,000 in Asia, 18,000,000 in Australasia, and 1,250,000 in South America. The Jews have over 10,000,000 in Europe, 5,000,000 in the New World, 550,000 in

Asia, and 350,000 in Africa. Of the 1,116,000,000 non-Christians in the entire world, 17,000,000 live in Europe; 14,000,000 in America; 45,000,000 in Australasia, 152,000,000 in Africa, and 888,000,000 in Asia. Of these world religions only the Mohammedans and the Christians carry on aggressive missionary work to win converts. Mohammedanism is both a religious force and a political power. Islam makes many converts among low-grade peoples such as are found in central Africa.

2. Christianity and Modern Life

Christianity and modern culture

Like western civilization, Christanity is alert and aggressive. It makes itself felt as a world force, and because it stresses human brotherhood and equality, it is a powerful factor in democratic progress. It permeates modern law and government and poses as the champion of peace and justice for all men and all groups of men. It advocated arbitration to settle disputes and warmly befriends the cause of internationalism in seeking to eliminate wars. No other religion has given such a stimulus to liberty and free political institutions. Renan said: "The Gospels are the Democratic Book par excellence." Christianity opposes tyranny, whether by kings or by peoples, and objects to license, disorder, and aimless revolution, as it does to despotism. It stands for orderly progress, and takes a prominent part in promoting education. Until recent times the instruction of the young was in the hands of the clergy in most of the European countries, and the church still controls thousands of primary and secondary schools, colleges and universities, and theological seminaries all over the world. In most Protestant countries today, however, the tendency is towards the secularization of education; in Catholic countries this trend is stubbornly resisted, but headway is being made even there. Many institutions like the Young Men's and Young Woman's Christian Associations devote much of their time and means to education. Numerous religious clubs and societies seek to improve society in divers ways.

Separation of church and state

The first examples of the separation of the church and state occurred under Roger Williams and William Penn in the New World. This principle was incorporated in the federal constitution of the United States. Canada, Mexico, Brazil, and some other Latin-American republics have followed this example, as have Australia, South Africa, Ireland, and Wales. France, after a long struggle, separated the church and state. As a result of the World War, Russia, Germany, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and some of the other newer European states have incorporated this provision in their constitutions and the idea is rapidly spreading.

The Protestant Revolt of the sixteenth century produced in northern Europe three great major churches — the Lutheran, Presbyterian, and Anglican — and many minor sects such as the Anabaptists, Zwinglians, and Quakers. This tendency towards division and mul-

Protestant sects

tiplication of the Christian denominations has continued down to the present time and has produced about 400 different groups. Among the most interesting of these movements were: Methodism founded by John and Charles Wesley in a great religious revival in England during the latter part of the eighteenth century; Unitarianism resulting from a secession from the Church of England in 1773 under Theophilus Lindsey; Mormonism established in 1830 in the state of New York by Joseph Smith Jr. on alleged revelations directly from heaven; Spiritualism originating in the same state in the family of J. D. Fox from certain "rappings" which were interpreted as messages from the dead; and Christian Science based on the writings of Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy in 1866.

Efforts on Christian union

The last few decades have witnessed various efforts to reunite the Protestant churches. Various organizations like the Christian Associations, the Salvation Army, and missionary boards have sought to secure the coöperation of the various sects. The Church of England in the Lambeth Conference of 1920 issued an "Appeal to all Christian People" calling for a series of conferences to realize "a reunited Catholic Church." A better understanding was arrived at with the Swedish Church, and the Orthodox Eastern Churches. The Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, was established in 1908 and now represents officially thirty Protestant denominations. Through special commissions the Council is studying such world problems as evangelism, social service, international goodwill and justice, church unity, the church and the race problem, relief, education, temperance, and so on. The World Missionary Conference held in Edinburgh in 1910 powerfully stimulated coöperation in foreign missions. The Interchurch World Movement of North America was organized by representatives of Protestant mission boards in 1918 to meet post-war opportunities. It made a remarkable world survey of religious, educational, and social needs, and sought to raise enormous sums of money to carry out its gigantic program. This movement revealed the possibilities of coöperation, but it failed largely because of unbusiness-like financial operations. In 1918 the Council of Organic Union with 19 Protestant denominations represented, drew up a project for a federal union, and held a second conference in 1920. These beginnings will, it seems reasonable to believe, result in greater ecclesiastical unity.

Roman Catholicism

The Greek Orthodox Catholic Church, and other eastern Christian sects have looked with some favor upon the proposition for amalgamation. The Roman Catholic Church, having retained its unity without serious division since the Protestant Revolt, has been less favorable to the idea of union. In recent years, however, negotiations have been carried on for the incorporation of groups of eastern Christians with Rome. The expansion of the Roman Catholic Church is seen in the fact that for the decade 1910–20 alone 71 new dioceses have been created. A missionary army of perhaps 35,000 priests,

monks, and nuns is scattered over the globe to care for the needs of 17,000,000 members and to manage the 1,700 schools with 800,000 pupils. Meantime in recent years administrative reforms have been enacted. In 1908 Pius X reorganized the Roman Curia, or the ruling body of the Papacy, in the interest of greater efficiency and promptitude. The Court of the Rota, which during the Middle Ages was the Court of Final Appeal, was restored to much of its former power. Special measures were enacted to care for the welfare of the 34,000,000 Roman Catholics in the English-speaking world. The "monstrous errors" and heresies of "modernism" have been condemned. A large commission of scholars made a new "Codex" of Canon Law, which was promulgated in 1917 by Benedict XV. Another commission of experts issued a revised Roman breviary for use in church service. In 1912 there was opened in Rome the Biblical Institute for research in the Bible.

Science and religion

The new science with its revolutionary theories about man and the earth at first encountered the open hostility of theological dogmatism. In Catholic countries, the opposition was most pronounced. Pope Pius IX took up the cudgel against the new heresies. Lutherans, Calvinists, and Anglicans, fearing that the new science would undermine the Bible's authority, upon which they relied, denounced its findings. But slowly the Protestants came to see that they might use the "right of private judgment," which the Reformation stressed, to revise their opinions about the Bible. The majority reconciled science with the Christian faith, and accepted the findings of the evolutionists. In Great Britain the Oxford movement was, in part, a protest against the advanced ideas, but it went to pieces when Newman and others joined the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholics either refused to accept the conclusions of scientific investigations, or explained them as pertaining to material things and not to the Deity and man's soul. Copernicanism and geology won notable triumphs, and evolution has had many powerful Christian champions, whose attitude may be stated in Tennyson's poetical summary, "one God, one law, one element, and one far-off divine event." The famous Vatican Library and archives were thrown open to scholars. Pope Leo XIII set up an astronomical observatory in the Vatican garden, and congratulated eminent Catholic scientists like Pasteur and Mendel upon their epoch-making discoveries. But Pius X and Benedict XV refused to endorse the extreme teachings of the new science.

As a force for social reform, Christianity has played a noteworthy role. It put the emancipation of the black slaves in America and the white serfs in Russia on a moral basis. It developed and supported charitable institutions until taken over in most instances by the state, and still manages many private charitable enterprises. Since 1900 the money spent for charities in Great Britain has multiplied eight times. Organizations like the Salvation Army and Sisters of

Christianity and social reform

Charity worked among the poor, in jails among the criminals, and in hospitals and homes among the sick. The church sought to improve the lot of women and children; to minimize divorce; to prevent prostitution; to abolish intemperence; and to produce a strong, clean, happy, human race. The Federal Council of the Churches has recently set forth the "Social Creed of the Churches" and a similar program was drawn up by the American Federation of Catholic Societies. Most of the larger denominations have special departments to carry out this work in many different ways. The churches have sought to solve the present industrial problems, and have proposed various remedies for the evils afflicting the workers. Christian Socialists opposed the materialism and class hatred of the Marxian Socialists, but denounced the present economic system as both unjust and unchristian. Pope Leo XIII wished to apply Christian principles to the relations between capital and labor; approved factory legislation and social reforms; and denounced socialism as a possible remedy. He was called the "Workingman's Pope" and was popular with Catholic workers everywhere. It is difficult to realize that religious toleration is a product of recent times. Compulsion in religion is now generally abandoned. Men of different beliefs live peaceably side by side in the same community, and respect one another's convictions.

The Christian Church in modern times has felt the call to carry Christian civilization to all parts of the globe. The goal is the conversion, not by the sword but by persuasion and education, of the 150,000,000 heathens and the still larger number of non-Christians scattered over the earth. Among the Roman Catholic missionary agencies the Society for the Propagation of the Faith, founded in 1822, has collected over $100,000,000 and has sent out 12,000 missionaries to Asia, Africa, America, and Australasia. The missionary work of the Protestants has been accomplished largely since the opening of the last century through many organizations. Millions of dollars have been contributed to this work and thousands of devoted men and women have gone out to foreign fields to spread the Gospel and to plant the seeds of a new life. From the United States and Canada alone for the decade following 1910 the foreign missionaries increased from 617 to 1,686 annually. Along with the missionary have gone the teacher, the physician, and the social worker to scatter the fruits of western civilization. Not only have mission churches been built, but also schools, hospitals, and sanitary stations have been established. A better knowledge of farming and industry has been taught. The sciences, arts, discoveries, and inventions of Europe and America have been introduced. Superstitions and barbarous practices have been eliminated, or reduced. Many of the natives are now employed to carry on the uplifting work among their fellows. Thus the backward peoples of the world are being elevated gradually to take their place among the progressive nations in the common

Christian missions

brotherhood. The most colossal scheme ever undertaken was launched in America by the Interchurch World Movement in 1918 to raise $326,000,000 in 1920 and $1,320,000,000 within five years to evangelize the world. The movement was not entirely successful, but it indicated the vision of the religious leaders of today.

Problems of contemporary religion

The problems confronting the Christian Church at the present time are numerous and serious. The church, like the state and the school, must make its thoughts and activities conform to the higher needs of man. It must become the exponent of democracy both by precept and example. It must learn the lessons of efficiency and co-operation, and cease to waste its substance and strength through senseless duplication. It must learn to work with the state and other agencies to accomplish the most for the race. It must stand for the fullest religious freedom and genuine toleration for all persons individually and collectively. It must recruit the ablest leaders of the day to manage its affairs in performing its great mission. It must modernize itself in spirit, creed, and methods of work in order to wield the leadership of the world and successfully spread the message of Jesus to all peoples. To intelligence it must add the new ethics as the standard of human conduct and the capacity of living well.

REFERENCES FOR FURTHER STUDY

J. MacCaffray, *History of the Catholic Church in the Nineteenth Century*, 2 vols. (1910); W. Barry, *The Papacy and Modern Times* (1911); J. McCarthy, *Pope Leo XIII* (1896); P. Sabatier, *Modernism* (1908); A. Loisy, *My Duel with the Vatican* (1924); J. H. Ryan and J. Husslein, *The Church and Labor* (1920); F. W. Cornish, *A History of the Church of England in the Nineteenth Century* (1910); S. L. Ollard, *A Short History of the Oxford Movement* (1915); A. C. McGiffert, *The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas* (1915); J. M. Robertson, *A Short History of Free Thought* (3d ed. 1915); W. Cunningham, *Christianity and Social Questions* (1910); *Christianity and Politics* (1915); S. Mathews, *The Church and the Changing Order* (1907); R. S. Baker, *The Spiritual Unrest* (1910); J. S. Shotwell, *The Religious Revolution of Today* (1913); S. Nearing, *Social Religion* (1913); W. S. Rauschenbusch, *Christianity and the Social Crisis* (1914); C. A. Ellwood, *The Reconstruction of Religion* (1921); H. C. Vedder, *The Gospel of Jesus and the Social Problem* (1914); C. S. McFarland, *Christian Service and the Modern World* (1916); L. Parks, *The Crisis of the Churches* (1922); E. B. Sanford, *History of the Federal Council of Churches* (1916); A. S. Crapsey, *The Last of the Heretics* (1924); S. L. Gulick and C. S. McFarland, *The Church and International Relations*, 3 vols. (1917); D. Philipson, *The Reform Movement in Judaism* (1907); R. J. H. Gottheil, *Zionism* (1914); H. M. Kallen, *Zionism* (1922); S. G. Wilson, *Modern Movements among Moslems* (1916); J. N. Farquhar, *Modern Religious Movements in India* (1915); J. S. Dennis, *Christian Missions and Social Progress* (1897), 3 vols.; W. O. Carver, *Missions and Modern Thought* (1910); W. R. Lambuth, *Medical Missions* (1920).

INDEX

INDEX

Abdul Aziz, 386, 392
Abdul Hamid II, 392, 393, 395, 396, 404, 405
Abdul Medjid, 386
Abraham, 155
Abyssinia, 285, 354, 419, 486, 489, 644
Academy of Sciences, Belles-Lettres, and Arts (Lyons), 19
"Academies of Labor" (Germany), 679
Acre, defeat of Napoleon at, 108, 373
Acropolis, 184
Act of Union and Security (Sweden), 57
Adalia (Asia Minor), 355, 558, 582, 636
Adam and Eve, 683
Adams, John, 25, 43, 140
Adams, Samuel, 26, 28, 35
Adana (Asia Minor), 381, 382
Aden (Arabia), 470
Admiralty Islands, 492
Adowa (Abyssinia), 514
Adrar, 490
Adrianople, Treaty of (1829), 184, 376, 377, 379, 407
Adriatic Sea, 53, 250, 262, 335, 366, 406, 576
Aegean Islands, 407, 408, 582, 636
Aegean Sea, 390, 406
Aehrenthal, Baron, 519
Afghanistan, 285, 339, 340, 423, 470, 519, 605, 607, 644
Africa, 3, 4, 9, 13, 15, 18, 38; in 1789, 44; 308, 310; imperialism in, 361; 414, 416, 419, 425, 426, 485, 569, 660, 677, 698
African Association (London), 45
African Negroes, 9, 18; in United States (1790), 38; 44; 434
Agadir incident, 311, 313, 331, 523, 524
Agassiz (Louis), 449
Agricultural Institute, 444
Agricultural Revolution, 157
Agriculture (France), 315
Aguinaldo, 439
Ahmed Arabi Pasha, 401
Aidin (Turkey), 403
Aisne River, 565
Aix-la-Chapelle, congress of, 136
Akermann, Convention of, 376, 377
Alabama (state of), 43
Alabama (S.S.), 285, 443
Aland Islands, 365, 580, 618
Alaska, 269, 339, 414, 420, 422, 423, 429, 435, 439, 449, 495
Alaskan Canal, 443
Albania, 390, 405–408, 527, 566, 580, 587, 588, 630, 631, 634, 636, 653
Albanians, 367, 370
Albert I (Belgium), 360, 556
Alberta, 457
Alcock (aviator), 694
Aleutian Islands, 492
Alexander, King (Greece), 567
Alexander I (Russia), 115, 131, 132, 135; liberal policy of, 145; 146, 148, 150, 215, 235, 267, 271, 622
Alexander II (Russia), 255; character of, 268; 269, 270, 271, 272, 277, 385
Alexander III (Russia), 340, 34
Alexander of Battenberg, 393
Alexander the Great, 13, 107
Alexandretta, Sea of, 393
Alexandria, 107
Alfieri (Vittorio), 54
Alfonso XII (Spain), 355, 356
Alfonso XIII (Spain), 356, 357, 586
Alfred, King, 7
Algeciras, 330, 443; conference of, 504, 518, 523
Algeria, 239, 241, 308, 423, 427, 486, 488, 490
Algiers, 308, 366, 402
Ali Pasha of Janina, 373, 386
Alleghanies, 23
Allenby, General, 568
Allied Council of Ambassadors, 631
Allied Maritime Transport Council, 654
Allied Naval Council, 654
All-Russian Central Executive Committee, 605
All-Russian Congress of Soviets, 574, 600, 602
Alps, 66, 108, 110, 112, 119, 568
Alsace, 42, 82, 133, 171, 175, 512
Alsace-Lorraine, 244, 245, 258, 260, 261, 280, 281, 302, 311, 316, 321, 323, 507, 531, 537, 541, 574, 575, 576, 578, 587
Alsatians, 77
Althing (Iceland), 363
Althusius, 15
Amadeo, Prince, 355
Amalfi (Italy), 352
Amazon River, 448, 495
America, new economic régime in, 39

American Collegiate and Theological Institute, 388
American constitution of 1787, 37, 97
American Federation of Catholic Societies, 702
American Federation of Labor, 665
American Institute of International Law, 441
American Republic, 4, 5, 38, 89
American Revolution, 3, 4, 6, 7, 18, 28, 31; explanation of the, 32; 37, 38, 40, 41, 71, 75, 88; influence of the, 89; 121, 124, 140, 155, 180, 182, 211, 216, 275, 297, 530, 645
Amiens, Treaty of, 110, 114
Amnesty Act of 1872 (U.S.), 278
Ampère, 686
Amsterdam, 72, 159, 593
Amundsen, 496
Amur Valley, 339, 475
Anabaptists, 699
Anarchism, 122, 222
Anatolia, 636
Andes, 454
Andrassy, Count, 389
Anglican Church, 69, 140, 141, 296, 699
Anglicans, 69, 141, 701
Anglo-French Entente, 517
Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 484, 589
Anglo-Russian agreement (1907), 519
Angola, 489
Angora, 403; Treaty of, 637
Animists, 698
Annam, 241, 308, 423, 473, 475
Annapolis, 34
Annobon Islands, 493
Annonay, 84
"Anti-Federalists" (U.S.), 36
Antilles, 450, 451; Lesser, 493
"Antiquity of Man, The" (Lyell), 684
Appalachian Mountains, 38
Apponyi, Count, 581
Arabia, 405, 629, 636, 638
Arabian Desert, 366
Arabs, 13, 366, 436
Arago (D.F.), 686
Arawaks, 452
Arbitration, 657
Archangel, 604
Archduke John of Austria, 201
Architecture, 70, 682
Argentina, 676, 694
Argonne Forest, 569
Aristotle, 643
Arizona (state of), 429, 445
Arkwright (Sir Richard), 161, 167
Armenia, 390, 391, 394, 395, 405, 469, 575, 582, 603, 636, 637, 650
Armenians, 345, 366, 367, 394, 395, 436
Arndt, 148
Arras, 568
Arriago, President (Portugal), 358
Art, in Europe (1789), 70; 681
Articles of Confederation (U.S.), 30, 34, 35, 149, 212, 214
Artois, count of, 91, 100, 138
Asbury, Francis, 40
Ascension Island, 492
Ashantee (West Africa), 285
Ashley, Lord, 211
Asia, 3, 4, 13, 15, 18; in 1789, 45; 416, 420, 425, 526, 588, 660, 677, 698
Asia Minor, 355, 366, 373, 381, 392, 401, 404, 471, 519, 629, 635
"Asiatic Monroe Doctrine," 485
Asquith, 550, 552
Assab, 354
Assembly of Notables (France), 91
Assignats, 98
Association of Friends (Greece), 184, 378
Assuan Dam, 465
Astor, John Jacob, 38
Astor, Viscountess, 645
Astronomy, recent progress in, 687
Athens, 184, 395, 635
Atlantic Ocean, 15, 75, 163, 455, 661, 694, 695
Ausgleich Compromise of 1867, 263, 334
Austerlitz, battle of, 114, 239
Australasia, 698
Australia, 4, 13, 18, 32, 37, 45, 161, 418, 422, 424, 427, 455, 458, 463, 464, 491, 645, 646, 660, 676, 699; Commonwealth of, 457, 458, 472
Austria, illiteracy in, 676; imperialism in, 53; political reforms in, 53; religious reforms in, 53; social reforms in, 53; Revolution of 1848 in, 202; under Joseph II, 52; under Maria Theresa, 52; Republic of, 614
Austria-Hungary, ethic situation in, 334
Austrian Empire, foreign policy of (under Metternich), 147; home policy of (under Francis I), 147; institutions of, 147; problems of nationality in, 335; social legislation in, 336
Austrian Kingdom, 54
Austrian Netherlands, 53
Austrian Revolution (1848), 203
Austrian ultimatum to Serbia, 545, 546
Austro-German Alliance, 508
Austro-German Treaty of 1879, 507, 508
Austro-Hungarian Empire, 334, 497, 514
Austro-Prussian War, 250, 255, 256
Avars, 369
Avogardo, 686
Avon Island, 492
Azerbaijan (Persia), 585
Azores, 493
Azov, Sea of, 627

Babeuf, Noël, 216
Bach, 72, 681
Bacon, Francis, 71
Bacteriology, 688
Baden, 115, 201, 257, 318, 611
Bagdad, 332, 373, 403, 568; Railway, 332, 403, 404, 519, 522, 539, 542
Bahamas, 430, 493
Bailly (J. S.), 92
Bakewell, Robert, 157
Bakunin (Michael), 223
Balance of power, Germany and the, 515
Balbo (Cesare), 234
Balearic Islands, 357
Balfour, 577, 629
Balkan League, 525, 527, 537, 538
Balkan States, 6, 49
Balkan War (First), 406, 407, 530; (Second), 400, 409, 526; 499, 525
Ballot Act of 1872 (England), 286
Baltic Sea, 55, 56, 329, 365, 621
Baltimore and Ohio Railroad, 164
Baluchistan, 339
Balzac, 235
Banat, the, 373, 581, 630, 632
Bancroft (George), 279
Bank of England, 70, 662
Bank of France, 112, 172, 662
Banks, Joseph, 458
Baptists, 41, 69, 141
Barbados, 464
Barbagallo, Corrado, 536
Barings (bankers), 172
Barnard (Henry), 226
Barras, General, 106, 107
Barrès, Maurice, 244
Bashi-Bazuks, 389
Bassora, 332
Bastille, 88; fall of the, 94, 96
Basutoland, 490
Basutos, 285
Batavian Republic, 106, 115
Batoum, 391
"Battalion of Death," 673
"Battle of the Nations," 118, 232
Bautzen, battle of, 118
Bavaria, 50, 53, 115, 242, 257, 318
Beaconsfield, Lord, 460, 506
Beard, Charles A., 36
Beauharnais, General, 107
Bebel (F. A.), 281, 332
Beccaria, 54
Bechuanaland, 490
Beethoven, 132
Bela Kun, 581, 615
Belfort, fortress of, 556
Belgian Congo Free State, 361
Belgium, 6, 8, 49, 111, 133, 134; establishment of independence of, 190; 215, 232; nationalism in, 235; 242, 279, 360, 556, 557, 563, 575, 588, 650; illiteracy in, 676; 679
Belgrade, Treaty of, 373
Bell, Alexander Graham, 164, 695
Bell, Henry (Bell's *Comet*), 163
Belleau Wood, 569
Benckendorff, 551, 552
Benedetti, 258, 259
Benedict XV, 573, 701
Bentham, 193, 294, 691
Bentham-Edwards, 316
Berchtold, 552
Berlin, 62, 115, 155, 200, 319, 433, 452, 509, 682
Berlin, Congress of, 272, 312, 337, 391, 401, 418, 504, 506
Berlin Decree, 116
Berlin, Treaty of, 391, 521
Berlin, University of, 123
Bermuda, 430, 464, 493
Bernadotte, 116, 134, 363
Berne, 58, 311
Bernhardi, 533
Bernstein, 691
Bernstorff, 57
Berzelius, 686
Bessarabia, 368, 385, 390, 391, 400, 632, 633
Bessemer process, 165, 279
Betelgeuse, 687
Bible, 683, 685, 701
Biblical Institute (Rome), 701
Big business, era of, 441
Bilinski, 540
Bill of Rights (England), 18
Birmingham (England), 62, 116, 141, 161, 163
Bismarck, 242, 243, 253–261, 311, 312, 320–329, 401, 496, 504–510, 520, 529, 578, 623
Bismarck Island, 492
Björkö (Finland), 517
"Black Hundreds," 343, 345, 347
Black Sea, 53, 55, 185, 261, 272, 366, 368, 369, 373, 385, 390, 393, 399, 400, 414, 509
Blackstone, 294
Blackwell, Dr. Elizabeth, 672
Blaine, James G., 453
Blanc, Louis, 189, 198, 218, 219, 220, 222, 691
Blanco, General, 356
Blanqui (J. A.), 173
Blücher, General, 119, 134, 149
Board of Education (England), 295
Bobrikov, Governor-General, 616
Bodin, 15
Boers, 285, 424, 456, 459, 460, 461, 486, 514
Boer War, 312, 359, 461, 463, 499, 515, 531

Bohemia, 53, 147, 202, 203, 204; Revolution of 1848 in, 204; 215, 233, 262, 264, 334, 335, 336, 615, 625, 626
Bohemians, 52, 204, 263, 264
Bokhara, 423
Bolivar, 453
Bolivia, 431, 448, 449, 450
Bolshevik government, 536
Bolsheviki (Bolshevists), 567, 575, 593, 597, 601–604, 619, 620, 623, 656, 669
Bolshevism, 122, 588, 590
Bolshevist Revolution of 1916, 270, 601, 607
Bombay, 466, 471
Bonaparte, Jerome, 115
Bonaparte, Joseph, 107, 115, 117
Bonaparte, Louis, 116
Bonaparte, President, 238
Bonapartists, 188, 190, 197, 314
Bonheur, Rosa, 681
Boone, Daniel, 39
Bordeaux, 70, 84, 99, 259, 301, 565
Börne, 234
Borneo, 470
Bosio, 70
Bosnia, 335, 337, 338, 371, 389–391, 398, 406, 507, 520, 521, 537, 539–542, 575
Bosphorus, 373, 381, 382, 383, 526, 636, 637
Boss (Lewis), 687
Boston, 25, 26, 42, 166, 682
"Boston Massacre," 26
"Boston Tea Party," 26, 27
Botany Bay, 45, 458
Botha, General Louis, 461, 569
Boulanger, General, 305, 311, 508
Boulogne, 114
Boulton and Holt, 167
Bourbon house, 119, 131, 134
Bourbon monarchy, 103, 121
Bourbons, 110, 112, 113, 133, 134, 186, 314
Bourgeoisie, 7; in France, 82, 101; 108, 163
Boxer Rebellion, 355, 444, 476, 513
Boy Scouts, 532
Brandenburg, 51
Brandenburg Gate (Berlin), 70
Bratiano, Jean, 632
Bratiano, Vintilo, 632
Brazil, 9, 15, 43, 182, 183, 355, 414, 418, 429, 430, 434, 441, 448, 449, 644, 676, 699
Bremen, 610
Breslau, University of, 123
Brest-Litovsk, Treaty of, 567, 604, 607, 628
Brest-Litovsk, Union of (1595), 627
Bretons, 77
Brett brothers, 695
Briand, Aristide, 307, 309, 310
Brienne, count of, 79
Bright (John), 277, 414
British Columbia, 472, 646
British constitution, influence of the, 90
British East Africa Company, 488
British Empire, 4, 5, 21, 31, 32, 72, 661
British Guiana, 430, 436, 443
British Honduras, 430
British Somaliland, 490
Brook Farm Colony, 217
Brooklyn, 448
Brown (aviator), 694
Brown University, 42
Browne, Miss Antoinette, 672
Browning, Mrs., 233
Brunswick, 191
Brusilov, General, 566
Brussels, 119, 565
Buchanan, 551
Buchanan, President, 276
Bucharest, 388, 567, 633
Bucharest, Treaty of, 409, 410, 527
Bucharest, University of, 399
Buchlau (Moravia), 520
Büchner (George), 220
Budapest, 263, 632
Buddhism, 14, 473
Buddhists, 698
Buffon, 71, 684
Bukowina, 335, 368, 381, 400, 627, 632, 633
Bulgaria, 280, 394, 406, 496, 507, 508, 525, 566, 575, 629, 633, 676
Bulgarian Revolution, 508
Bulgars, 367, 369, 387, 396, 408
Buller, Charles, 462
Bundesrat (Germany), 257, 318, 319, 320; (Austria), 614
Burckhardt (J. L.), 487
Bureaucracy (France), 76
Burke, 3, 27, 42, 50, 72, 139
Burma, 65, 285, 424, 470, 471, 473, 475, 685
Burne-Jones, 681
Burschenschaft, 150, 236
Business cycles, 663
Byng, General, 568
Byron, Lord, 123, 184, 233, 681
Cabral, 15
"Cadets" (Russia), 346, 347
Cadiz, 179
Cadorna, General, 568
Caesar, Julius, 7, 113
Cahiers (France), 93, 97
Caicos Island, 430
Caillaux, 313, 524, 526
Cairo, 108, 460, 490, 569
Calas, Jean, 68
Calcutta, 466, 471
California, 175, 278, 429

Caliphate, 638
Calles, President, 451
Calonne, 91
Calvin, 3, 13
Calvinists, 69, 701
Cambodia, 308, 473, 475
Cambrai, 568
Cambridge, University of, 141, 295, 691
Cameroon, 490, 491, 524
Cameroons, the, 325, 508, 569
Camorra (Naples), 351
Campo Formio, Treaty of, 106, 110
Canada, 22, 23, 24, 37, 43, 213, 430, 434, 435, 445; origins of, 456; Dominion of, 463; 464, 472, 493, 495, 645, 676, 699
Canadian National Railway, 457
Canadian Pacific Railroad, 457
Canary Islands, 357, 493
Cannes, 119
Canning, George, 143, 181, 182
Canova, Antonio, 70, 681
Canovas, Prime Minister, 356
Can Reb, 285
Canton, 473, 474
Cape Colony, 134, 161, 414, 486
Cape Horn, 440, 448
Cape Town, 461
Cape Trafalgar, 114
Cape Verde, 489, 493
Capitalism, 664
Capitulation System (Turkey), 371
Capo d'Istria, 379
Caprera Island, 249
Caprivi, 511
Carbonari, 179, 183, 186, 205, 235, 246, 247
Carducci, 234
Carey (William), 419
Caribbean Sea, 440, 443, 452
Carlos, 452
Carlists (Spain), 355
Carlos I (Portugal), 358
Carlowitz, Treaty of, 373
Carlsbad Decrees, 148, 150, 233
Carlyle, 233, 681
Carnegie, Andrew, 656
Carnot (L. N. M.), 104
Carnot, President, 343
Caroline Islands, 356, 492
Carolingians, 113
Carpathian Mountains, 366
"Carpet-baggers," 278
Carranza, General, 441, 451
Carroll, Charles, 164
Carson, Sir Edward, 298
Carthage, 485
Carthaginians, 44
Cartwright, 162
Casablanca (Morocco), 331
Casement, Sir Roger, 299
Casimir-Périer, President, 306
Caspian Sea, 339, 414, 469
Cassaba (Asia Minor), 403
Castelar, President, 355
Castlereagh, 132, 135, 140, 142, 150
Catherine II (the Great), 54, 55, 58, 537, 622
Catholics (see Roman Catholics)
Catt, Mrs. Carrie C., 646
Caucasus, 55, 268, 339, 379, 423
Cavendish, 71
Cavour, Count, 205, 246, 247, 248, 250, 349, 496
Cawnpore, 466
Cayenne, 239
Cell theory, 688
Celts, 296
Central America, 37, 429, 430, 434, 440, 450, 451
Central American Court of Justice, 657
Central American Federation (Union), 431, 451
Central Powers, 313, 542, 557, 558, 561, 563, 566, 567, 570, 571, 573, 575, 577, 583, 587, 589, 596, 598, 620, 623, 629
Cettinje, bishop of, 398
Ceylon, 111, 134, 419, 420, 470
Chad, Lake, 487, 491
Chamber of Deputies (France), 138, 187, 305, 310, 537, 548, 549, 669; (Italy), 350, 353, 651; (Hungary), 264, 265, 313, 314, 315, 336
Chamber of Lords (Austria), 262
Chamberlain, 290, 456, 460, 461, 463, 533
Chambord, count of, 186
Charlemagne, 155
Charles, King (Hungary), 615
Charles, Emperor (Austria), 613
Charles Albert (Sardinia), 205, 214
Charles Felix, 183
Charles I (England), 18, 91
Charles II, 191
Charles III (Spain), 54, 55
Charles IV (Spain), 55
Charles X (France), 138, 146, 151, 173, 185, 186, 187, 190, 197, 234
Charles XIV (Sweden), 363
Charles (Carol) of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, 399
Charles the Great, 7, 107, 113
Charleston harbor, 276
Charter of 1814 (France), 137
Chartist movement (England), 207
Chartists, 197, 207, 286
Chataldja line, 407
Chateaubriand, 130, 234
Chateau-Thierry, battle of, 569
Chatham Island, 495
Chaudet (A. D.), 70
Cheidze, 600
Chemistry, recent progress in, 686

Cherubini, 72
Chicago, 164, 433, 444, 682
Children's Welfare Act of 1908 (England), 295
Chile, 181, 431, 434, 436, 441, 449, 453, 498, 570
Chilperic, 113
China, 4, 18, 38, 45, 339, 414, 420, 423, 426, 435, 444, 469, 471, 472; missions in, 474; 476-480, 494, 495, 512, 568, 682
Chinese, 13, 18, 278, 435
Chinese Republic, 478, 480
Chino-Japanese War, 483, 499
Chios, 379
Cholet, 172
Chosen (Korea), 484
Christian VII (Denmark), 57
Christian IX (Denmark), 255
Christian Federation, 11
Christian Missions, 420-421, 702
Christians, number of, 698
Christian Science, 700
Christian Socialism, 218
Christian Socialists, 218, 669, 702
Christianity, 11, 14, 40, 67, 117, 124, 419, 481, 587; and modern culture, 699; 700, 701, 702
Christmas Island, 492
Church and state, separation of, 699
Church of England, 700
Church of Scotland, 141
Church World Movement in the United States, 420
Churchill, Winston, 551
Cicero, 13
Cilicia, 405, 629, 636, 637
Cisalpine Republic, 106
Civil Constitution of the Clergy (France), 97
Civilization, history of, 693
Civil Rights Act (U.S.), 278
Civil War (American), 241, 277, 279, 280, 285, 431, 432, 438, 442, 445, 472, 661
Clay, Henry, 184
Clemenceau, 305, 508, 573, 577
Clermont (S.S.), 163
Cleveland, Grover, 439, 443
Cleves, provinces of, 66
Clinton, George, 35
Clovis, 138
Clyde River, 163
Cobbett, William, 142, 193
Cobden, 414
Coblenz, 130
Cochin China, 241, 308, 423
Code Napoléon, 111, 120, 121, 310
"Codex" of Canon Law, 701
Coke, Thomas, 40
Colbert, 84, 85
Coleridge, 233
Collins, Michael, 299
Cologne, 613
Colombia, 181, 440, 448, 450
Colonial Society (Germany), 325
Colonial trade, prosperity of, 22
Columbia, District of, 276
Columbia River, 43
Columbia University, 42
Columbus, Christopher, 13, 15, 155, 694
Columbus Library, 453
Commercial Revolution, 3, 16, 21, 75, 156, 158
Committee of General Security (France), 102, 103
Committee of Public Information (U.S.), 595
Committee of Public Safety (France), 102, 103, 104
Communard movement (France), 301
Communards (France), 301, 302
Communication, 164, 695
Communist Manifesto, 221, 224
Communists, 302, 309, 593, 669; in Italy, 350; in Hungary, 615
Company d'Anzin, 84
Company of the Indies (France), 84
Compromise of 1850 (U.S.), 275
Compromise (Ausgleich) of 1867, 263, 334
Comte, August, 236, 691, 692
"Concert of Europe," 136, 655; after 1815, 503
"Concert of Powers," 194
Concord, battle of, 28
Concordat of 1801, 111, 137, 307
Confederacy (U.S.), 276, 277
"Confederate States of America," 276
Confederation of the Rhine, 115, 118, 133
Confucianism, 14, 473
Confucianists, 698
Confucius, 473, 478
Congo, 308, 417, 487, 488
Congo Free State, 489, 490, 504
Congregational Church, 226
Congregationalists (U.S.), 34; (England), 69
Congress of Vienna, 6, 119, 131; blunders of the, 134; 135, 139, 145, 146, 148, 149, 179, 183-185, 190, 191, 199, 202, 214, 232, 246, 250, 252, 274, 363-364, 459, 486, 529, 577, 650, 695
Congress of Workers' Councils (Germany), 609
Connecticut, 29, 36, 38, 212, 432
Conservative Royalists (France), 315, 549
Constantine (Russia), 146
Constantine, King (Greece), 567, 629, 635
Constantinople, 55, 118, 184, 268, 272, 339, 372, 373, 378, 380, 384, 399, 400, 403, 471, 506, 526, 531, 537, 566, 576, 582, 635; Treaty of, 409
Constantinople-Bagdad Railway, 330
Constantsa, 399
Constituent Assembly (Latvia), 620
Constitution of 1791 (France), 97
Constitution of 1795 (France), 106
Constitution of the Year VIII (France), 110
Constitution of 1850 (Prussia), 200, 678
Constitution of 1876 (Turkey), 392

Constitutional Assembly (Berlin), 200
Constitutional Convention of 1787 (U.S.), 34, 35, 101
Constitutional Convention of 1848 (Austria), 203
Constitutional Democrats (Russia), 346, 600, 604
Constitutionalists (Italy), 350
Constitutions, creation of, 4; new, 121, 647; modern, 212;
Consulate (France), 108, 113
Continental Coalition, 515
Continental Congress, First, 27; Second, 28, 34, 212
Continental System, 116
Cook Island, 492
Cook, Captain, 45, 71, 457, 496
Cooper (J. F.), 681
"Cooperative Commonwealth," 668
Copernicus, 71, 147
Corfu, 630
Corn Laws (England), 207, 224
Corot, 681
Corsica, 107, 354
Cort, Henry, 165
Cortes (Spain), 49, 138, 180, 193, 314, 356, 357, 586
"Cosmopolitan Alliance" (France), 186
Cossacks, 56, 118, 270, 345
Costa Rica, 451
"Cotton Gin," 162
Council of Commerce (France), 84
Council of Elders (France), 105
Council of Five Hundred (France), 105–106
Council of Nations (Russia), 605
Council of Organic Union, 700
Council of Peoples' Commissioners (Russia), 602, 603; (Germany), 608
Council of Regency (Poland), 623
Council of States (France), 110, 239; (India), 467; (Russia), 345; (Switzerland), 208
Council of Workmen's and Soldiers' Deputies (Russia), 599, 600
Councils Act of 1909 (India), 467
Courland, 343, 603, 615, 619
Court of Final Appeal (R.C.C.), 701
Court of the Rota (R.C.C.), 701
Covent Garden, 72
Cracow, 134
Crawford (England), 161
Crete, 272, 379, 384, 387, 391, 395, 396
Creusot (France), 171
Crimea, 55, 240
Crimean War, 208, 241, 247, 256, 259, 268, 281, 339, 384, 385, 386, 400
Criminal law, recent changes in, 5, 78, 142
Crispi, 354
Croatia, 203, 204, 335, 581
Croats, 204, 335, 631
Crompton, 161
Cromwell, 18
Cronstadt, 512
Crown Council (Russia), 527, 539
Crown Prince William (Prussia), 200, 327
Crusades, 14
Cuba, 355, 356, 414, 429, 430, 434, 439, 440, 452, 453, 493, 545, 644
Cumberland, 39
Cunard Line, 163
Curie, 687
Customs Union (Germany), 175
Cuza, John Alexander, 387, 399
Cyprus, 391, 470, 582
Czecho-Slovakia, 578, 581, 586, 588, 613, 623, 625, 626, 630, 647, 650, 699
Czecho-Slovaks, 280, 334, 625
Czechs, 147, 204, 262, 264, 335, 625
Czernowitz (Rumania), 566

Dacia, 368
Daguerre, 171
Dahomey (Africa), 490
Dáil Eirann, 299
D'Alambert, 71
Dalmatia, 114, 335, 354, 367
Dalton, John, 686
Damao (China), 470
Damascus, 402
Dana, Charles A., 317
Danilo (Bishop of Cettinje), 375, 398
Danilo II (Rumania), 398
Danish West Indies, 363
Dante, 250
Danton, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105
Danube River, 118, 366, 369, 373, 385
Danubian provinces, union of, 387
Danzig, 134, 578, 623, 624, 653
Dardanelles, 373, 382, 383, 384, 566, 635, 636, 637, 674
Dartmouth College, 42
Darwin, Charles, 427, 670, 684, 685, 691
Darwinism, 685
David (J. L.), 70, 681
Davis, Jefferson, 276, 277
Davy (Sir Humphrey), 686
Dawes Committee, 612
Dawes Plan, 612, 613
d'Azeglio, 234, 350
Deak, Francis, 203, 263, 337
Deane, Silas, 42, 43
de Bougainville, Louis, 71
Decaen, General, 112
Decatur, 533
Declaration of Independence, 6, 9, 28; principles in the, 29, 35, 42, 72, 89, 96, 212, 679

"Declaration of the Rights of Man" (France), 9, 96, 97, 105, 213, 231, 679, 692
"Declaration of the Rights of Nations" (Pan-American Union), 441
Dedeagatch, 409
Defense Association (Germany), 331
De Kalb, 71
de la Barre, Chevalier, 68
Delacroix, 681
Delagoa Bay, 488
Delatoche, 681
Delaware River, 39, 429
Delaware (state of), 36
Delcassé, 244, 312, 517
de Lesseps, 305
Delhi, 466
Delyannes, 395
de Maistre, 130
Denikin, General, 604
Denmark, 6, 9, 49, 57, 134; Revolution of 1848 in, 208; 215, 231, 255, 362, 430, 439, 498, 558, 578, 618
De Quincey, 681
Déroulède, Paul, 244
Descartes, 71
De Siebert, 536
Despotism, in small states, 149; of Louis Napoleon, 243
D'Estournelles de Constant, Baron, 656
de Valera, Eamon, 299
Devil's Island, 306
de Vries, Hugo, 685
Dewey, Admiral, 356
DeWitt Clinton, 274
"Diamond Jubilee," 463
Diaz, General, 451, 568
Dickens, Charles, 206, 233, 681
Dickinson, John, 30
Dictatorship of the Councils (Germany), 609
Diderot, 55, 71, 88
Dimitrievitch, Dragutin, 540
Directory (France), 98, 106, 107, 108, 216
Disease, war on, 667; germ theory of, 689
Disraeli, 286, 391, 462
"Dissenters," 69, 141, 193, 224.
"Divine Right," 4
Dnieper River, 55, 627
Dniester River, 55, 627
Dobrorolski, General, 546
Dobrovsky, 625
Dobrudja, 368, 390, 391, 401, 409, 527, 581
Dodekanese Islands, 355, 406, 582, 634, 635
"Domestic System," 159, 166
Dominicans, 419
Don John VI (Brazil), 182
Don Pedro I (Brazil), 182
Don Pedro IV (Portugal), 182
Dorpat, 343; Peace of, 617
Dostoievsky, 273
Drake, Sir Francis, 694
Dred Scott (decision), 275
Dresden, 223
Dreyfus, Alfred, 306, 312
Drummond, Sir Eric, 580
Drury Lane, 72
Druses (Syria), 370, 387, 638
Dual Alliance of 1891, 312, 313, 337, 341, 513, 534, 551
Dual Monarchy, 263, 264, 335, 337, 542, 566, 613, 625
Dublin, 297, 299
Duke de Aiguillon, 95
Duke d'Enghien, 112, 114
Duma (First), 345, 346; (Second), 346; (Third), 347; (Fourth), 347, 598
Dumba, Dr., 560
Dunkards, 41
Durazzo, 406
"Durbar" of 1911, 467
Durham, Lord, 213, 456, 462
Duruy, 678
Dutch, 15, 38, 44, 45, 215, 414
Dutch East India Company, 73
Dutch Guiana, 414, 419, 429, 430, 436
Dutch Reformed Church, 40
East Africa, 490, 508
East Carelia, 617
"Eastern Question," 185
East India Company, 26, 73, 466, 474
East Indies, 15, 45, 112, 359, 414, 436, 471, 492
East Prussia, 319, 565, 622
East Silesia, 578
Ebert, Frederick, 608, 609, 613
Economic Council of the Commonwealth (Germany), 610
Economics, science of, 692
Ecuador, 448, 450
Eddy, Mrs. Mary Baker G., 700
Edinburgh, 690, 700
Edison, 695
Education, improvements in, 9–10; in United States (1790), 41; 69–70; in France, 85–86; in France under Napoleon, 112; 123; in Italy, 139; in England, 294; in Italy, 351; in Spain, 357; 676–680
Education Act of 1918 (England), 295, 679
Edward VII, 312, 326, 357, 651
Egypt, 107, 111, 176, 311, 312, 330, 366, 383, 401, 402, 422, 464, 485, 486, 490, 516, 569, 576, 587, 677, 694
Egyptians, 44, 155
Eider-Danes, 255
Eiffel, 305

Einstein, 687
Elba, return of Napoleon from, 119; 131
Elbe River, 66, 330, 511
Eldorados, 489
Electricity, recent progress in, 686
Elementary Education Act of 1870 (England), 679
Eliot, George, 233
Ellice Island, 492
Emancipation Law (Russia), 270
Emancipation Proclamation (U.S.), 9, 276
Emerald Isle, 296
Emerson, 279
Emigration, oriental, 472
Emigrés (France), 98, 101, 102, 104, 111, 130, 137
Empress of China (S.S.), 38
Ems telegram, 243, 269
Encyclopedists, 89, 530
Engels, Frederick, 8, 220, 221, 222, 691
Engineering, 681
England, nobility in, 60; middle class in, 61; peasants in, 65; "dissenters" in, 69; constitutions of, 213
English Channel, 207, 531, 556, 695
English Revolution, 21, 27, 75, 155
English Society for Encouraging Manufacturers, 161
"Enlightened Despotism," 124
"Enlightened Despots," 55, 89, 125
Enos, 408
Entente Allies, 557–563, 566, 567, 573–578, 583, 586–589, 596–600, 604, 611, 636, 646
Entente Cordiale, 312, 522, 523
Entente Pact of London, 557
Enver Bey, 407
Epirus, 391, 406
Episcopalians (U.S.), 34
Erasmus, 3
Ericsson, 163
Erie Canal, 39
Eritrea (Africa), 354, 490
Erlich, Dr., 690
Eski Shehr, 403
Esterhazy, Major, 306
Esthonia, 585, 604, 615, 618; Republic of, 619, 647, 650
Esthonians, 281, 343, 619
Eugénie, Empress, 240, 242, 243, 258
Eupen, 578
Euphrates River, 366
Evolution, theory of, 683, 685, 693
Ewart, John S., 536, 551
Eylau, battle of, 115

"Fabians" (England), 691
Fabre-Luce, Alfred, 536, 542
Factories, emergence of, 167
Factory Act of 1833 (England), 223, 224
Factory System, 7; beginnings of the, 84; 166
Factory Workers' Councils (Germany), 610, 613
Falkland Islands, 492
"Family Compact" (Spain), 55
Fanning Island, 492
Faraday, 686
Far East, 32, 339, 344, 356, 423, 444, 469, 474, 519
Far Eastern Republic, 585, 605
Farm Loan Bureau (U.S.), 445
Faroe Islands, 493
Farther India, 495
Fascisti, 586, 633
Fashoda, 312, 465, 514
Faumotu Island, 492
Favre (J. A.), 243
Fay (S. B.), 243
February Revolution (France), 197
Federal Council (Russia), 605; (Germany), 318; (Switzerland), 308
Federal Council of the Churches of Christ (America), 700, 702
Federal Land Banks (U.S.), 445
Federal Legislature (Austria), 614
Federal Reserve Bank (U.S.), 445, 662
Federal Trade Commission (U.S.), 445
"Federalists" (U.S.), 36, 274
Feisal, King (Iraq), 638
Félix-Faure, President, 306
Ferdinand (Bulgaria), 406, 409
Ferdinand (Rumania), 632
Ferdinand IV (Naples), 139
Ferdinand VI (Naples), 183
Ferdinand VII (Spain), 138, 139, 146, 151, 179, 180, 181
Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, 392
Ferry (J. F.), 243, 508
Ferry Laws (France), 678
Feudalism, abolished in France, 95
Fez (Morocco), 523
Fichte, 220, 233
Fiji Islands, 492
Filipinos, 439, 494
Finland, 49, 116, 117, 118, 134, 145, 345, 347, 363, 414, 576, 585, 603, 604, 615, 616, 617, 618, 647, 650
Finns, 284, 343, 344, 627
First Continental Congress (Philadelphia), 27
First French Republic, 101–102, 105, 113, 124
First International, 655
First Reform Bill (England), 193
Fiske, John, 685, 701
Fitch, John, 39, 163
Fiume, 354, 531, 630, 631, 653
"Five Intolerable Acts," 27
Flanders, 82
Flemings (Belgium), 360
Florida, 22, 23, 43, 55, 181, 423, 429, 430

Foch, Marshal, 575, 577
Folkething (Denmark), 363
Fonseca Bay, 440
Food Council of Allied Powers, 654
Foreign Office (Germany), 595
Forgach, 552
Formosa, 419, 475, 483, 492
Forster, 277
Forster Act (England), 294
Forth and Clyde Canal, 163
Fort Sumter, 276
Fourier, Charles, 216, 217, 219, 691
Four-Power Treaty, 589
"Fourteen Points," 574–577
Fourth Estate (France), 82
Fox (C. J.), 42, 50
Fox (J. D.), 700
France, absolute monarchy in, 76; agriculture in, 315; bureaucracy in, 76; business in, 112; capitalists in, 172; Catholicism in (1900), 307; centralization of government in, 313; church in, 79, 97; clergy in, 79–80; coal and iron in, 172; colonial empire of, 308; commerce and manufacturing of, 171, 316; Communard movement in, 302; constitutions of, 213; criminal law in, 78; despotism in, 243; disease in, 244; economic changes in, 123; economic conditions in, 170, 315; factory system in, 84; fourth estate in, 82; illiteracy in, 676; imperialism in, 308; Industrial Revolution in, 196; industrial system of, 85; internal reforms in, 111; land ownership in, 122; local government in, 77; military policies of, 310; national finance in, 77; national workshops in, 198, 219; nobility in, 60, 81; Parliament in, 314; peasants in, 65, 82; Protestants in, 68; political changes in, 115; political parties in, 99, 137, 315; public improvements in, 112; religious conditions in, 80, 123; religious reforms in, 308; rôle of the ministry, 314; rôle of the President, 313; railroads in, 172, 310; republicanism in, 244, 303–304; social conditions in, 80; socialism in, 216, 218–220, 309; social legislation in, 309; social revolution in, 95, 113, 122; taxation in, 77–78; textiles in, 171; third estate in, 82; town workers in, 82; trade and industry in, 84; under the charter of Louis VIII, 137
France, Anatole, 244
Francesco di Paoli, Church of (Naples), 70
Francis I (Austria), 131, 146, 147, 151, 192, 215
Francis II (Austria), 115, 249
Francis Ferdinand, Archduke, 338, 398, 535, 540, 541
Francis Joseph I, 204, 205, 235, 262, 263, 264, 335, 337, 529, 542, 625
Francis Xavier, 419, 480
Franciscans, 419
Franco, Prime Minister (Portugal), 358
Franco-Prussian War, 243, 250, 258, 310, 315, 323, 400, 463, 496, 531, 534
Franco-Russian Alliance, 512, 536, 537, 538, 54
Frankfort, 72, 149, 191, 201, 253, 257; Treaty of, 260; Peace of, 301
Frankfort Parliament, 201, 252
Franklin, Benjamin, 30, 31, 32, 35, 41, 42, 43, 71, 96, 140, 503, 695
Franz, G., 536, 546
Fraudamental Law (Russia), 346
Frederick, Crown Prince (Denmark), 57
Frederick II (the Great), 13, 16, 31, 51, 52, 53, 58, 59, 88, 115, 174
Frederick III (Germany), 326
Frederick IV (Denmark), 419
Frederick William II (Prussia), 51
Frederick William III (Prussia), 132, 148, 150, 215
Frederick William IV (Prussia), 201, 215
Freedman's Bureau (U.S.), 278
Freemasons, 179, 183, 186, 235, 246, 247
Free Trade, 89, 414, 663
French Academy, 19
French and Indian War, 50
French Congo, 313, 331, 524
French Company of India, 73
French Foreign Legion, 331
French Guiana, 414, 429
French Panama Company, 440
French Revolution, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 18, 43, 49, 54, 55, 57, 61, 73, 75, 76, 80, 94, 95, 96, 100, 119, 120–124, 129, 139, 148, 151, 155, 156, 171, 179, 180, 182, 193, 216, 246, 297, 316, 414, 530, 585, 607, 645, 678
Freud, Sigmund, 690
Friedland, battle of, 115
"Friends of the Constitution" (Spain), 179
"Friends of Truth" (France), 186
Froude, 233
Fuad I (Egypt), 465
Fuad Pasha (Turkey), 386
Fulton, Robert, 114, 163

Gabun River, 488
Gainsborough, Thomas, 70
Galicia, 134, 334, 335, 565, 567, 580, 622, 623, 627
Galileo, 71
Gallipoli, 566
Galvani, 71, 686
Gambetta, 243, 244, 259, 261, 391, 465
Gambia (Africa), 490
Gambia River, 44
Gandolfo Castle, 345
Ganges, 495
Gapon, Father, 345
Garden of Eden, 683
Garibaldi, 205, 234, 247, 249, 250

Garrett, Dr. Elizabeth, 672
Garrison, 275
Gaspée (S.S.), 26
Gastein, Treaty of, 255, 256
General Confederation of Labor (France), 309
General Federation of Labor (Italy), 353
Genesis, story of Creation in, 683
Geneva, 68, 222, 362
Geneva Economic Conference, 590, 605
Geneva Medical College, 762
Geneva Tribunal, 285, 443
Genoa, 49, 54, 134, 249
Genoa Economic Conference (1922), 590
Gentz, F. von, 134, 135
George, Crown Prince (Greece), 635
George I (Greece), 395
George III (England), 13, 23, 26, 28, 29, 30, 49, 50, 140, 167, 457
George IV (England), 140, 151
George V (England), 288, 296, 467
Georgia (state of), 26, 36, 275
Georgia (Russia), 268, 585, 604
Georgians (Russia), 345
German Army Act of 1913, 532, 539
German Commonwealth, 609
German Confederation, 255, 257
German Constitution, the new, 609
German East Africa, 325, 361, 491
German Empire, army system in, 328; centralization of government in, 322; education in, 678; foreign policy of, 321; imperialism in, 330; Industrial Revolution in, 323; *Kulturkampf* in, 322; militarism in, 329; navalism in, 330; rise of colonial empire of, 325; political parties in, 321; *socialism in*, 324, 327, 328; *social legislation* in, 324, 327
German Navy League, 329–330
German Reformed Church, 69
German Republic, 465, 582, 590, 605, 609
German Southwest Africa, 325, 461, 491, 508, 569
Germanic Confederation, 149, 191, 202, 214, 252
Germany, and Russia, 513; army system in, 328; conditions in, 173; Industrial Revolution in, 174; industry in, 174; militarism in, 329; nationalism in, 233; opposition to autocracy in, 150; peasants in (1789), 66; 133; railroads in, 175; Revolution of 1830 in, 174; rise of colonial empire of, 325; socialism in, 220; *textiles in*, 174
Gerry, E., 36
Ghandi, 467
Gibbon, 32, 58, 72
Gibraltar, 55, 414
Gilbert, 695
Gilbert Islands, 492
Gioberti, 234, 246
Giolitti, Premier, 353
Girondists, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 111
Gladstone, 277, 286, 290, 294, 298, 340, 414, 460, 679
Glasgow, 163, 164
Gluck, 72
Goa (India), 419, 470
Godwin, *Mary Wollstonecraft*, 645, 672
Godwin, William, 691
Goethe, 72, 149, 233, 234
Gogol, 273
Gold Coast, 488, 490
Goldsmith, 72
Gonsalvi, Cardinal, 132
Gooch, G. P., 536
Gordon, C. G., 474
Gotha, 173
Gough Island, 492
Government of Ireland Act of 1920, 299
"Government of National Defense" (France), 301
Government of National Safety (Russia), 600
Government of Northern Ireland, 299
Gramont, duke of, 258
Grand Army (of Napoleon), 118
"Grand Empire" (of Napoleon), 118
Grand National Assembly (Turkey), 637
Grand National Consolidated Trades Union (England), 224, 292
Grand Theater (Bordeaux), 70
"Grand Trek" (Boers), 460, 461
Gray, Asa, 685
Great Act of 1892 (France), 310
Great Britain, agrarian reforms in, 294; Chartist movement in, 207; commerce of, 661; "dissenters" in, 141; extension of suffrage in, 286; *foreign policy of*, 142; *franchise in*, 141; Labor Party in, 292; labor unionism in, 292; land problems in, 293; local government reforms in, 287; Parliament in, 289; political parties in, 290; public education in, 294; reforms of 1800–1840 in, 260; representation in, 141; religious liberty in, 296; rôle of the king in, 288; rôle of the ministry in, 288; state Church in, 140; socialism in, 216–217; under the Old Tories, 139; woman suffrage in, 288
Great Columbia, 431
Greater Bulgaria, 531
"Greater Europe," 19
Greater Greece, 395, 396, 531, 634
Greater Rumania, 399, 632
Greater Serbia, 398, 531, 540
Great Lakes (U.S.), 39, 419, 429
Great Reform Bill of 1832 (England), 170, 194, 205, 213, 224, 539
Great Revolution of 1914, 585
Great Western (S.S.), 163
Greco-Turkish War, 396, 471, 635, 637

Greece (ancient), 14
Greece, 70, 179; *origin or nationalism in*, 186; 232; nationalism in, 235; 279, 396, 406, 409, 472, 498, 558, 563, 575, 581, 582, 629, 630, 633, 635; illiteracy in, 676
Greek Archipelago, 379
Greek Catholics, 268
Greek Orthodox (Catholic) Church, 11, 55, 67, 340, 343, 380, 399, 594, 597, 598, 700
Greek Revolution (1821–1829), 379
Greek War of Independence, 378, 380, 381, 395.
Greeks, 6, 13, 183, 367, 368, 396, 408, 469, 700
Greeley, Horace, 217
Greely (explorer), 363
Greenland, 363, 419, 422, 493
Gregory VII, 3
Grévy, President (France), 305
Grey, Earl, 143, 193
Grey, Sir Edward, 518, 524, 548, 549, 551, 552, 553
Grey-Cambon correspondence, 539
Grieg, 681
Grotius, 15, 503
Guadeloupe, 414
Guam, 356, 439, 492
Guatemala, 450
Guesde, Jules, 309
Guiana, 134
Guild Socialism, 669
Guild Socialists, 669
Guild System, in England, 63, 73
Guinea, 489, 490
Guise (France), 217
Guizot, 173, 189, 190, 197, 244, 678
Gustavus III (Sweden), 57
Gustavus V (Sweden), 364
Gutzkow (*K. F.*), 234, 599

Haase (F. G.), 655
Haeckel, 685
Hague Court (Tribunal), 331, 364, 443, 535
Hague Peace Conferences, 443, 504, 535, 649, 657
Hague, The, 657
Haig, General, 569
Hainisch, Dr. Michael, 614
Haiti, 112, 429, 430, 433, 434, 440, 448, 452, 457, 493
Hakon VII (Norway), 364
Haldane, Lord, 524
Hain, fortress of, 238
Hambach, 191
Hamburg, 72, 610
Hamburg-American Line, 327
Hamilton, Alexander, 27, 34, 35, 36
Hancock, John, 36
Handel, 681
Hango (port of), 617
Hanover, 50, 114, 148, 191, 257
Hapsburg *dominions*, 202
Hapsburgs, 52, 146, 215, 262, 334, 585, 613
Harbin, 339
Hardenberg, 132, 148
Hardie, James Keir, 655
Harding, President, 441, 589
Hardinge, Viceroy, 467
Hargreaves, 161
Harvard University, 42
Havana, 356
Hawaii, 435, 439, 492
Hawthorne, Nathaniel, 217, 279, 681
Hay, John, 477
Haydn, 72
Hay-Pauncefote Treaty, 443
Hebrews, 13
Hedjaz, 470, 568, 582, 638, 644, 650
Hedjaz Railway, 392
Hegel, 234
Heine, 123, 189, 221, 234
Heligoland, 326, 330, 414; Treaty, 511
Helsingfors, 617
Henderson (*E. F.*), 551
Henry, Colonel, 306
Henry, Prince, 359
"Hertzian waves," 687
Herzegovina, 337, 389, 390, 391, 398, 406, 507, 520, 521, 537, 539, 542, 575
Herzen, Alexander, 272
Hesse, 318
Hesse-Cassel, 191, 257
Hesse-Darmstadt, 257
High Court (Australia), 458
Himalayas, 495
Hindenburg line, 567, 569
Hindus, 13, 18, 436, 461, 463, 466, 467, 472, 496, 594, 698
Hobbes' *Leviathan*, 16
Hohenzollerns, 51, 200, 243, 257, 262, 334, 542, 578, 585, 613, 627
Holland, 6, 42, 45, 49, 57, 61, 67, 68, 106, 111, 116, 133, 134, 158; Revolution of 1848 in, 208, 231, 359, 430, 459, 470, 498, 558, 585, 644, 650, 676, 679
Holmes, 681
Holstein, 255, 363
"Holy Alliance," 135, 655
Holy Roman Empire, 49, 50, 52, 60, 61, 122, 133, 231
Holy See, 558
Home Rule, movement for in Ireland, 298
Home Rule Bill (Ireland), 298
Honduras, 134, 440, 451, 452
Hong Kong, 164, 416, 470, 471, 474
Hooker telescope, 688
Hoover, Herbert, 560, 590

Hopes (bankers), 172
Hôtel de Ville, 198, 243
Hottentots, 459
Hötzendorf, 549
House of Commons, 141, 142, 193, 205, 207, 213, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 291, 298, 434, 550, 669, 673
House of Lords (Austria), 335
House of Lords (England), 60, 141, 142, 194, 213; decline of the, 287; 289, 292, 673
House of Representatives (U.S.), 35; (Australia), 458; (Austria), 335; (New Zealand), 459
Howland Islands, 492
Hoyos (J. L.), 552
Hudson River, 39, 163, 429
Hudson's Bay Company, 73, 456
Huguenots, 38, 419, 422, 459
Humanitarianism, 667
Humbert, King, 349, 353
Hume, 72, 80
Hungarians, 52, 147, 215, 263, 279
Hunt, J., 681
Hunter, John, 71
Hus, John, 13
Hussein, King (Hedjaz), 638
Hutton, James, 683
Huxley, 427, 685

Ibrahim (Egypt), 379
Ibsen, 681
Iceland, 363, 422, 493, 694
Illiteracy, 676
Imbros, 635
Immigration (America), 431
Imperialism, of Joseph II, 53; of Napoleon I, 112; in United States, 281; in France under Third Republic, 308; in Italy, 354; in Africa, 361; 413, 414, 415, 425, 426, 496, 531, 661, 678
Imperial University (France), 678
Inclosure Acts (England), 140
Independents (France), 309
Independent Socialists (Germany), 607
India, 15, 18, 38, 44, 45, 107, 176, 308, 401, 403, 414, 420, 423, 436, 465, 466, 469, 470, 471, 472, 569, 587, 605, 677, 682, 694
India Bill of 1919, 467
Indian Ocean, 339, 423, 455, 466, 492, 531
Indians (North America), 18; trade with the, 23
Indo-China, 308, 475
Indus, 495
Industrial Revolution, 3; effects of the, 7; social and political results of the, 17; 39, 64, 73, 75, 116, 123, 155, 156-160, 165, 174; spread of the, 196; 226; in Germany, 323; 336, 341, 357, 413, 416, 417, 424, 438, 475, 482; in Japan, 482; 597, 598, 645, 660, 663
Industrial System (France), 85
Industrial Workers of the World (U.S.), 671
Ingres, 681
Innsbruck, 203
Inquisition, 55, 138, 179, 182, 214
"Institution of the Propagation of the Faith" (R.C.C.), 420
Intellectual Revolt, 9
Inter-Allied Council on War Purchases and Finance, 654
Inter-Allied Supreme War Council, 577, 578, 654
Inter-Church World Movement, 594, 700, 703
International agencies, 653
International Association of Laborers, 222
International Association of the Congo, 488
International Bureau of American Republics, 441
International Court of Justice, 359
International Federation of Trade Unions, 593, 665
International finance, 662
International Institute of Agriculture, 653
Internationalism, appearance of, 7; 678, 693
International Labor Office, 579, 653
International Labor Organization, 579, 592
International Law, 15, 131, 132, 134, 135, 142, 520, 533, 553, 557, 563, 570, 578, 652, 657, 658
International Postal Union, 362, 444
International Prize Court, 657
International Red Cross Society, 362, 594
International Research Council, 653
International Suez Canal Commission, 653
International Workingmen's Association, 655
Interparliamentary Union (Brussels), 657
Ionian Islands, 184
Iraq, Kingdom of, 470, 637, 650
Ireland, 4, 32, 66, 140, 206, 208, 279, 280, 281, 286, 296, 576, 587, 676, 694, 699
Irish Catholics, 296
Irish Free State, 299, 464
Irish Land League of 1875, 298
Irish Parliament, 140, 297, 298
Irish Question, 296, 297
Irkutsk, 470
Irredentism, 354, 355
Irredentists, 354
Irving, Washington, 681
Isabella, Queen, 243
Islam, 699
Ismail I (Egypt), 465
Istria, 114
Isvolski, Alexander, 520, 521, 525-527, 537, 538, 541, 545-547, 550
Italia Irredenta, 283, 337, 354, 507, 531, 558, 576, 588
Italian Campaign (of Napoleon), 107
Italo-Turkish War, 499

Italy, conditions in (1789), 54; education in, 354; emigration from, 352, 355; financial problems of, 351; government of, 349; illiteracy in, 351, 676; imperialism in, 354; industrial conditions in, 353; Irredentism in, 354; labor in, 353; national resources of, 352; nationalism in, 234; nobility in (1789), 61; progress toward democracy in, 350; Revolution of 1830 in, 192; Revolution of 1848 in, 205; religious freedom in, 68; sectionalism in, 350; unification of, 246–250
Ivory Coast, 490

Jackson, Andrew, 194, 445
Jacobin Clubs, 102, 103
Jacobins, 96, 99, 100–103, 108, 111, 112
Jacoby, Dr., 202
Jahn (F. L.), 148
Jamaica Island, 430, 434, 452, 646
James II (England), 18
"Jameson Raid," 460, 514
Janina, 407
Japan, 4, 9, 18, 45, 176, 285, 344, 414, 420, 425, 426, 435, 436, 444, 469, 471, 472, 474, 480, 494, 495, 498, 512, 557, 569, 576, 662, 682
Japanese, 19, 278, 496
Jassy, University of, 399
Jaurès, Jean, 306, 309, 311, 549, 671
Java, 359, 419
Jay, John, 36
Jefferson, Thomas, 3, 30, 37, 41, 43, 83, 96
Jellachich, Baron, 204
Jena, battle of, 115; 236
Jenner, 71
"Jenny," 161
Jerusalem, 568
Jesuits, 51, 52, 55, 138, 234, 322, 419, 480; Order of the, 130
Jewish Welfare Board, 594
Jews, 41, 53, 56, 66, 67, 79, 80, 98, 141, 220, 267, 296, 306, 343, 345, 366, 563, 594, 698
Jihad ("Holy War"), 558
Joffre, General, 565
Johannesburg, 460
John Brown, 275
Johnson, Samuel, 72
"Joint Council" (Ireland), 299
Joseph II (Austria), 52, 53, 54, 67
Josephine, Empress, 117
Joule (J. P.), 687
Jourdan, General, 106
Judaism, 14
Jugo-Slavia, 294, 581, 613, 626, 631, 633, 647, 650
Jugo-Slav movement in Serbia, 539
Jugo-Slavs, 280, 367, 369, 388, 615, 630
"June Days" (France), 198
"Junkers," 148, 200, 253, 320, 321, 611
Justinian, 113
Jutland, battle of, 571

Kaffirs, 285, 424
Kagoshima, 481
Kaiser Wilhelm Canal, 329
Kalahari Desert, 487
Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854, 275
Kant, Immanuel, 70, 72, 503, 655
Kara George Petrovich, 375, 376
Karolyi, Count, 615
Kars, fortress of, 385, 391, 637
Kauffmann, Angelica, 70
Kaulbach, 681
Kay, 161
Keats, 233, 681
Kelly, 161
Kelvin, Lord, 687
Kemalists, 636, 637
Kerensky, 567, 574, 600, 601, 602
Kermadec Island, 492
Khartoum (Africa), 312
Kiao-chau, 475, 484, 513, 531, 569, 570, 589
Kiel, 255, 257, 608; Canal, 578
Kiev, 344, 347, 623, 628
Kilimanjaro, 487
Kingsley, Charles, 218, 681
Kipling, 462
Kirghiz, 423
Kirk Kilisse, 406
Kitchener, General, 312, 461
Knights of Columbus, 594
Koch, Dr., 688, 689, 690
"Kodok," 465
Kolchak, 604
Kollar, 625
Konia, 403
Königgrätz, battle of, 256
Korais, 378
Koran, 66
Korea, 344, 473, 475, 483, 484, 495, 512, 587
Körner, 233
Kornilov, 600
Kosciusko, 56
Kossuth (F. L.), 203, 204
Kossuth, Francis, 337
Kotzebue, 150
Koweit, Sheik of, 332
Kropotkin, 223
Kruger, Paul, 359, 461
Kruger telegram, 514
Krupps, 316
Krylenko, 602
Kuban River, 373
Kublai-Khan, Emperor, 419
Kuchuk-Kainarji, Treaty of, 373, 378, 381

lux Klan, 278
Kulturkampf, 322
Kumanovo, battle of, 406
Kurdistan, 405, 582, 636, 637
Kurds, 366, 370, 393
Kurile Islands, 492
Kwang-chow-wan (province of), 475

Labor Party (England), 291, 292, 669, 692
Laborites (England), 291
Labor Unionism (England), 292; 664
Labrador, 430
Lafayette, 71, 80, 91–96, 120, 186, 187, 192
La Fenice Theater (Venice), 72
La Harpe, 145
Laibach, congress of, 136, 184
Lamarck, 684
Lamartine, 123, 234, 244
Lamb, Charles, 681
Lambeth Conference (1920), 645, 700
Lancashire, 168
Land Act of 1920 (Latvia), 620
Land Acts of 1881, 1891, and 1896 (Ireland), 298
Landtag (Prussia), 253, 611
Langer, W. L., 536
Lansing, Robert, 577
Lansing-Ishi agreement, 444
La Scala Theater (Milan), 72
Lassalle, Ferdinand, 220, 691
Lateran, 349
Latgallia, 620
Latin America, 4, 6, 29; extent of in 1789, 43, 75, 176, 179, 212, 214, 232, 277, 279, 280, 418, 425, 432, 433, 435, 440, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 472, 493, 660, 676, 698
Latin League, 192
Latvia, 585, 619, 620, 650
Latvian Republic, 620
Lauenburg, Duchy of, 255
Lausanne Conference, 605, 637
Lausanne, Treaty of, 406, 634, 635, 637
Lavigerie, Cardinal, 489
Lavoisier, 71, 686
Law, Bonar, 551
Law of Nations, 7
Lawrence (Sir Thomas), 70
League of Nations, 7, 262, 464, 486, 574, 578, 580, 581, 587–590, 614, 632, 633, 637, 646, 649, 652–654, 658, 663
"League of Patriots" (France), 244
"League of the Just" (France), 220, 221
League to Enforce Peace (U.S.), 658
"Leagues of True Russians," 342
Lebanon, Mount, 387
Leclerc, 112
Le Creusot (France), 316
Lee, Arthur, 43
Leeds, 141
Leeward Island, 430
Legion of Honor (France), 111, 305, 317
Legislative Assembly (France), 99, 101, 104; (India), 467
Leibnitz, 71
Leipsic-Dresden Railway, 175
Leipzig, 172; battle of, 118; 220
Lemberg, 628
Lenbach, 681
Lenine, Nicolai, 567, 601, 603, 606, 682
Lens, 567
Leo XIII, 323, 665, 701, 702
Leopardi, 234
Leopold I (Belgium), 190
Leopold, Prince (Tuscany), 54
Leopold II (Austria), 100
Leopold II (Belgium), 360, 361, 488, 489
Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, 360
Leopold (Spain), 243, 258, 355
Leroy-Beaulieu, 426
Lessing, 72, 234, 503
Lettre de cachet (France), 78
Letts, 281, 343, 575, 615, 619, 620, 627
Levant, 15, 45, 84
Leviathan, 16
Lewis and Clark Expedition, 495
"Lex Kallio" (Finland), 617
Lexington, battle of, 28
Liao-tung peninsula, 45, 475, 483, 484
Libby, Professor, 3
Liberal Action Party (France), 315
Liberalism, 72; persistence of, 179; failure of in Germany, 202; social liberalism, 216; autocracy versus, 530
Liberal Monarchists (France), 187, 301
Liberals (England), 290, 291, 294, 298; (France), 138; (Spain), 138
Liberia, 423, 488, 490, 494, 568, 644
Liberty Party (U.S.), 275
Liebknecht, Karl, 607, 656
Liége, 565
Lille, 171
Lincoln, Abraham, 275, 276, 277, 285, 695
Lindsey, Theophilus, 700
Linnæus, 71
Lisbon, 433
Lister, 667, 690
Liszt, 681
Literature, 72, 123, 680–681
Lithuania, 271, 575, 578, 580, 585, 604, 619, 621–623, 650
Lithuanians, 56, 281, 344, 615, 619, 620, 621 627
Little Entente, 624, 626
Little Russians, 627

Liu-Kiu Luchu Islands, 492
Liverpool, 164, 168, 416
Livingstone, David, 420, 487, 488
Livonia, 343, 604, 615, 618, 619
Li Yuan Hung, 479
Lloyd George, 287, 289, 291, 293, 299, 331, 523, 573, 574, 577, 590, 591
Lloyd's Marine Insurance Company, 159
Local government (France), 77
Locke, John, 15, 27, 71, 90
Lombardo-Venetia, 204, 205, 248
Lombardy, 54, 248, 249, 262
London, 62, 72, 159, 656, 695; Congress of, 407; Treaty of (1913), 407; University of, 123
Longfellow, 279, 681
Long Island, 694
Loreburn, Lord, 551
Lorraine, 82, 133, 260, 512
Loubet, President, 306, 312
Louis XIV, 3, 51, 76, 87, 102, 119
Louis XV, 76, 87, 89
Louis XVI, 42, 76–79, 85, 87, 90–95, 98, 100, 102, 119, 137, 146, 171, 186, 231, 268
Louis XVIII, 119, 123, 131, 132, 137, 138, 151, 182, 185, 187, 217
"Louis Capet," 102
Louisiana, 43, 112, 423, 429; Purchase, 274
Louis Napoleon, 116, 192, 199, 238, 239, 240
Louis Philippe, 173, 187; character of, 188; 189, 190, 192; opposition to, 196, 197, 219, 225, 238, 360
Louisville (Ky.), 38
Louvain, University of, 565
Lowe, Robert, 294
Lowell, 275
Loyalists (America), 27, 32, 38; (Canada), 456
Loyalty Island, 204
Loyola, 13
Lübeck, 610
Lucca (duchy of), 204
Luckhow, 466
Ludendorff, 568, 575
Lule Burgas, battle of, 406
Lundy, 275
Lunéville, Treaty of, 110, 111
Lusitania (S.S.), 560, 571
Luther, 3, 150, 155
Lutheran Church, 69, 699
Lutherans, 41, 69, 701
Lutzen, battle of, 118
Luxemburg, 133, 242, 556, 557, 563, 565, 575, 644
Luzon, 439
Lvov, Prince, 599, 600
Lybia, 355, 490, 491
Lyell, Sir Charles, 684
Lyons, 62, 84, 104, 172, 188, 420
MacAdam, 163
Macao (China), 470, 473
Macaulay, 233, 681
MacDowell, 681
Macedonia, 367, 368, 369, 391, 396, 397, 406, 407, 498, 568, 581, 629
Machado, President (Portugal), 358
Machiavelli, 15
Madagascar, 308, 423, 490, 492, 516
Madeira, 493
Madison, James, 34, 35, 36
Madras, 471
Madrid, 60, 192, 433; Convention of 1880, 330; Conference of 1880, 517
Mafia (Sicily), 351
Magellan, 15
Magenta, battle of, 248
Magna Carta, 207, 693
Magyars, 146, 203, 204, 265, 396, 337, 559, 626
Mahmoud II (Turkey), 374, 379, 381, 382, 386
Maintmorte, 83
Main River, 257
Maine (S.S.), 356
Majority Socialists (Germany), 607
Malay Peninsula, 417; race, 439; states, 470, 471
Malmedy, 578
Malta, 111, 134, 354, 414, 464
Malthus, 413, 691
Manchester (England), 62, 116, 141, 158, 163, 164, 168, 224
Manchuria, 339, 344, 473, 475, 476, 484
Manchus, 473, 478
Mandarin dialect, 480
Manet, 681
Manihiki Island, 492
Manila, 356
Manitoba, 457
Mann, Horace, 226
Mannerheim, General, 617
Mannesmann Brothers, 534
Mannheim, 150
Mansfield, Lord, 26, 486
Mansfield, Miss Belle, 672
Manuel II (Portugal), 358
Manzoni, 234
Maori, 459
Marat, 101, 189
Marburg, 158
Marchand, Captain, 312
March Revolution (Russia, 1917), 599
Marconi, 695
Marco Polo, 419, 469, 473
Maria Christina, 356
Maria Louisa, 117, 192
Maria Theresa, 51, 52
Marie Antoinette, 90, 100, 171
Maritza River, 635

Mark, province of, 66
Mark Twain, 681
Marmora, Sea of, 390
Marne, battle of the, 565, 569
Marne River, 565
Maronites, 387
Marquesas Islands, 423
Marseillaise, 197
Marseilles, 84, 104
Marshall, John, 34
Martin, Luther, 35, 36
Martinique, 414
Marx, Karl, 8, 220–222, 301, 309, 325, 691
Marxian Social Democrats (France), 309
Marxian Socialism, 8, 222, 252
Marxian Socialists, 669, 702
Maryland, 26, 34, 36, 225
Masaryk, 626
Mason (G.), 277, 285
Mason-Dixon Line, 274
Massachusetts, 26, 28, 29, 36, 225, 432; Constitution of, 212
Masurian Lakes, 623
Maude, General, 568
Mauritania, 490
Mauritius Island, 134
Max, Prince (Baden), 608
Maximilian (Mexico), 241
Maximilian, Prince, 575
Maxse, 551
Mayer (J. T.), 687
May Laws of 1873–75 (Russia), 322
Mazzini, 192, 205, 234, 235, 236, 246, 247, 249, 354, 655
MacDonald, Ramsay, 289
McKinley, William, 545
Mediterranean Agreement (First), 509; (Second), 510
Mediterranean Sea, 84, 312
Mehemet Ali, 373, 374, 379, 380, 381, 382, 383, 464
Meikle, Andrew, 157
Mekong Valley, 475
Memel, 578, 621
Mendel, 685, 701
Mendelssohn, Moses, 67, 681
Mennonites, 41
Mensheviki, 601
Menshikov, Prince, 384
Mercantilism, 16, 32, 413, 690, 691
Mesopotamia, 366, 403, 404, 542, 582, 629, 636, 638
Mesta River, 409
Methodism, 700
Methodist (Episcopal) Church, 40
Methodists (U.S.), 34, 141
Metric Union, 653
Metschnikoff, 689
Metternich, 130, 131, 135–140, 143, 147–151, 179, 180, 184, 187, 189, 190, 192, 200, 204, 215, 219, 233, 235, 236, 252, 324, 529
"Metternich System," 131, 138, 150, 151
Metz, 259
Mexican Revolution, 441
Mexico, 181, 241, 277, 417, 419, 429, 431, 436, 440, 441, 448–453, 662, 695, 699
Meyer, Eduard, 644
"Mezentian Union," 312
Middle class, in Europe (1789), 61–62; in France, 82
Midhat Pasha, 392
Midia, 408
Midway Island, 439
Migrations of Peoples, 494,
Milan, 183, 196, 205, 353; Milan Decree, 116
Militarism, 532
Military Revolutionary Committee (Russia), 602
Mill, J. S., 236, 413, 645, 691
Millais, 681
Millerand, 309, 315
Millet, 681
Milosh, Obrenovich, 376, 398
Milyukov, Professor, 599
Mindanao, 439
Miners' Federation (England), 292
Mines Act of 1842 (England), 223
Mines Code (England), 292
Minorca, 55
Mirabeau, 3
"Mirs" (Russia), 270, 271, 340, 346, 347, 598
Missions, 419, 420, 421; in China, 474; Christian, 702
Mississippi River, 23, 43, 163, 448
Mississippi (state of), 434
Missouri Compromise, 274, 275
Modena, 54, 204, 205, 248; Duke of, 192
Mohammed VI, 637
Mohammedanism, 14, 699
Mohammedans, 11, 66, 330, 370, 372, 387, 466, 467, 473, 558, 594, 698, 699
Moldavia, 366, 368, 373, 376, 377, 385, 387
Moluccas, the, 419
Mommsen, 234
Monaco, 644
Monarchists (France), 99, 302, 305–309, 314
Monastir, 406, 408
Mongolia, 473
Mongolians, 436, 480
Mongols, 54
Moniteur (France), 186
Monongahela River, 39
Monroe, 181
Monroe Doctrine, 137, 143, 181, 182, 241, 440, 441–443, 453, 519, 559, 573, 580, 588

Montenegro, 280, 341, 366, 375, 390, 406, 409, 557, 566, 629, 650
Montesquieu, 15, 71, 87, 503
Montevideo, 450
Montgelas (Max), 536
Montreal, 430
Moravia, 203, 334, 520, 525, 615, 626
Moravians, 41, 419
More, Sir Thomas, 216
Morea, 379
Moreau, General, 106, 110
Morel, 551
Moresnet (province of), 578
Morgenthau, Henry, 544
Morhardt (M.), 536, 553
Morley, Lord, 212
Mormonism, 700
Mormons, 226
Morocco, 308, 312, 313; crises (Germany), 330; 356, 402, 417, 486, 490, 504, 516; crises, 517; 523
Morse, 164, 695
Moscow, 60, 118, 339, 344, 347, 607, 628
Motley (J. L.), 279
Mountain, the (Jacobins), 101
Mount Vernon, 34, 694
Mount Wilson Observatory, 688
Mozambique, 489
Mozart, 72
"Mule," 161
Municipal Reform Act of 1835, 213
Munitions Council, 654
Murad V (Turkey), 392
Mürzsteg Program, 397
Muscovites, 375
Music, 681
Mussolini, 586
Mustapha Pasha, 375
Mustapha Kemal Pasha, 636, 637

Nanking, 478
Nansen, 495, 496
Naples, 155; revolution in, 183; 249
Naples, Bourbon house of, 115, 134
Napoleon, 4, 6, 59, 67, 87, 98, 102, 106–124, 131, 132, 147, 171, 232, 236, 241, 246, 250, 316, 529, 678, 693
Napoleon III, 220, 234, 239–244, 248, 254–258, 268, 277, 301, 442
Napoleon, Prince, 248
Napoleonic Empire, 117
Napoleonic Wars, 9, 123, 129, 139, 171, 232
"Napoleonism," 118
Narragansett Bay, 26
Narutowicz, Gabriel, 624
Nassau (province of), 257
Natal, 424, 460, 472
National Assembly (Austria), 581; (Costa Rica), 451; (France), 94, 171, 231, 238, 301, 302, 313, 314; (Germany), 578, 608, 609
National Consolidated Trade Union (England), 206
National Constituent Assembly (France), 94
National Convention (France), 96, 101
National Council (Czecho-Slovakia), 626; (Switzerland), 208
National Council of Workingmen's Delegates (Russia), 345
National Economic Council (Germany), 613
National Guard (Paris), 301; (United States), 567
Nationalists (France), 306, 311; (Ireland), 291
Nationalism, spread of, 6; results of, 7; in Greece, 384; origins of, 231; in Italy, 234; democracy and, 235; in United States, 281; in Greece, 378; in Serbia, 398; in Rumania, 400, 420, 426; in South Africa, 463, 504, 531; in Bohemia, 625
National Liberals (Germany), 320, 321
National Pact (Turkey), 636, 637
National Radicals (France), 315
Nationalrat (Austria), 614
National state, origin of, 231
National Union (Italy), 247
National Union of Railwaymen (England), 292
National Woman's Suffrage Association (U.S.), 646
National Workshops (France), 198, 219
Naval Acts of 1898 and 1900 (Germany), 330
Navarino, bay of, 379
Navy League (Germany), 331
Near East, 45; problem of the, 55; 354, 368, 369; causes of international rivalry in, 380–381; 383, 389, 395, 397, 399–403, 469, 510, 512, 519, 520, 568
Near East Relief, 635
Near Eastern Question, 185, 261, 508, 509
Necker, 85; reforms of, 91; 92, 93, 94
Nelson, Admiral, 107, 114
Neptune (planet), 687
Nesselrode, 131
Netherlands, 6, 15, 52, 83, 176, 358; government of the, 359
Neuilly, Treaty of, 581, 633
New Amsterdam, 414
New Brunswick, 456
New Caledonia, 241, 423, 492
Newcomen (T.), 162
"New Doomsday Book," 158
New England, 27, 38, 41, 176
Newfoundland, 312, 429, 430, 455, 456, 457, 493, 516, 694
New Guinea, 325, 464, 492, 508
New Hampshire, 33, 34, 37

New Harmony (Indiana), 218
New Hebrides (Islands), 492, 653
New Jersey, 36, 212
New Lanark (Scotland), 217
Newman, Cardinal, 701
New Mecklenburg, 492
New Mexico, 429
New Orleans, 163
New Pan-Americanism, 441
New South Wales, 457, 458
Newton, Sir Isaac, 71
New World, contributory factors in, 21; an extension of the Old World, 42
New York (City), 38, 274, 278, 416, 429, 433, 440, 448, 452, 680, 682, 695
New York (State), 26, 37, 41, 164, 225, 249, 432
New York Sun, 226
New Zealand, 285, 424, 455, 457, 458, 459, 463, 464, 492, 645, 646, 660, 676
Ngami, Lake, 487
Niagara Falls, 695
Nicaragua, 440, 451
Nice, 106, 242, 248, 249, 354
Nicholas I (Russia), 146, 151, 204, 267; foreign policy of, 268; 340, 384, 385
Nicholas II (Russia), 312, 342, 344, 345, 597, 599, 616; Manifesto of, 345
Nicholas, Grand Duke (Russia), 546, 623
Nicolson, Sir Arthur, 552
Nietzsche, 533
Niger, 490
Niger River, 45, 486
Nile River, 465, 485
Noailles, Vicomte de, 95
Nobel, Alfred, 656
Nobility, in Europe (1789), 59; in England (1789), 60; in France (1789), 60
Nobles' Congress (Russia), 598
Non-conformists, 295
Norfolk (England), 63
Normandy, 82
North, Lord, 26, 50
North Africa, 354, 509
North America, 9, 13, 15, 21, 37, 43, 429
North Borneo, 464, 492
North Carolina, 26, 28, 37; University of, 42
North German Confederation, 257, 260, 318
North German Lloyd, 327
North German Union, 242
North Pole, 495
North Sea, 329, 330, 527, 565, 571
Norway, 6, 49, 57, 61, 77, 134, 280, 362, 363, 364, 558, 615, 644, 646, 650, 676
Norwich (England), 63
Notre Dame (cathedral of), 113, 239
Nova Scotia, 456
Novibazar, 391, 409, 520
Nuremburg-Furth Railway (Germany), 175
Nyanza, Albert, 488
Nyassa, Lake, 487
Nyassaland, 490
Nystad, Peace of, 618, 619

Oberlin College, 226, 672
Oberlin Theological Seminary, 672
Obok, 488
Obregon, General, 451
Obrenovich, Prince Michael, 388, 398
Oceania, 43, 45, 308, 416, 418, 492
O'Connell, 297
"Octobrists" (Russia), 345, 346
Odessa, 378, 388, 604
Oersted (H. C.), 686
Ohio River, 24, 26, 33, 163
"Old Catholics" (Germany), 322
"Old Tories" (England), 140, 193
Ollivier (O. E.), 243
Olney, 443, 453
Omaha, 438
Omsk, 470
Opium War of 1839–40, 285, 474
Orange, House of, 131, 133, 208
Orange Free State, 460, 461
Orange River, 424, 460, 487, 488
Ordinance of 1787 (U.S.), 37
Ordinance of Nullification (South Carolina), 274
Ordinance of the North-west Territory (U.S.), 680
Oregon, 278, 423
Origin of Species, The (Darwin), 684
Orkney Islands, 493
Orlando, 577
Orleanists (France), 314
Otto, King (Greece), 185, 395; Otto, Prince (Bavaria), 379
Ottoman Empire, 55, 66, 370, 380, 381, 383, 385, 391, 392, 404, 405, 566, 581, 636, 637
Ottoman Porte, 9
Ottoman Turks, 366, 369
Outer Mongolia, 475
Overbeck (J. F.), 681
Overseas Expansion, motives for, 17; reaction of on West, 19
Owen, Robert, 216, 217, 218, 223, 292, 294, 691
"Owenism," 218
Oxford University, 141, 295, 296, 645

Paderewski, 623
Page, Walter Hines, 559
Paine, Thomas, 28, 34, 43, 530
Palacky, 625
Palatinate, 201
Palestine, 366, 470, 568, 582, 629, 638
Palmerston, Lord, 277, 386

Palmyra, 492
Panama, province of, 440; Canal, 416, 440, 443, 452, 663; Canal Zone, 436, 440, 453; Company (France), 305; Republic, 440, 450, 644; "Panama Scandal" (France), 305
Pan-American Congress, 657
Pan-Americanism, 453
Pan-American relations, 440
Pan-American Union, 453; Bureau of the, 441
Pan-Aryan Association, 472
Pangalos, General, 635
Pan-Germanism, 7, 531
Pan-Germanists, 329
Pan-German League, 331
Pan-Hellenism, 7
Pan-Islamism, 392, 531
Pan-Italians, 354
Pankhurst, Mrs. Emmeline, 645
Pan-Slavism, 7, 341, 342, 347, 531, 598, 616
Pan-Slavs, 506
Papacy, 14, 130, 349, 594, 701
Papal States, 49, 54, 68, 116, 134, 192, 238, 248, 249, 349
Papin, Denis, 158
Paraguay, 419, 431, 448, 450
Parents' Advisory Councils (Germany), 679
Paris, 59, 62, 67, 72, 83, 84, 96, 111, 112, 119; siege of, 259; 301, 302; Congress of, 247, 385; 386, 433, 452, 565, 682, 695
Paris Commune, 94, 101, 104, 280, 301, 309
Paris Revolt, 196
Parisians, 77, 96, 103
Paris Peace Conference, 299, 464, 479, 484, 577, 580, 587, 592, 614, 630
Paris-Rouen Railway, 172
Paris, Treaty of, 131, 135, 260, 385, 387, 400, 504
Park, Mungo, 45, 486
Parker (F.), 275
Parkman (T.), 279
Parlement, 78
Parliament (England), 18, 22–28, 49, 141, 286, 287, 289, 292; (France), 314
Parliament of Labor (England), 224
"Parliament of Man," 658
Parliamentary System, growth of, 5
Parma, 54, 192, 204, 205, 248
Parnell (T.), 298
Party of Union and Progress (Turkey), 404
Pashitch, Premier, 540, 631
Passarowitz, Treaty of, 373
Pasteur, Louis, 316, 667, 688, 690, 693, 701
Pasvan Oglu, 373
Patmos, Island of, 406
Patrick Henry, 35, 36
Patterson, 35
Paul, 161
Pavia, University of, 235
Pawtucket, 39
Peace Movement, 656
Peary, Robert E., 363, 495, 496
Peasants, in Europe (1789), 64; in France, 82; in Ireland, 298
"Peasants' Union" (Russia), 346
Pedro I (Brazil), 182
Peel (R.), 223
Pekin, 419, 473, 474, 475; University of, 477
Pelew Islands, 356, 492
Penn, William, 699
Pennsylvania, 36, 41, 225, 439, 695; University of, 42
People's Act of 1918, 287
"People's Charter" (England), 207
"People's Parliament" (England), 207
Permanent Court of Arbitration, 504, 657
Permanent Court of International Justice, 580, 617, 657
Permanent International Bureau of Peace, 656
Permanent Sugar Commission, 653
Perry, Commodore, 481
Pershing, General, 568
Persia, 332, 340, 403, 417, 419, 423, 469, 494, 519, 595, 605, 607, 644
Persian Gulf, 330, 332, 403, 519
Persians, 366
Peru, 419, 431, 436, 448, 450, 498
Pescadores, 483
Pestalozzi, 70
Peter I (the Great), 54, 55, 268, 339, 398, 604, 618
Peter II, 398
Peter III, 54
"Peterloo Massacre," 193
Petition of Right of 1628 (England), 18
Petrograd, 536, 565, 599, 600, 602
Petrovich families (Serbia), 398
Pfizer, 233
Phanariotes, 377
Philadelphia, 34, 38, 39, 41, 42, 163, 694
Philippines, 45, 356, 414, 435, 439, 444, 470, 475, 477, 492, 587, 677
Phillips, Wendell, 275
Phillips Academy (Andover), 41; (Exeter), 41
Phoenix, 492
Physics, recent progress in, 687
Physiocrats, 72, 89, 413, 691
Piave River, 568
Picardy, 82
Picquart, Colonel, 306
Piedmont, 54, 106, 134, 136, 139; Revolution in, 183; 205, 246–249, 268, 349, 504
Pilgrims, 694
Pillnitz, Declaration of, 100
Pilsudski, General, 623
Pinckney, Charles, 35
Pitt, 26, 27, 42, 50, 110, 114

Pitt (the younger), 381, 503
Pittsburgh, 39
Pius VII, 115, 130
Pius IX, 205, 246, 249, 259, 322, 349, 685, 701
Pius X, 307, 701
Place de la Concorde, 197, 311
Place, Francis, 207
Plain, the, 101
Plate River, 161
Plehve, 342, 343, 344, 616
Plombières, 248
Pobiedonostsev, 340, 343, 345
Poe, 279, 681
Poincaré, Raymond, 244, 315, 526, 527, 537, 538, 541–551, 554, 573
Poitevin, 81
Poland, 6, 42, 49, 51, 52, 55, partition of, 56; 59, 66, 68, 118, 133, 134; Revolution of 1830 in, 191; 200; Revolution of 1848 in, 208, 215, 233; nationalism in, 235; 271, 343, 414, 575–581, 604, 622–625, 646, 647, 699
Poles, 52, 56, 238, 262, 280, 281, 344, 622, 673
Polish Republic, 623
Polish Revolt (1863), 271
Political Parties, origin of, 6; in England, 790; in France, 99, 315; in Germany, 321
Pombal, Minister (Portugal), 182
Pomerania, 133, 134
Pontus Conference, 504
Poor Law of 1834 (England), 206
Po River, 192
Port Arthur, 339, 344, 471, 475, 483, 484, 513, 531
Porte, The, 268, 330
Port Jackson (Australia), 45
Porto Rico, 356, 414, 429, 430, 439, 440, 452, 453, 493
Portugal, 6, 15, 43, 44, 49, 68, 116, 139; Revolution of 1820 in, 182, 214, 231; nationalism in, 295, 368; 414, 429, 430, 470, 498, 557, 567, 676
Portuguese, 44, 45, 116
Portuguese East Africa, 491
Portuguese Republic, establishment of the, 358
Portuguese Revolution of 1820, 182
Posen, 134, 281, 622
Potomac River, 34, 39
Potsdam, 403; Agreement, 522; Conference, 542; 544
Poverty, 665–666
Pradier (James), 70
Prague, 204, 625; Treaty of, 256
Presbyterian Church (Scotland), 296; 699
Presbyterians, 34, 69, 141
Prescott, 279
Pressburg, Treaty of, 114
Pretoria, 461
Priestly, 71
Prince Edward Island, 456, 457
Prince Henry (Portugal), 15
Prince Islands, 493
Princeton University, 42
Progressives (France), 315; (Germany), 321
Proletariat, 7, 25, 168, 188, 218
Protectionism, 663
Protectorate, 18
Protestant Episcopal Church (U.S.), 40
Protestant Revolt, 14, 699, 700
Protestants, 11, 53, 67; in France, 68, 69; 79, 80, 98, 117, 118, 148, 296; number of, 698, 701
Proudhon, 222, 223, 301
Provence, count of, 99
Provisional Council of State (Poland), 623
Provisional Government (Russia), 599, 600, 601, 618
Prussia, 6, 17, 42, 49; 50; Kingdom of, 51; 56, 59, 64, 115, 117, 133; under Frederick William III, 148, 173; Constitution of 1850, 200; 318, 611, 678
Pruth River, 366
Pskov (Russia), 599
Psychiatry, 690
Pufendorf, 15
Puritan Commonwealth (England), 18
Puritanism, 18
Puritans, 419
Pushkin, 273
Pu-yi, Emperor, 478
Pyrennes, 119

Quadruple Alliance, 135, 136, 143, 149, 193, 503, 505
Quakers, 9, 41, 69, 141, 419, 434, 486, 699
Quartering Act (England), 24
Quebec, 26, 419, 430
Quebec Act of 1774, 24
Queen's College (England), 672
Queensland, 458, 464
Queen Victoria, 169, 277, 326, 463, 466, 651
Quesnay, 89

Rada (the Ukraine), 628
Raditch, 631
Raeburn (Sir Henry), 70
Railroads, 163; in France, 171, 318; in Germany, 175
Rangoon, 466
Rapallo, Treaty of, 631
Rebellion of 1837 (Canada), 456
"Red Guards" (Russia), 602, 604
Redmond, John, 298
Red Sea, 488, 638
"Red Sunday," 345
"Red Terror" (Russia), 604
Reformation, 11, 14, 15, 21, 70, 701
Reform Bill of 1884 (England), 286

Reform Bill of 1887 (England), 286
Reform Party (China), 477, 478
Reichsrat (Austria), 264, 335; (Germany), 609
Reichstadt, duke of, 192
Reichstag (Germany), 257, 318, 319, 321, 327, 329, 524, 609, 612
Reign of Terror (France), 102, 104, 105, 198
Reinsurance Treaty, 509, 511
Reis, Philip, 164
Relander, L. K., 617
Religion, 10–11, 14, 40–41; *in Europe (1789)*, 66, 67, 68–69; in France, 79–80, 123, 307, in England, 296; in Spain, 357; problems of contemporary, 703; science and, 701
Remiemont, abbess, of, 79
Renaissance, 14, 15, 70
Renan, Ernest, 685, 699
Renouvin, Pierre, 536
Reparations Commission, 621, 633
Representatives on Mission (France), 103
Republican Entente (France), 315
Republicanism (France), 303–304, 317
Republican Party (U.S.), 275, 445
Republicans (France), 187, 189, 190, 196, 301, 305, 311; (Spain), 355
Reunion Island, 490, 492
Reuter, Fritz, 233
Reventlow, 57
Revolution of 1688, 18
Revolution of 1830, 173, 185, 187, 188, 190, 192, 194, 233
Revolution of 1848, 8, 131, 135, 179, 190, 196, 201, 202, 204, 207, 211, 215, 221, 232, 362, 530
Revolution of 1868 (Japan), 481
Revolution of 1905 (Russia), 347, 348, 598, 601
Revolution of 1917 (Russia), 669
Revolution of 1918, 201, 252, 256, 260, 319, 498, 613
Revolutionary Tribunal (France), 102, 103; (*Russia*), 604
Reynolds, Sir Joshua, 70
Rheims, cathedral of, 565
Rhenish Palatinate, 242
Rhigas, C., 378
Rhine River, 102, 110, 118, 119, 148
Rhode Island, 28, 29, 34, 36, 37, 432
Rhodes, Cecil, 460, 533
Rhodes, Island of, 355, 406, 582
Rhodesia, 461, 490, 646
Ricardo, 413, 691
Ricasoli, 250
Richelieu, 3
Rif, the, 490
Riga, 345, 566, 601; Peace of, 620
Rigby, Dr., 83
"*Rights of Man, The*" (*Germany*), 220
Riigikogou (Esthonia), 619
Riksdag (Sweden), 57, 215, 363
Rio de Janeiro, 419, 433, 682
Rio de Oro, 490
Roads, 163
Roberts, Lord, 461
Robespierre, 100, 101, 104, 105, 189
Rochambeau, 71
Rochefort, harbor of, 120
Rockefeller, John D., 441, 666
Rocky Mountains, 495
Rodbertus, 220, 691
Rodin, 681
Roland, Madame, 104
Roman Catholic Church, 11; clergy of, 67; 68, 80, 88, 111, 123, 137, 140, 214, 235, 247, 271, 364, 356, 357, 573, 700, 701
Roman Catholics, 11; in Canada, 24; 32, 34, 40, 53, 67, 69, 79, 98, 141, 148, 224, 267, 296, 308; *number of*, 698; 701
Roman Curia, 701
Romanoff, House of, 268
Romanovs, 334, 585, 599
Romans, 13, 14, 155, 469
Romanticism, 129
Rome, 14, 59, 67, 70, 117, 164, 250, 433, 472, 682
Romney, George, 70
Röntgen, 686
Roosevelt, 426, 436, 440, 442, 443, 445, 453, 495, 537, 545, 646
Rossini, 681
Rothschild, Nathan, 159
Rouen, 84
Rousseau, 70, 71, 72, 83, 85, 88, 90, 105, 113, 231, 233, 234, 503, 529, 646, 654, 681
Rouvier (M.), 517
Royal Agricultural Society (England), 157
Royal Exchange and Bank of England (London), 70
Royalists (France), 112, 138
Ruand, 361
Rubenstein, 681
Ruhr Basin, 588, 611
Rumania, 185, 268, 279, 390, 399, 400, 409, 498, 527, 558, 575, 581, 626, 629, 632, 676
Rumanians, 146, 204, 334, 367, 387, 400
Rumelia, 337, 391, 397, 507
Rumsey, James, 39
Ruskin, 681
Russell, Lord John, 193
Russia (Russian Empire), abolition of serfdom in, 269; absolutism in, 340; condition of (1789), 54; illiteracy in, 676; minority peoples in, 343; nobility in, 61; movement eastward of, 339; *oil in*, 695; *Pan-Slavism in*, 341; *opposition to* tsardom in, 342; reforms in, 271; Revolution of 1905 in, 348; reaction and terrorism in, 272; under Alexander I, 145; under Nicholas I, 268; under Alexander II, 268

Russian Orthodox Church, 267
Russian Revolution, 567, 574, 597, 621, 645
Russian Slavs, 54
Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, 602
Russo-Japanese War, 344, 475, 499, 532, 616
Russo-Turkish War (1877–78), 272, 390, 499, 504
Ruthenians, 56, 262, 335, 615, 625, 627

Saar Valley, 316; Basin, 578
Sadi-Carnot, President, 305
Sadowa, battle of, 256, 263
Safarik (P. J.), 625
Sahara Desert, 490
Saint Dominic, 3
Saint Gaudens, 681
Saint Germain, Treaty of, 614
Saint Helena, Napoleon's exile to, 120; 259, 492
Saint Lawrence River, 429
Saint Lucia Island, 6134
Saint Mihiel, 569
Saint Paul, 155
Saint Peter's (Rome), 117
St. Petersburg, 146, 271, 343, 344, 345, 347, 383, 536, 539, 541, 542, 545, 546
Saint Quentin, 567
Saint-Simon, Henri, 216, 217, 219, 691
Saint Stephen, Hungarian crown of, 53, 263
Saint Thomas, Island of, 493
Saionji (Marquess), 577
Sakhalin Island, 339, 344, 423, 492
Salonica, 404, 406, 566
Saloniki, 520, 531
Salvador, 451
Salvation Army, 594, 700, 701
Samoa, 435, 439
Samoan Islands, 325, 653
Samokov (Bulgaria), 388
San Carlo Theater (Naples), 72
Sand, George, 234
Sand, Karl, 150
Sandwich Islands, 492
San Francisco, 440, 682
Sanjak, 520
San Paulo, 436
San Stefano, Treaty of, 272, 390, 391, 401
Santa Cruz, 492
Santiago (Chile), 433; (Cuba), 356
Santo Domingo, 429, 434, 440, 453, 493
Sarajevo, 338, 535, 540, 541
Sardinia, 241, 242
Sargent, 681
Saskatchewan, 457
Savannah, 163
Savoff (General), 408
Savoy, 106, 242, 248, 249; House of, 354
Saxe-Weimar, 149, 150
Saxony, 50, 115, 133, 158, 175, 191, 201, 318
Sazonov, 526, 538, 540, 541, 546, 551, 552, 553
Scandinavian countries, 56
Scharnhorst, 148
Schaudinn (Dr.), 690
Scheidemann, 609
Schenkendorf (M. von), 233
Schiller, 72, 149, 234
Schilling, Baron, 546
Schleiden (M. J.), 688
Schleswig, 255, 281, 363, 578
Schleswig-Holstein, 255–257
Schmitt, Beradotte, 536, 554
Schnaebele incident (France), 508
Schubert, 681
Schumann, 681
Schurz, Carl, 202, 533
Schwann, Dr., 688
Science, advance in, 158; in modern civilization, 383; slow progress of to 1800, 693; contemporary, 694; applied, 165, 695
Scientific thought, growth of, 10
Scotland, 206, 286, 290, 293, 595, 676, 679, 694
Scotland, Church of, 141
Scott, Captain, 496
Scott, Sir Walter, 233, 680
Sculpture, 70
Scutari, 406, 407
Seabury, Samuel, 40
Sebastopol, 272, 385
Second Continental Congress (America), 28
Second (French) Empire, decline of, 241; overthrow of, 301
Second International, 655
Second Reform Bill (England), 193
Second Soviet Congress (Russia), 605
Secret diplomacy, 534
Secular state, rise of, 14
Sedan, 569; battle of, 243, 259, 301
Segur, 90
Seimas (Lithuania), 621
Self-government, rise of, 4
Selim III (Turkey), 373, 374
Semnelweiss, 667
Senegal, 490; river, 44, 423; valley, 308, 488
Separation Law (France), 307
Sepoy mutiny (1857), 285, 466
Sepoys, 466
Serbia, 280, 337, 390, 406, 409, 498, 525, 542–546, 575, 576, 650, 677
Serbo-Croats, 262, 335
Serbs, 183, 205, 367, 369, 396, 408
Serfdom, abolition of, 9, 17, 57; in Russia, 269
Sergius, Grand Duke, 344
Serrano, Marshal, 355
Seven Weeks' War, 256
Sèvres, Treaty of, 582, 636, 637, 638

Sex Disqualification Removal Act (England), 645
Shackleton, 496
Shakers, 41, 226
Shakespeare, 13
Shanghai, 471
Shantung, 444, 470, 476, 479, 484, 485, 563, 569, 576, 579, 587, 589
Shays' Rebellion (U.S.), 33
Sheffield, 63
Shelley, 123, 233, 681
Sherman Anti-Trust Act (U.S.), 442
Sherman, Roger, 35
Shetland Islands, 493
Shimonoseki, Treaty of, 481, 513
Shintoism, 481
Shintoists, 698
Shogunate (Japan), 530
Shotwell, James T., 116
Siam, 45, 308, 470, 473, 516, 568, 569
Siberia, 19, 223, 269, 339, 414, 420, 470, 471, 483, 569, 588, 677
Sicily, 196, 214, 249
Sienkiewicz, 681
Sierra Leone, 488, 490
Sieyès, 110
Sigel, Franz, 202
Silesia, 16, 51, 52, 59, 175, 334, 622, 626
Simms (W. G.), 279
Simon, Jules, 244
Singapore, 471
Sin-Kiang (district of), 473
Sinn Fein, 298
Sinn Feiners, 299
"Sisters of Charity" (England), 701–702
"Six Acts" of 1819 (England), 142
Skoropadsky, General, 628
Skupshtina, 631
Slavery, abolition of, 9; (U.S.), 276
Slavs, 146, 147, 204, 279, 334, 335, 336, 69, 627
Slidell, 277, 285
Slovakia, 581
Slovaks, 204, 252, 625
Slovenes, 262, 335, 631
Smith, Adam, 16, 72, 89, 294, 413, 503, 530, 691
Smith, Joseph, 700
Smuts, General, 569, 579
Smyrna, 403, 582, 634, 636, 637
Social Catholics, 669
"Social Contract, The" (Rousseau), 88
Social Democrats (Germany), 281, 319, 321, 323, 328; (Russia), 346, 600, 601
Socialism, appearance of, 8; 122; germs of, 122; Utopian, 216; Christian, 218; growth of, 222; Municipal (Germany), 328; in United States, 281; in France, 309; in Germany, 324; 593; basis of, 668; varieties of, 669, 691; 693
Socialistic Commonwealth, 8
Socialist Republicans (France), 198
Social liberalism, 216
Social Revolution, significance of (France), 121
Social Revolutionists (Russia), 346, 600, 601
Social Science, importance of, 696
Socialists (France), 301, 311; 670, (Germany), 323–327, 670; (Italy), 350, 670; (Russia), 347, 593
Society de Creusot (France), 84
Society for the Propagation of the Faith (R.C.C.), 702
Society Island, 492
Sociology, 692
Socrates, 13
Sofia, University of, 633
Soho, 167
Solferino, battle of, 248
Solomon Islands, 492
Somaliland, 354, 490, 491
Somme, battle of the, 567
Sonnino, 577
"Sons of Liberty" (U.S.), 26
South Africa, 18, 37, 422, 424, 427, 498, 514, 660, 699; Union of, 677
South African Republic, 460
South African War, 290
South America, 3, 9, 13, 18, 37, 43, 308, 355, 357, 429, 519, 682
South Australia, 458
South Carolina, 26, 28, 37, 274, 275, 434
Southern Confederacy (U.S.), 442
South Georgia Islands, 492
South Orkney Islands, 492
South Pole, 496
South Sea Islands, 420
South Shetland Islands, 492
South Wales, 158
Soviet Republic of Russia, 470, 593, 606
Soviets, 600, 601, 603
Spa, 568
Spain, nationalism in, 6; 15, 42, 49; under Charles III and Charles IV, 55; religious freedom in, 68; under Ferdinand VII, 138; Revolution in, 179; Revolution of 1830 in, 179; Revolution of 1848 in, 208; nationalism in, 235; political conditions in, 356; illiteracy in, 677
Spaniards, 44
Spanish-American colonies, revolt of, 180
Spanish-American War, 356, 430, 439, 440, 443, 444, 499
Sparticists (Germany), 608, 609
Spencer, Herbert, 685, 692
"Spheres of influence," 417
Spirit of Laws (Montesquieu), 87
Spiritualism, 700
Staatsrat (Prussia), 610

Stahlberg, K. J., 617
Stambulisky, Alexander, 633
Stambulov, 393
Stamp Act Congress (U.S.), 25, 35
Stamp Act of 1765 (England), 24, 25
Standard Oil Company, 441
Stanley, 361, 487, 488, 511
Stanley Falls, 488
Stanojevic, 540
State Churches, 11; in Great Britain, 140
State Socialism, 591
State Socialists, 669
States General (France), 49, 91–93, 96, 101, 231; (Holland), 57, 208
Stein, 3; educational gains under, 123; 132, 145, 148, 149, 252
Stephens, 276
Steuben, 71
Stevens, John, 163
Stevenson, George, 164
Stockholm, 215
Stolypin, 347
Storthing (Norway), 364
Straits Convention of 1841, 383
Straits Settlements, 470
Strassburg, archbishop of, 79; 259, 260, 302, 311
Stratford de Redcliffe, Lord, 384
Stuart (G.), 681
Stuart monarchy, 18
Stulginskis (M.), 621
Stuttgart, 202
Styria, 335
Sudan, 490
Suez Canal, 401, 416, 465, 488, 663
Sugar Act of 1764 (England), 24, 25
Sugar Duties (U.S.), 24
Sukhomlinov, 546
Sun Yat-Sen, 478, 479
Sunnite Mohammedans, 370
Supreme Council of National Economy (Russia), 603
Supreme Council (Lithuania), 621
Supreme Court (U.S.), 275, 276, 278, 442, 458; (Russia), 605
Supreme Macedo-Adrianopolitan Committee, 397
Supreme War Council, 654
Surgery, recent progress in, 690
Svinhufvud government (Finland), 616
Sweden, 6, 49; in 1789, 56; 57, 61, 66, 116, 134, 176, 231, 363, 364, 498, 558, 646, 650, 676
Swedish Church, 700
Switzerland, 49, 57, 58, 61, 66, 131, 133; Revolution of 1830 in, 193; Revolution of 1848 in, 208; 215, 361, 362, 498, 558, 565, 585, 676, 679
Sykes, Sir Mark, 629
Syndicalism, 122, 670
Syndicalists, 670, 671
"Synthetic Philosophy" (Spencer), 685, 692
Syracuse (N.Y.), 226
Syria, 366, 381, 382, 387, 392, 403, 404, 436, 470, 519, 582, 629, 635, 636, 637, 638

Table of Magnates (Hungary), 264, 336
Tadema, 681
Taff Vale Railway (Wales), 292
Tahiti, 420, 423
Talleyrand, 132, 135, 645
Tanganyika, Lake, 487
Tangiers, 330, 517
Tannenberg, battle of, 565
Taoism, 473
Taoists, 698
Tardieu, 538
Tartary, 419
Tasmania, 285, 458, 492
Taurus Mountains, 366, 381, 403
Tchitcherin (Commissar), 603
Telegraph Union (U.S.), 444, 653
Temperley, Harold, 536
"Temples of Reason" (France), 104
Tenedos, 635
Tennis Court Oath (France), 96
Tennyson, 701
Terestchenko, 599
"Terrorists" (Russia), 347
Teschen (province of), 623
Teutons, 620
Texas, 245, 423, 429, 430, 453
Thackeray, 233, 681
Thessaly, 368, 391, 395, 396
Thiers, 186, 187, 244, 301, 302
Third Estate, 82–83, 94, 231
Third French Republic, 243, 258, 261, 305, 307, 308, 316, 678
Third International, The, 605, 656
Thirteen Colonies (America), 414, 422, 430, 431, 456, 462, 529
Thirty Years' War, 625
Thomas, Albert, 579
Thorn, 134
Thorwaldson, 78, 681
Thrace, 369, 406, 408, 581, 582, 633, 634, 637
Three Emperors' League, 311, 321, 505, 506, 509
Tiber River, 192
Tibet, 473, 495, 519
Ticino, 554
Tientsin, 355, 470, 474
Tigris River, 366
Tilsit, Treaty of, 115, 475
Timbuktu, 486
Timor, 470
Tisza, Count, 337, 542, 544
Tobago Island, 134, 430
Togoland, 325, 490, 491, 569

Tokelau Island, 492
Tokio, 481
Tolstoy, Leo, 273, 656, 681
Tomsk, 470
Tonga Island, 492
Tonkin, 308, 475
Tories, 27, 170, 233, 290
Tory Party (England), 49
Toul, 556
Toulon, 104, 107
Townshend Acts (England), 25, 26
Townshend, Charles, 157
Trades Dispute Act of 1906 (England), 292
Trade-unions, 64, 224
Trajan, Emperor, 368
Transcaucasia, 628
Transcaucasian Republic, 605
Transportation (U.S.), 39; by water, 163
Transport Workers' Federation (England), 292
Trans-Siberian Railroad, 339, 475
Transvaal, 417, 424, 460, 461, 488, 514
Transylvania, 335, 368, 400, 567, 581, 629, 632, 633
Treitschke, 533
Trentino, 250, 354, 507
Trepoff, General, 344, 345
Trevithich, Richard, 163
Trianon, Peace of, 581
Trieste, 250, 354, 507, 531
Trikoupes, 395
Trinidad, 111, 134, 430
Triple Alliance, 312, 313, 321, 337, 341, 354, 507, 508, 509, 511, 512, 514, 515, 519, 534, 535, 552, 554, 653
Triple Entente, 313, 519, 534, 535, 552, 554, 561, 653
Tripoli, 312, 355, 406, 486, 487, 516, 525
Tristan Island, 492
Troppau, Congress of, 136, 142, 145
Trotsky, Leon, 567, 601, 602, 603
Trumbell, 681
Tsankov, Professor, 633
Tsing-Tau, 569
Tudors, 233
Tuhai Island, 492
Tuilleries, 96, 98, 119, 197, 238
Tull, Jethro, 157
Tunis, 312, 354, 402, 486, 490, 507
Turco-Egyptian crisis, first, 381; second, 382
Turco-Italian War, 406, 634
Turgeniev, 269, 272, 273
Turgot, 85, 89, 91, 413, 422, 462
Turin, 139, 183, 248, 249
Turkestan, 339
Turkey, administrative system in, 372; capitulation in, 371; Constitution of 1876 of, 392; economic conditions in, 371; financial difficulties of, 386; growth of German interest and influence in, 402; international intervention in, 382, racial situation in, 366; religious situation in, 370; territorial extent of (1815), 366; "spheres of influence" in, 403;
Tuscany, 54, 204, 205, 248, 350
Two Sicilies, 54
Tyrol, 53
Tzu-Hsi, Empress, 476

Uganda, 490
Uitlanders (Africa), 460, 461
Ujiji (Africa), 487
Ukraine, the, 605, 615, 627
Ukrania, 585, 604, 623, 650
Ukranian Republic, 628
Ulmanis (K.), 620
Ulster, 298
"Ulsterites," 299
Ulster Unionists, 299
"Ulster Volunteers," 298
Ultra-royalists (France), 137, 138
Uniate Church (the Ukraine), 627
United Socialist Party (France), 309
Unikiar Skelessi, Treaty of, 382
Unionists (England), 289, 290
"Union of Liberation" (Russia), 343
Union of Railway Freight Transportation (Europe), 653
Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, 605
Union of South Africa, 455, 459, 461, 490, 677
"Union of the Russian People," 346
Unitarianism, 700
"United Brethren in Christ" (U.S.), 40
United Kingdom, 281, 296
United States, cultural changes in, 279; development of democracy in, 280; education in, 446; federal and state legislation in, 445; industrial conditions in, 176; industrial developments in, 279; industrial expansion of, 438; Mexican policy of, 441; policy of in the Orient, 444; political progress of, 445; population increase of, 445; relations with Europe, 443; rise of large-scale business enterprise in, 442; separatism in, 274; socialism and imperialism in, 281; social conditions and improvements in, 225, 278; territorial growth of, 439; Revolution of 1830 in, 194
"United States of the World," 658
United States Steel Corporation, 442
"Universal German Workingmen's Association," 220
Universal Postal Union, 653
Universalists, 41
University of France, 112, 123, 317
University of the State of New York, 123
Upper Silesia, 578, 580

Uranus, 687
Uruguay, 450, 498
Urundi (Africa), 361
Usher, Archbishop, 683
Utopia, 216
Utopian Socialism, 216
Utopian Socialists, 216, 218, 669

Vail (T.), 164
Valentin, V., 536
Valmey, 233
Van Buren, President, 226
Vardar River, 520
Varennes (France), 98, 100
Vasco de Gama, 15
Vatican Council, 322
Vatican Library, 701
Vendée, province of (France), 99, 104, 108
Venetia, 114, 246, 249, 250, 256, 262, 504
Venezuela, 443, 449, 450
Venice, 49, 54, 61, Republic of, 106
Venizelos, Eleutherios, 369, 567, 629, 635
Vera Cruz, 441
Verdi, 681
Verdun, 556
Verhagen, 70
Verona, Congress of, 136, 180
Versailles, 76, 77, 79, 81, 93, 95, 260, 301, 313; Palace of, 578, 649; Treaty of, 576-579, 590, 611, 621, 623, 654, 657
Vicomte de Noailles, 95
Victor Emmanuel I, 183
Victor Emmanuel II, 205, 246, 247, 248, 249, 349, 355
Victor Emmanuel III, 349, 353
Victor Hugo, 128, 184, 234, 244, 656, 674, 681
Victoria (Australia), 458
Victoria Falls, 487
[illegible], fortress of, 373
Vienna, 53, 62, 72, 114, 119, 134, 203, 256, 433, 506, 682
Vienna, Peace of (1809), 117
Villa (Pancho), 441
Vilna, 621, 623; University of, 621, 625
Virgin Islands, 363, 430, 439, 440, 453, 493
Virginia (state of), 26, 28, 34, 37, 41, 212
Viviani, 309
Vlachs, 367, 368, 400
Vladivostok, 339, 423, 470, 604
Volga, 369
Volta, 54, 71, 686, 695
Voltaire, 13, 51, 58, 71, 79, 83, 88, 90, 91, 503, 530
von Behring, 689
von Bethmann-Hollweg, 533, 549, 557
von Bieberstein, 402
von Bülow, 329, 330, 351, 623
von Caprivi, 510
von der Goltz, 402, 617
von Gagen, 201
von Haller, 71
von Hindenburg, 565, 568, 613
von Holstein, 510, 516, 551
von Humboldt, 132, 148, 150, 495
von Ketteler, 476
von Krüdener, Baroness, 135
von Liebig, 686
von Mackensen, 566, 567
von Moltke, 253, 255, 256, 259, 310, 549
von Ranke, 234
von Roon, General, 253, 254, 259
von Sanders, 410
von Tirpitz, 514, 551
von Welz, Baron, 419

Wagner, 681
Wagram, battle of, 117
Wahabites, 370, 638
Wake Island, 439
Wakefield, Edward G., 462
Waldeck-Rousseau, Premier, 307
Wales, 62, 140, 286, 290, 699
Wallace, 685
Wallachia, 366, 368, 373, 376, 377, 387
Walloons, 360
Walpole, Spencer, 194
Waltham (Mass.), 39
War of 1812, 274
Warren, Dr., 690
Warsaw, 115, 134, 191, 344, 565, 619
Warsaw, Grand Duchy of, 115, 133, 622
Wartburg Festival, 150
Washington (Disarmament) Conference, 444, 479, 485, 589
Washington (D.C.), 278, 453, 682
Washington, George, 13, 28, 34, 35, 140, 181, 213, 274, 559, 694
Washington Island, 492
Washington, state of, 423, 449
"Water Frame" (Arkwright's), 161
Waterloo, battle of, 116, 120, 134, 199
Watt, James, 162, 457
Watts (G.), 681
Wealth of Nations, The (Adam Smith), 17, 72, 89
Webster, Pelatiah, 34
Wei-Hai-Wei (China), 444, 470, 475, 513
Weimar, 608
Weitling, 220
Wellington, Duke of, 119, 132, 138, 140, 143, 193, 203, 207
Weser River, 532
Wesley, John and Charles, 700
West, 681
Western Railroad (France), 310

West Indies, 414, 440, 443, 451, 464
Westminster Abbey, 487
Westphalia, 115, 118; Treaty of, 503
West Prussia, 578, 622
Weyler, General, 356
Whigs, 27, 42, 49, 140, 170, 193, 206, 233
Whistler, 681
White Book (The German), 611
White Russia, 605, 628
White Slave Traffic, 580
"White Terror" (France), 137, 604
Whitney, Eli, 162
Whittier, 275, 279, 681
Wilberforce, 486
"Wilderness Road" (U.S.), 39
Wilhelmina, Queen, 359
Wilhelmsland (New Guinea), 492
William and Mary, College of, 42
William, Crown Prince (Germany), 359
William I (Holland), 190
William II (Holland), 207
William III (Holland), 359
William V (Holland), 57
William I (Prussia), 243, 253, 254, 256, 258, 259, 260, 312, 321, 324, 326
William II (Prussia), 260; character of, 326; 327, 328, 329, 330, 359, 402; diplomacy of, 511; 529, 533, 568, 578
Williams, Roger, 699
Wilson, James, 35
Wilson, Mount, 688
Wilson, Woodrow, 441, 445, 479, 557, 559, 560, 561, 567, 573–577, 599, 630, 636
Windischgrätz, General, 204
Windward Island, 430
Wintringham, Mrs. George, 645
Witte, Serge J., 341, 345, 602
Wöhler, 686
Wolf, 222
Woman's Movement, progress of the, 673
Woman's Social and Political Union, 645
Woman Suffrage (England), 286; 645
Woman's Suffrage Convention (U.S.), 646
Woosung (China), 476
Wordsworth, 233
"Workingmen's Parliament" (England), 207
Workingmen's Party (U.S.), 226
Workman's Compensation Act (England), 493
Workmen's Social Democratic Party (Russia), 342
World History, forces in, 155
World Missionary Conference, 700
World State, 657
World War, 4, 6, 116, 134, 185, 191, 205, 211, 237, 245, 250, 258, 265, 281, 286, 289, 291, 293, 297, 309, 311, 315, 334, 347, 354, 358, 361, 398, 444, 463, 479, 484, 530, 542, 547, 647, 667, 673
World Wealth, increase in, 8
World's Columbian Exposition, 444
Woyciechowski, Stanislas, 624
Wrangle, General, 604
Wright, Francis, 672
Württemberg, 50; Duke of, 115; 202, 257, 318, 611
Wyatt (J.), 161

"X-rays," 687, 690

Yale University, 42
Yangtze Valley, 475, 476
Yellow Continent, 45
Young, Arthur, 62, 81, 83, 157, 316
Young China Party, 478
Young Communists (Russia), 605
Young Czechs, 265
Young Europe, 236
Young German League, 532
Young Germany, 234
Young Hungary, 236
Young Italy, 192, 205, 235, 246, 247
Young Ireland, 236
Young Men's Christian Association, 594, 677, 699
Young Poland, 236
Young Turks, 337, 392, 402, 404, 405
Young Turk Revolution, 405–406, 520
Young Women's Christian Association, 594, 677, 699
Yovanovitch, L., 540
Ypres, 565
Ypsilanti, Alexander, 184, 378
Yuan-Shih-Kai, President, 478, 479
Yudenich, General, 604

Zabern Incident, 311, 329, 655
Zanzibar, Sultan of, 325
Zambezi, 487
"Zemstvos" (Russia), 271, 340, 342, 344, 597, 598; Union of, 599
Zeppelin, 694
Zola, Émile, 244, 306
Zollverein, 175
Zulus, 285
Zürich, Peace of, 249; University of, 672
Zwinglians, 699