UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY
OU_216487
UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 940.28/B88H Accession No. 4467

Author

Title History of Europe in Outline.

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

THE HISTORY OF EUROPE IN OUTLINE

1814—1848

FROM THE RESTORATION OF THE BOURBONS TO THE FALL OF THE MONARCHY OF JULY

BY

OSCAR BRCVWNING, M A.

Senior Fellow of Kind's College, Cambridge, and University Lecture in History
Principal of the Cambridge University Pay Training College

London
MACMILLAN AND C
NEW YORK: THE MACMILLAN
1901

All rights reserver

RICHARD CLAY AND SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON AND BUNGAY.

PREFACE

THE Board of Education has selected as the historical subject in 1902, for students in men's Training Colleges, the History of Europe from 1814 to 1848, and has defined it as extending from the Restoration of the Bourbons to the Fall of the Monarchy of July. As no convenient book exists upon the subject in English, it seemed desirable to provide one. Perhaps the present work, written primarily for Training College students, may prove useful to others, and may even find favour with the general public.

OSCAR BROWNING.

MARIENBAD,
August, 1901

CONTENTS

THE HISTORY OF EUROPE IN OUTLINE

CHAPTER I

THE RESTORATION.—THE REIGN OF LOUIS XVIII

THE allies entered Paris on March 31, 1814. In the evening of that day eight persons met in the house of Tj^Hfeyrand, the Tsar and two of his ministers, the King of Prussia, Schwarzenberg and Lichtenstein representing Austria, with Dalberg and Talleyrand who had been in the service of Napoleon. They adopted a declaration drawn yp by Talleyrand which said that they would not treat any more either with Napoleon or with any member of his family, that they would respect the integrity of France as it had existed under its legitimate kings, and that they would recognise and guarantee any constitution which the French nation should propose for itself. They asked the Senate to create a provisional government which should undertake the administration of the country, and to propose a constitution.

The Senate nominated a Provisional Government of five members, which drew up a constitution which

preserved the royal authority to the Bourbons, kept the Senate and the Corps Legislatif as an essential part of the government, guaranteed to the army its pay, its ranks and distinctions and the right of possession to those who had purchased national domains. It also established the liberty of worship and of the press, and full freedom in the expression of political opinions. But when the Comte d'Artois arrived in Paris on April 12, and assumed the Viceroyalty, he gave it to be understood that the basis of the Restoration according to which the royal authority was conferred by the national will and not by the Grace of God was no longer accepted by the Bourbon family. When Louis XVIII. came back to France he threw over the constitution of the Provisional Government, but by the Declaration of St. Ouen on May 2 put forward certain liberal principles on which a future constitution might be based.

The result of this was the publication of a Charter (La Charte) on June 4, 1814. By this instrument Louis, a constitutional king by Divine Right, was invested with full executive authority, and was made the source of legislative power, which he was to exercise in conjunction with the Chambers. These were two in number. The first, a chamber of hereditary peers, was appointed by the king, who naturally excluded from it all Bonapartists and Republicans. The second chamber was elective, the franchise being fixed at the payment of 300 francs direct taxes for electors, and of 1000 francs direct taxes for members. The other points of importance in the Charter were, the responsibility of ministers, the independence of the law courts, the provision of a jury, the freedom of religion and of the press, the recognition of the sale of national property, of the public debt, and of the old and new nobility, and equal rights of all Frenchmen to civil and military offices. An act

of amnesty was included by which no one was to be disturbed or persecuted for his previous opinions or votes. But the effect of these concessions was weakened by an article which permitted the sovereign to issue any edicts which might be necessary for the carrying out of laws, and the security of the government.

It was soon seen that the Bourbons had learnt nothing and had forgotten nothing. Pains were taken to obliterate all that might recall the Revolution or the Empire. The tri-colour cockade was superseded by the white cockade. The old aristocracy treated the *parvenus* of the Empire with insolence and contempt and excluded them from the Court, where the tone was set by the proud and frivolous Comte d'Artois, and his gloomy daughter-in-law, the Duchess of Angouleme, the daughter of Louis XVI., who had never forgotten her imprisonment in the Temple, and the murder of her father and mother. The royal guard of Swiss mercenaries was re-established, many of the officers of the Grand Army were dismissed on half-pay: the Legion of Honour was degraded by being conferred lavishly on unworthy recipients, the conditions of the Treaty of Fontainebleau which provided an income for the Emperor and his family were not observed. The luxury of the Court was extravagant and the taxes were heavy. The Clergy and the emigrants attempted to recover their confiscated property, their titles and feudal rights. Louis XVIII. was a man of ability, but he was past his prime and considered only how he might make the restored monarchy last during his lifetime. His minister, Blacas, was narrow and prejudiced.

While the Congress of Vienna was still sitting, Napoleon returned to France. With about eleven hundred soldiers and no horses, he landed at Golfe Jovan, in the neighbourhood of Cannes, on March 1, 1815, and reached Paris without firing a shot. The

troops sent to oppose him came over to his side, and on March 7 Grenoble opened its gates to him. Ney, who had promised Louis XVIII. to bring him back to Paris in an iron cage, was overcome by his influence and returned to his old allegiance, while Soult, Massena and Augereau took the same course. But the allied powers remained firm in their determination to crush him and Napoleon, notwithstanding his efforts for peace, was unable to shake their resolution. Following the example of the Bourbons he proclaimed a constitution on liberal lines, but the position of a constitutional monarch was not congenial to him, nor was it likely to prove a success. The last gleam of his power was exhibited in the Champ de Mai, a solemn function held on Juno 1, in which the oath was taken to the Constitution, and the new eagles were distributed to the army. On the night of June 12 he left Paris for the army, and was defeated by Wellington at Waterloo on Juno 18. Returning to Paris, ho was compelled to alxlicate. He then proceeded to the sea coast hoping to escapo to America, but eventually gave himself up to the English, who sent him to the island of St. Helena, where he died on May 5, 1821.

After the second abdication of Napoleon a provisional government was established in France with Fouchd at its head. This government made an agreement with Wellington and Blucher that no one should be punished for his previous actions and opinions, and then surrendered the capital to the allied. But the allied sovereigns were irritated not only against Napoleon, but against the country which had received him back with enthusiasm. They exacted an indemnity of 700 millions of francs payable in five years, and the maintenance of an army of occupation of 150,000 men for a period of from three to five years. By the second treaty of Paris, France was confined to the

frontiers of 1790, by which she lost Savoy and half a million of inhabitants. Prussia, Austria, and the German princes would have demanded further sacrifices if it had not been for the opposition of England and th6 Tsar.

There was a wide difference in the temper of the allies during the invasion of 1814 and during that of 1815. In the first they declared that they were making war against Napoleon alone, and that they respected the independence and the territory of the country over which he ruled. In the second, they were angry that France had so readily deserted her legitimate sovereign, they were of opinion that it was necessary to keep that unruly country under perpetual control, and by a second treaty of November 20, 1815, they bound themselves to carry out an armed intervention in case a revolution should break out. A further result was the conclusion of the Holy Alliance, between the Emperors of Russia and Austria and the King of Prussia, for the purpose of maintaining in Europe a..high , standard of Christian faith and piety, which would have the effect of discouraging revolutionary movements in future. The impulse to this alliance was given by Madame von Kriidener, a religious enthusiast, and it was joined by all the European powers, with the exception of England. We shall see that it produced no inconsiderable effect in European politics.

The effect of this was that France was divided into two camps, those who adhered to Napoleon and the tri-colour flag, and those who supported the Bourbons and the white flag. The first was republican and imperialist; it formed a party at once military and patriotic, democratic and lay. Among the Bourbonists there were some who supported the Charter and the Constitutional monarchy, but there were others who

desired a counter-revolution, a social revolution which should destroy the work of the Revolution of 1789. They were especially bitter against the confiscation of national property and against the Concordat. They were called the party of the *ultras.* They were recruited amongst the returned *emigres,* and the country gentlemen, especially in the west. They looked to the Comte d'Artois, afterwards King Charles X., as their head.

There now ensued a violent reaction, and an outburst of vengeance against those who had joined Napoleon in the Hundred Days. At Marseilles, Toulon, Nimes, Avignon, Toulouse, and other southern towns, fanatical mobs attacked their fellow-citizens who were supposed to be , Protestants, Napoleonists or Republicans, and murdered them by hundreds in the most cruel manner. Marshal Brune was assassinated at Avignon on August 2, and his body was thrown into the Rhone, General Ramel met with a similar fate at Toulouse. In Nimes the rioters went about armed with wooden clubs, shod with iron and decorated with lilies, and General Lagarde, who attempted to suppress them, fell a victim to their fury. A similar fate befell the brothers Faucher at Bordeaux. The horrors of 1793 were recalled to life. Colonel Labedoyere, who had assisted Napoleon in gaining possession of Grenoble, was tried before a court-martial and shot. Lavalette, who, as master of the Post Office, had assisted the return of the Emperor, was condemned to death, but was enabled to escape from prison by the assistance of his wife, a niece of the Empress Josephine. The most illustrious victim was Marshal Ney, who was executed in Paris on December 7.

\ The Chamber of Deputies, consisting of 402 members, was elected in August, 1815, under the influence of the invasion of the allies and of the White Terror. It was

chosen by a system of double election, by bodies of electors chosen for life, both in the arrondissements or parishes, and in the departments or counties. The electors of the arrondissement proposed candidates which were chosen by the electors of the department. The prefects had the right to add to these lists ten names for each arrondissement and twenty names for each department. Many of the Imperialist electors had not the courage to take part in the vote. The result was that the Chamber was composed entirely of supporters of the white flag, the large majority were ultras, and the supporters of the Charter and a constitutional monarchy formed a minority. The King was delighted at this outburst of loyalty and called the Chamber, the *Chambre introuvable*, meaning that he should never find anything like it again. The Chamber voted seven laws against sedition, and established courts for the trial of Bonapartists. It abolished divorce at the bidding of the clerics. It proposed also to abolish some of the institutions guaranteed by the Charter, such as the University, the national debt, and the permanence of judges, and it voted for the restoration of property confiscated from the royalists. These extreme measures were prevented by the House of Peers, who had beeji in the main functionaries of the Empire, and who supported the Charter,

The ministers did not represent the majority of the Chamber. Talleyrand and Fouche had been dismissed, and their places were taken by the Due de Richelieu and Deeazes, who was soon afterwards created a Peer and Duke. Of the whole ministry only three belonged to the party of the *ultras.* These were friends of the Comte d'Artois, and were accused of forming with him a cabal which had its sittings in the Pavilion Marsan, the part of the Tuileries in which he resided. Thus there arose two theories of the nature of royal authority;

according to one, the King was allowed a free choice in the selection of his ministers, even if they did not represent the majority in the Chambers; he was also allowed full control of the executive power provided that he kept within the limits of the constitution. According to the other theory, the King was obliged to select his ministers from the majority of the Chambers, and the executive was under the control of Parliament, who could turn the ministry out by an adverse vote. It is a curious fact that in 1816 the ultra-royalists supported the rights of Parliament against the King, whereas the liberals defended the royal prerogative against the royalists.

The burning question at this time was that of electoral reform and of the composition of the Chamber. The ultras desired to extend the suffrage to two million electors, to have a numerous Chamber, the whole body being renewed every five years. The liberal minority desired to restrict the suffrage to less than 100,000 electors, with a high property qualification, partial renewal of the Chamber every year, and a smaller number of deputies. The proposition of the *ultras* was carried, but was rejected by the House of Peers. The *ultras* placed their confidence in the support of the country gentlemen; the liberals in the prefects of the departments and the humbler electors. Louis kept his ministers and resisted the Chamber. He was, however, compelled to prorogue it in April 1816, and to dissolve it in the following September. He issued an edict fixing the number of the new Chamber at 258, and he created a number of new peers, who had been generals and functionaries under the Empire.

The new Chamber was opened on November 4. It was composed of four parties, the right consisting of ultra-royalists, whose leaders were Villfele, Labourdonnaye, Corbiere, Bonald, and Castelbajac ; the right

and left centres composed of Constitutionalists of different complexions, and the left or Independents led by Lafayette. The ministers belonged mainly to the Right Centre, which comprised Royer-Collard, the head of the Doctrinaires, who was chosen as Vice-President, as well as Guizot and Mole. Louis said in his opening speech, "Let animosities come to an end, let the children of the same country be a nation of brothers."

The question of election to the Chamber was settled in 1817. An electoral College was formed in every department, consisting of French citizens who were over thirty years of age and paid three hundred francs in taxes. By these, two hundred and fifty deputies were chosen by direct election, who must be at least forty years of age and pay a thousand francs in direct taxes. Thus 90,000 electors had a number of 16,000 to choose from. A fifth part of the Chamber was to retire every year. The attention of the legislators was also occupied by the discussion of a press law, which was not finally voted till 1819. It was drawn up chiefly under the influence of the *doctrinaires*, Royer-Collard, Guizot, and the Due de Broglie. The censorship of the press was abolished, newspapers were to be stamped and had to pay caution money, but were allowed the privilege of trial by jury. The finances of the kingdom were also placed upon a better footing. Also by a recruiting law of March 6, 1818, for which Gouvion St. Cyr, the new war minister, was responsible, the position of the army was improved, and Louis had the satisfaction of seeing the army of occupation reduced by a fifth, a proof that the powers of Europe began to feel confidence in the future of France.

In the autumn of 1818, a Congress was summoned at Aix-la-Chapelle which was attended by the Emperors of Austria and Russia and the King of Prussia, who came together to discuss the affairs of Europe. The Due de

Richelieu, who was an old friend of the Tsar's, with the help of Pozzo di Borgo, persuaded the sovereigns to promise that France should be entirely free from foreign garrisons before the end of the year. The Emperor Alexander and King Frederick William paid Louis a visit in Paris, the effect of which was unfavourable to the reactionaries. Vitrolles, who had denounced the existing government to the allied monarchs, was removed from the Council of State, and the Comte d'Artois was deposed from the command of the National Guard. Louis was allowed to enter the Holy Alliance. This completed the reconciliation of France with the powers which had subdued her.

Richelieu heard at Aix-la-Chapelle that in the annual election to the Chamber the Liberals had a majority, owing largely to the influence of the Liberal press, the principal representative of which was the journal called the *Minerva.* This party had grown by slow degrees, it numbered twenty-five members in 1817, forty-five in 1818, and ninety in the following year. Those now elected included the names of Lafayette, Manuel and Benjamin Constant. The Emperor Alexander recommended to Richelieu a change of system, and in this he was supported by Metternich and Wellington. Richelieu returned from Aix-la-Chapelle fu|l of anxiety ; but he found himself with Laine at variance with Decazes. The consequence was that he retired from office on December 27, 1818, and General Dessolles became Prime Minister in his place with the charge of foreign affairs.

The result of this was that the majority which had supported Richelieu was cut into two parts. The left centre supported Dessolles, but the right centre joined the ultras in opposition to the ministry. Decazes created more than sixty new peers, most of whom had served under the Empire, The list contained the names

of Lebrun, Champigny, Lefebvre, Davout, Jourdan, Moncey and Suchet. Decazes also removed some of the fetters which controlled the freedom of the press. He was violently opposed by the party of the Comte d'Artois, the Pavilion Marsan, that "Coblentz transplanted to Paris," as it was called. But this liberal policy was nipped in the bud by the result of the new elections which took place in September 1819, when out of fifty-four new members of the Chamber, thirty-five were found to be liberals. Among these was the notorious Bishop Gregoire, who in 1793 had voted for the execution of the King. The ambassadors of foreign powers began to warn and threaten, and the result was that Dessolles was compelled to retire, and to leave the government in the hands of Decazes.

The speech from the throne which opened the new Parliament promised amendments in the Charter. It was proposed that the Chamber should follow the example of England and be renewed entirely every seven years, also that half its members should possess qualifications in land. Gregoire, who, since the days of the Revolution, had made himself an honourable name by his moral courage and his humanity, was excluded from the House. But their operations were suddenly stopped by an unexpected event,, of the highest importance. On February 13, 1820, the Due de Berry, the younger sonj of the Comte d'Artois, was murdered, just outside the Opera House, by one Louvel, a political enthusiast, inspired with a fanatical hatred against the Bourbons. Although it was clear that Louvel had no accomplices, and that the murder was not the result of a conspiracy, the *ultras* seized the opportunity to throw the blame on the shoulders of Decazes and of the Liberal party. This they said was the result of making common cause with republicans and regicides, and of placing legislative power in the hands of democrats and doctrinaires.

Louis was not able to make head against the storm, and two days later, dismissed his favourite minister whom he loved as a son.

The Due de Richelieu took his place, and his first act was to pass the laws which had been proposed by his predecessor. The Comte d'Artois promised Richelieu his firm support. On September 29 the widow of the Due dc Berry bore a son, who received the title of the Due de Bordeaux. He was hailed as the child of heaven, the miraculous heir of the Bourbon race. The royalist cause was in the ascendant, and the *ultras* obtained a preponderance in the Chamber. The differences between the two parties became extreme, and this feeling was intensified on both sides by the successful efforts of Austria to crush the revolution in Italy, and by the death of the great Napoleon in May, 1821. The Comte d'Artois, forgetful of his pledges, urged the King to stronger measures, which he was too weak to resist. Richelieu was obliged to resign his office, and died shortly afterwards of a broken heart. His successor, Villele, was the acknowledged leader of the extreme royalists.

The next years were occupied by the Spanish War, of which an account will be given in another chapter. It cost the French 4,000 men and 200,000,000 francs, its only advantage being that it contented the army, and attached it to the dynasty. The internal situation of France became worse and worse. Louis XVIII., racked with the pains of gout, sank more and more into the hands of his brother and his niece. Education was committed to ignorant monks, the voices of Guizot and Royer Collard were silenced in their professorial chairs. School-books written to order mentioned Napoleon only as the successful general of the army of Louis XVIII. The press was free only in name. The observance of saints' days was enforced, but it was not

allowed to spend them in amusement; Frenchmen, when not working to pay their taxes, were commanded to observe strict obedience, self-denial, and prayer.

The elections of 1824 gave a still more decided majority to the ultra-royalists. Out of a Chamber of 430 members, the Liberals could number only thirteen votes and the Moderates only four. Villele used his power to propose two reactionary measures; by the first the Lower House was to be elected for a period of seven years instead of five, and the article of the charter, which provided that a fifth of the Chamber was to be renewed every year, was abrogated; by- the second, the interest on the national debt was reduced from five to four per cent., in order to provide a relief to poor royalists. The second measure was rejected by the Peers, but the first was carried. Chateaubriand was dismissed from office, the Congregation became more and more powerful in the state. Bishop Frayssinous, an ignorant bigot, who had been previously appointed Grand Master of the University, was now made Minister of Worship. The King was evidently dying, and was surrounded by a crowd of priestly comforters. His illness had been carefully concealed, but on September 13a bulletin in the *Monitenr* left no doubt as to his condition, and four days later he expired. He was buried with all the feudal trappings of the old rdgime, the precedents of musty records were accurately followed, heralds and kings-at-arms stood around, the banner of France was cast into the grave by Talleyrand, who had assisted at so many political funerals, and was to assist at more.

CHAPTER II

SPAIN, PORTUGAL, AND ITALY

SPAIN, up to the time of the French invasion, had been an absolute monarchy under ecclesiastical influence. The provinces of which the kingdom was formed had littlo cohesion, but no independent power, and the Cortes, the ancient parliament of estates, was never convoked. The Grandees, the hereditary aristocracy, were in complete subjection to the King. The King, however, was a feeble personality and was entirely in the hands of those who surrounded him, his confessor, his wife, or his wife's favourite. This group of persons was called the Camarilla, and during the reign of Charles IV. the real sovereign of Spain was the favourite of the Queen, Godoy, entitled Prince of the Peace. The only power which could hold its own against this clique of royal favourites was the Church, which possessed immense private property, almost entirely exempt from taxation, the Tribunal of the Inquisition, considerable power over criminal jurisdiction, and the censorship of the press. Spain was therefore subject to two despotisms, that of the Camarilla, "the Little Chamber/' and the Church.

The French invasion of Napoleon dealt a fatal **blow to** this system. A French King ruled in Madrid. His supporters, who were called Afrancesados, **were governed by a military absolutism, which, however, was**

consistent and enlightened and was entirely free from Church influence. The Patriots, on the other hand, had to find a new government for themselves. The provinces furthest removed from Madrid, in their efforts to defend themselves, established first provincial Juntas, then a central Junta, and finally, in 1812, a Constitution containing a Cortes.

The Cortes, or Spanish parliament, found itself divided into two parties, the Serviles, or partisans of the former state of things, and the Liberales. The liberals were in the majority, they declared the Cortes sovereign and indissoluble and decreed the abolition of the censure of the press, of seignorial rights and of the privileges of the nobles. The Constitution declared that the sovereignty resided in the nation. It was drawn up on the model of the French Constitution of 1791. The King was the head of the executive, but he acted in all things by the advice of his ministers, he had a suspense veto over legislation which was placed in the hands of the Cortes. There was a single chamber, elected, ati two degrees, by universal suffrage, the deputies being chosen for two years and not re-eligible, the ministers not forming part of the assembly. There could not have been a more complete renunciation of the *ancien regime.* It is true that the Catholic religion was proclaimed the one recognised religion of the country, but the Inquisition, which had been abolished by the French, was not restored by the Cortes.

The French invasion had driven out the legitimate King, an English army brought him back on March 22, 1814. The Serviles presented to Ferdinand a manifesto against the Cortes and the Constitution and demanded that the Cortes should be summoned according to ancient forms. As the restored sovereign passed through the country he was saluted with cries, "Long live the absolute King!" "Down with the traitors!"

On May 4 he signed a manifesto which said, "My royal will is not only not to swear to the constitution, and not to accept any decree of the Cortes, but to declare that Constitution and those decrees of none effect. Whoever wishes to preserve them commits an insult against the prerogative of my sovereignty and the good of my country. I declare him guilty of high treason; any one who offends by speech or writing shall suffer the penalty of death." The hall of the Cortes was closed and their papers were placed under seal.

In the night preceding the entry of the King into Madrid, May 13, 1814, about thirty members of the liberal party were arrested. No charge was brought against them, but they remained in prison for more than eighteen months. In December 1815, the King, of his own authority, condemned some of them to eight years in the galleys, others to imprisonment in a convent, others to exile, adding that when their sentence was expired they should remain at his disposal. A reactionary ministry was established in their place, with all the abuses of the Inquisition, the privileges of the nobles and the Camarilla. It was reported that every evening the King's confessors took council with him, drew up decrees and ordered arrests. The Council of Castile, the head of a subservient army of officials, obliterated all traces of former liberal legislation.

The Afrancesados were cruelly persecuted. All who had held office under Joseph Bonaparte or had assisted him in any way were severely punished, and the same treatment was extended to the heads of the guerilla movement such as Alava, Valdez, and Porlier, who had shed their blood for their country, King, and fatherland. Many of the most heroic combatants in the late war perished by the hand of the executioner, or wasted in prison; others were banished into foreign

countries, among them General Epoz y Mina, the bravest guerilla hero of the North. In October, 1815, Porlier, who had escaped from imprisonment in Corunna, raised the banner of insurrection and suffered on the gallows, Richart underwent the same fate, and the heads of himself and his accomplices were publicly exhibited in the streets. General Lacy, who also attempted to rouse an insurrection in Catalonia, was carried off by night from Barcelona to Majorca, and was shot in the ditch of the fortress of Belver, in June, 1817. In Valencia hundreds of the discontented were put to death.

Agents of the Camarilla travelled through the provinces, and stirred up a system of terror. The Inquisition established a practice of domiciliary visits by night. Renegades were rewarded with posts and honours. Even the reactionary ministry was not violent enough for the King's taete; one of its members was arrested by the monarch himself as he lay in bed. San Carlos, the Prime Minister, was compelled to resign. His place was taken by Don Pedro Cevallos, a man of weak and undecided character. Under his control administration and justice fell into a terrible condition, the public treasury was completely exhausted notwithstanding the heavy taxes, the Spanish Colofllles in South America raised the standard of insurrection, commerce was seriously impaired, the population was discouraged, while the army was neglected and fell into disorder.

This shameful condition of things lasted for six years, only slightly relieved by occasional attempts at reform. The influence of foreign Powers and the representations made in the English Parliament, which felt itself to some extent responsible for what had occurred, produced no effect upon the dull and obstinate mind of the King. Ferdinand married Maria Isabella of Portugal in 1816, but she died at the close of 1818,

He then espoused a third wife, Josepha of Saxony, who made the Clerical influence stronger than ever. Not only the populace, but the upper classes and especially the army were honeycombed with discontent, and conspiracies were only kept down by severe measures.

At last the storm broke. On New Year's Day 1820, the troops collected in Cadiz and the neighbouring towns for the purpose of subduing the risings in the South American Republics, burst out into insurrection, under the influence of Colonel Riego and General Quiroga. They demanded that the Cortes should be re-established. The movement made way but slowly. Riego penetrated into Malaga and Cordova, but met with little support. On March 3, a rising, called by the Spaniards a pronunciamiento, took place in Corunna, and it was imitated by the other towns of Galicia. In a short time the enthusiasm spread to the rest of Spain, and in most towns and provinces the Cortes were recalled and war was declared against absolute monarchy. The King was compelled to yield. He summoned the Cortes and accepted the position of a constitutional sovereign. On March 7, the Liberals took the place of the Serviles, and the Camarilla was deprived of power. The buildings of the Inquisition were destroyed by the people. No blood was shqd except in Cadiz.

Although the Powers of Europe had protested against the government of Ferdinand, they disapproved still more strongly of his decree of March 7, which they regarded as a degradation of his sovereignty. They said that it would have been better to have perished sword in hand on the steps of the throne. The Emperor of Russia was desirous to crush the movement at once ,by force. Rut the other Powers, especially England, were not anxious to repeat the experience of Napoleon in 1808. The imprisoned Liberals were once more restored to the light of day, and the bureaucracy was

reformed, But when the Cortes met on July 9, the Radicals, or Exaltados, had already gained a victory over the Liberals. Moderation was discouraged, and there was a danger of the necessary conditions of government being destroyed. Riego, who commanded the national army of San Fernando, was exalted by the Radicals into the position of a dictator. His name became famous throughout Europe, like the name of Garibaldi at a later period. But the new Government had no money ; their plan was to do away with taxes which were paid by the people, and to throw the whole burden of expense upon the Grandees, who were the possessors of the soil.

The Moderate party in the Cortes were in a difficult position. They succeeded in excluding Riego from Madrid, and banishing him to Oviedo. But they were cheated by the King, whose only object was to regain the power which he had lost. His plan, thus far, was to discourage the Moderates, and to press the Cortes to extreme measures. They rewarded the officers and soldiers who had laboured for the restoration of freedom, they filled the public offices with patriots, they passed measures abolishing entails and trusts and everything which tended to interfere with the freedom of the soil, they forbade the Ctn/rch and other institutions to hold land in mortmain. These proposals roused the opposition of the Serviles and the Clericals. The King was pressed by his confessors and the Queen to defend the Church against the godless revolution. On October 23, after long hesitation, he signed a law depriving the monastries of their landed property. War to the knife was declared between the Constitutional party and the Camarilla.

In the beginning of 1821, the Clerical party began to form Juntas and an army of faith in order to free Ferdinand from the fetters of the Constitutionalists.

One of the King's chaplains, Vinuesa, determined to attempt a *coup d\(tat.* Both parties armed themselves,. and Vinuesa was murdered in the prison into which he had been thrown. The excitement was increased by the news of a similar rising in Italy. There was no place left for the counsels of the Moderate Party; the whole peninsula was in a condition of anarchy. In the new elections to the Chamber the Radicals gained a complete victory over the Moderates, and in February, 1822, Riego, the hero of the day, was chosen as President.

Similar events were taking place in Portugal. That country was, at the close of the eighteenth century, like Spain, under the dominion of the Camarilla and / tho clergy. The King was absolute, but left the government in tho hands of his favourites. The Cortes were no longer summoned, the Grandees held aloof from public affairs, the Catholic religion was obligatory on all, tho Church was entrusted with the censure of the Press and of books, with the care of education and with the Inquisition. The invasion of the French roused the spirit of reform. An English army occupied the country to save it from the hands of Napoleon, and a national army was organised. The royal family fled to Brazil in 1809 to escape the im/aders, and remained there after the fall of Napoleon. Marshal Beresford, the commander of the English, was appointed Regent, and exercised a despotic authority, assisted by a Junta of Regency.

There gradually grew up a patriotic party, which, like the Spanish Freemasons and the Italian Carbonari, pursued national ends by secret societies and the agitation of conspiracies. The members of these societies were especially numerous in the army, which felt bitterly the degradation of foreign rule, their previous devotion to England having been long ago turned to

hatred. Their object was to drive the English out and to found a progressive national Government. They took as their leader General Gomez Freyre de Andrada, a patriotic nobleman of high social position. The existence of this conspiracy first publicly showed itself in the refusal of certain regiments to obey the King's order to cross the ocean for the purpose of invading the Banda Oriental, in South America, on May 25, 1817. Beresford arrested a number of the ringleaders and brought them to trial. Freyre and seven others were condemned to death, and they were executed in public on October 19, one by one. They were first strangled and then burnt, and their ashes cast into the sea. On March 20, 1818, an edict was issued against clubs and secret societies : to belong to them was to be guilty of the crime of high treason. " Whoever sells, gives, lends or lets pass out of his hands a medal, seal, symbol, engraving, book, catechism, or instruction having anything to do with these accursed societies shall be punished by transportation extending from four to ten years."

These measures could only have the result of bringing about what they were intended to prevent. On August 24, 1820, whilst Beresford was on a visit to the Portuguese Court at Rio, a revolution broke out in Oporto, under Colonel Sepulveda. A provisional Junta was formed, under Count Silvcria, to carry on the government in the name of the King until the Cortes should have drawn up a Constitution. The example given by Oporto was followed by Lisbon and other towns. The Regency lost its head, and issued foolish proclamations. The Portuguese soldiers refused to obey their English officers. On September 15 a general Junta, with the Bishop at its head, undertook the duties of government, and sent a member of the Regency to Brazil to acquaint the King

with what had occurred. When Lord Beresford returned from Rio he was not allowed to land at Lisbon, and proceeded to London to beg Lord Castlereagh to intervene in the affairs of Portugal. Rut the English Cabinet was not willing to undertake tho task. At the beginning of 1821 the Cortes was summoned to meet at Lisbon. They were told at their opening that King John VI. had determined to return to Portugal and to leave the administration of Brazil in the hands of his son Pedro. He landed at Lisbon on May 3, 1821.

The King gave his consent to the new Constitution, which was founded upon tho principle of national sovereignty. The place held by Riego in Spain was taken in Portugal by Sopulveda. It was natural that a reactionary Clerical party should arise in opposition, which was inspired by the Queen Carlotta, sister of King Ferdinand of Spain. She was living apart from her husband in the palace of Queluz, and this formed a meeting-place for all the "Corcundas," or Humpbacked, as the Portuguese Serviles were called. Dom Miguel, the second son of the King, occupied a position similar to that taken by Don Carlos in Spain, and aimed at securing the Regency of an absolute monarchy. The Queen was kept in strict imprisonment in the palace of Ramalhao, and Dom Miguel was compelled by his father to take the oath to the Constitution.

After the departure of John VI. from Brazil, events had happened there which led to the separation of the two countries. When Dom Pedro was summoned to join his father in Lisbon in January, 1822, a number of Brazilian patriots, headed by Dom Jose de Andrada, persuaded him that obedience would be dangerous both to himself and to his dynasty. He, therefore, determined to remain where he was. The Cortes at Lisbon passed a resolution that, unless he obeyed within four

months, he should lose his rights to the crown. Dom Pedro now took up the position of constitutional defender of Brazil. A constituent assembly was summoned, which, on August 13, declared the entire independence of Brazil, and on October 12 proclaimed Dom Pedro as constitutional Emperor. Bahia and the northern provinces were reduced to obedience by Admiral Lord Cochrane, who was in the Brazilian service, and in July, 1823, the constitutional Empire of Brazil under Dom Pedro was an accomplished fact.

The Emperor Napoleon was the first person in modern times who brought the existence of Italy as a self-governing State within the range of practical politics. At the same time, it could hardly be said to enjoy this privilege during the period of the French domination. The.jpjeixifl-sula was divided into three parts, the Kingdom of Italy, consisting of Venetia and the Milanese, under the Viceroyalty of Eugene Beauharnais, Napoleon's stepson ; the Kingdom of Naples, under Murat, Napoleon's brother-in-law ; and the provinces annexed to the French Empire, Piedmont, Genoa, Tuscany, Parma, and Rome. During this time the family which had reigned at Turin had taken refuge in the island of Sardinia, and the Bourbon King of Naples in the island of Sicily. Italy suffered much during the French domination : it was drained both of money and men. Napoleon led 27,000 Italians into Russia, of which only 1,000 returned. But the country had been penetrated with the modern spirit : the institutions of feudalism had been undermined, and the inhabitants had received the inestimable benefits of equality before the law of personal liberty, of freedom of religion, and of the Code Napoleon, while the landed property of the convents had passed into lay hands.

Whatever may have been the faults of the Napoleonic Government, the vices of these which succeeded it were much worse. The treaties of Vienna brought back the

state of things which existed before the revolution,! except that no attempts were made to restore the republics of Venice and Genoa. The other provinces were given back to their former masters; Genoa went to swell the territory of Sardinia; the duchies of Tuscany and Modena were conferred on two Austrian archdukes; Parma fell to the Empress Marie Louise; Austria governed part of the peninsula under the title of the Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom. Most of the restored princes governed despotically.

Victor Emmanuel I., on his return to his estates, officially re-established the Church in its former position; he re-enacted the laws which punished the profanation of the host with death; he set up the ecclesiastical censure of the Press, and re-endowed the Church with the property which had been taken away from it. The University was placed under stricter supervision, and dangerous books, such as Montesquieu and Gibbon, were not allowed to be taken out by readers. Several thousands of French residents were expelled from the city; the botanical garden of Turin which had been formed by the French * was destroyed, and the beautiful bridge across the Po was only saved by a church being built at the other end of it.

The Duke of Modena re-enacted the laws of 1771, and persecuted the Jews. The States of the Church, underwent a complete transformation. The ecclesiastical government was restored. The Inquisition was brought back and all the convents were re-established. The country was divided into eighteen legations, each governed by a Cardinal-legate. All lay officials were deprived of their places, and the Code Napoleon was abolished. The French Government had introduced vaccination, and had illuminated the streets of Rome at night, but both these reforms were now abrogated. All secret societies were persecuted, especially the Free-

masons. But the Government was powerless to suppress brigandage, -and bands of marauders pillaged the Campagna up to the gates of Rome.

King Ferdinand IV. on his return to Naples preserved some of the most important French institutions. The privileges of the tiobles remained abolished, the Code Napoleon was maintained, the centralised system of administration was preserved, and the conscription was left in force. The convents were not all restored, and the bishoprics were not raised to their former number. At the same time the authority of the clergy and of the political police remained in full vigour; the government of the Cortes was absolute and was supported by the two institutions above mentioned. This policy may have disgusted those who wished for more stringent measures, but it did not content the Liberals, who desired a constitutional monarchy, which should be 'at once Liberal and lay. Metternich, who was the principal authority for the reconstruction of Europe at the time, did not improve matters by declaring that Italy was only a geographical expression.

There can be no doubt that the peninsula was, at this time, in a condition of dismemberment. The Lombardo-Venetian Kingdom was in possession of the Emperor of Austria, and an Austrian archduke reigned at Milan, while the sovereigns of Tuscany, Modena, and Parma were all Austrians. The King of Naples was bound by a promise not to introduce into his estates any institutions which were incompatible with those of Lombardy and Venice. Thus after 1815 Italy was divided into a number of small states, governed by absolute princes dependent for the most part upon Austria. What Italian patriots desired was the unity of Italy, the establishment of constitutional government, and the expulsion of the foreigner from Italian soil. The efforts to obtain this, which many years after-

wards culminated in success, are among the most heroic struggles which it is the privilege of history to record.

The soul of this Liberal movement was the society of the Carbonari, the Charcoal Burners, who, taking their origin in the Neapolitan mountains, extended their influence by Vendite or sections into all parts of the peninsula. They were opposed by the league of the Calderai, or Braziers, under the leadership of Prince Canosa. The influence of the Carbonari was chiefly felt in the middle classes and the army. The head of the Liberals was General William Pepe, and among his chief supporters was his elder brother Florestan, Colletta, the historian, and Carascosa. The news of the Spanish revolution stirred the Carbonari to action. The Vendita of Salerno sent out messengers to persuade the army and the citizens to introduce the Spanish Constitution into Naples. At the beginning of July, 1820, the flag of insurrection was raised at Avellino, and Pepe soon placed himself at the head of the movement, the insurgents taking the oath to the King and the Constitution.

When the King heard that a Constitution was the unanimous wish of the people, and that all opposition was in vain, he made over the care of the government to the Crown Prince, Francis, Duke of Calabria, who proclaimed parliamentary government on July 7. A messenger was sent to the camp of the insurgents at Monte Chiaro, to hear from Pepe's mouth what were the conditions he wished to impose. Pepe asked for himself the chief command of the army, the establishment of a council of government consisting of men favourable to the Constitution, and that the King should swear allegiance to the Constitution of Cadiz.

These propositions were agreed to, and two days later Pepe entered the capital in triumph. The officials of the Court stood on the balcony of the palace decorated with the Carbonari colours; the King and the

Regent received Pepe with gratitude. On July 13, the aged King swore allegiance to the Constitution on the Gospels, before the altar of the Cathedra], and fixing his eyes on the crucifix, added these words, " Almighty God ! Thou who readest the souls of men and the future, if I lie or break my oath, let in that moment the lightning of Thy vengeance fall upon my head ! " Then the princes took the oath, and they all embraced each other with tears of joy.

Unfortunately the revolution in Sicily took a different course. The King was not desirous of extending the Neapolitan Constitution to that island, but preferred to revive the Sicilian Constitution of 1812, so that there would bo two independent constitutional kingdoms under the same sovereign. But the patriotic ardour of the people broke through all barriers. General Church, who was sent to Sicily to command the army, was not popular either with the peoplo or tho soldiers. When he attempted to restrain his troops from following the example of their comrades on the mainland, the smouldering embers burst into flame. Palermo became the scene of wild excesses. Barelli, the Viceroy, lost his head and allowed 14,000 muskets to fall into the hands of the mob. Armed crowds marched through the streets, increased every hour by the accession of mutinous soldiers, of foreign Carbonari and Democrats, and by the convicts from the opened prisons. Public buildings, palaces, and private houses were plundered and destroyed, and prominent citizens were murdered in the streets. Barelli and Church escaped to Naples with a small handful of their troops. These scenes of disorder lasted two days. Florestan Pepe was sent to restore order, but no settlement was arrived at till the first week of October, and the arrangement then reached could not be regarded as satisfactory or permanent.

On the other hand the revolution in Naples kept within the bounds of moderation, chiefly owing to the influence of William Pepe and the Carbonari, who had a thousand Vendite in different parts of Italy, all connected with the mother society in Naples. But when Parliament opened in Naples on October 1, the outlook could scarcely be called favourable. Sicily held sullenly aloof. The oath taken by the King and the heir apparent to the Constitution could not be trusted ; the ambassadors of the new Government were not recognised in Vienna, Petersburg, or Berlin. The finances were in a bad condition, loans could not be raised in foreign countries, and yet the army had to be increased to meet the threatening preparations of Austria. The new Government clung with pedantic accuracy to the Spanish Constitution, which they very imperfectly understood. Pepe placed his resignation in the hands of the King, which to his great disappointment was accepted. Thus he lost command of the army, while he continued to be the popular leader, and was the acknowledged head of the Carbonari, and all that it implied. He made the mistake of rejecting the advice of Louis XVIII., that the new Constitution should be reformed on the French model, and was responsible for the inconsiderate cry, "The Spanish Constitution or Death!"

The news of the revolution of Naples terrified the Great Powers of Europe. In the eyes of Metternich, who directed the policy of the Holy Alliance, revolution meant anarchy and a return to chaos ; the corner-stone of order was legitimacy, people were only to enjoy the rights which sovereigns of their own free will might be inclined to grant them. The garrisons in Northern Italy wore strengthened, the Carbonari were forbidden to meet under pain of death, the smaller States were warned not to make any reforms, a rigid censure of

books and newspapers was established, distinguished writers were thrown into prison, amongst them the poet, Silvio Pellico.

The sovereigns of Austria, Russia, and Prussia met in November, 1820, at Troppau in Silesia, which was sufficiently near the dominions of all of them to be convenient. In January, 1821, they moved to Laibach in Carinthia, where the King of Naples came to meet them. Before he left his capital he gave a solemn promise that he would abide by the Constitution, and would defend it before the Congress. He sailed in an English ship to Leghorn, and travelled thence to Laibach by way of Modena.

In that city, on February 2, 1821, it was determined that the Liberal movement in Naples should be put down by force of arms. For this purpose the kingdom was to be occupied by two Austrian armies, which should, if necessary, be strengthened by ltussian troops. The news reached Naples on February 13. Parliament was immediately summoned and raised its voice against this act of treachery. Pepe took command of the forces which streamed under his banner. Colletta was made Minister of War, with Carascosa at his side. Committees and individuals vied with each other in devotion to the fatherland; the assemblies of the Carbonari resounded with patriotic speeches. The Prince Regent himself seemed to favour the movement.

An Austrian army of 43,000 men marched upon the Neapolitan frontier at the beginning of February. On February 25 Ferdinand issued a proclamation **from** Florence in which he announced his return, recommended his subjects not to resist the Austrians, who were his allies and protectors. The Prince Regent played a double part. The national troops commanded by Pepe and Carascosa were **not in a condition to resist a** highly **disciplined enemy. Pepe was defeated at**

Rieti on March 7, and many of his troops deserted. The Austrians occupied the Abruzzi as far as Aquila and Sulmona. Arms and flags were abandoned by the retreating patriots, cannon were overthrown and destroyed, earthworks and fortifications left undefended—all discipline was at an end. Pepe retired to Salerno and then to Naples. He contrived to escape, and lived an exile in foreign lands, dying at Turin in 1855. The division of Carascosa broke up in a similar manner. The Parliament dissolved itself before the end of March, Poerio taking the lead in declaring the honesty of their intentions and actions.

On May 15, 1821, the King returned to his capital, and absolutism was restored. The army was broken up and reconstructed; the Carbonari were annihilated by relentless persecution ; the Austrian occupation lasted for three years. Canosa was recalled from banishment and made Minister of Police. The galleys and the prisons were crowded with the friends of liberty. Morelli and Salvati perished by the hand of the executioner ; many of the best citizens left the kingdom ; exiled Neapolitans were seen in the streets of London, in the cities of America, and even in the Moorish states of North Africa. On treeless, rocky islands olHcers of high rank, who had fought in the cause of liberty, were manacled together with common malefactors. In the meantime the Court gave itself up to luxury and festivity, while the cost of the Austrian occupation sucked out the marrow of the land.

Three days after the combat of Rieti a similar revolution broke out in Piedmont. Indeed, enthusiasm for self-government spread from the straits of Messina to the foot of the Alps. The authorities in Milan and Laibach saw with horror that the revolution was raising its head in the rear of the Austrian armies. The Liberal party in Turin was composed principally of the

young nobles, the students of the Turin University, and the officers of the army. The movement began in January, 1821, which had to be quenched in blood. At the instance of Austria some of the most suspected Liberals—Prince Cisterna, Marchese Prierio and Perrone—were imprisoned, which only added fuel to the flame. The Count of Santarosa now placed himself at the head of the insurrection, a man of high birth and courtly manners, well educated, eloquent, and of the highest character. He and his followers placed their confidence in the heir to the throne, Prince Charles Albert of Carignan, who seemed by his admirable qualities destined to put new vigour into the House of Savoy. On March 10, 1821, two officers made themselves masters of the citadel of Alessandria, proclaimed the Spanish Constitution and the kingdom of Italy. Similar risings took place on the same day at Pinerolo and Vercelli.

A few days later the insurrectionists became masters of the citadel of Turin. The King Victor Emmanuel was in great embarrassment, especially when he was forbidden by the Great Powers at Laibach to grant any Constitution to his country. He sought a refuge which was not unknown to members of his house. On the night of March 12 he abdicated the throne in favour of his brother Charles Felix, gave the Regency to the Prince of Carignan, and retired to Nice. Charles Felix, fifty-six years old, was a strong supporter of Metternich's policy, and was the guest of the Duke of Modena. The Regent tried to pursue a middle course. He refused to place himself at the head of an army which should fight the Austrians, but at the same time he summoned an assembly of thirty notables, with whose concurrence he adopted the Spanish Constitution, formed a provisional Junta and a new ministry, with Santarosa as Minister of War. When Charles Felix

heard this he expressed his strong disapproval, and ordered the Regent to go to Novara, and there await his commands. Arrived at Novara, the Regent issued an edict complaining of the violence done to him, laying down his Regency and ordering the troops to return to the banner of the King.

This was a terrible blow to the revolutionary movement in Piedmont. Santarosa, who exercised a kind of military dictatorship, withdrew to the fortress of Alessandria. Austrian regiments under Bubna crossed the Ticino to join the forces which were faithful to the King. Santarosa marched to Novara in the hope that the royal soldiers might desert their colours. But these expectations were baseless. The battle of Novara was fought on April 8, 1821. After twelve hours' honourable conflict the revolutionary army fled in wild disorder. Turin and Alessandria were occupied, the provisional Government was dissolved, absolutism was restored. Santarosa and Collegno sought Spain or Greece, a new battle-ground for liberty. Court-martials and special commissions exercised their office under the protection of Austrian bayonets. Thes Prince of Carignan retired to Florence, and was threatened with the loss of the succession. By the middle of October everything was quiet, and Charles Felix was able to return to his capital.

The end of the Spanish revolution was as melancholy as that of the Italian. The left became more and more powerful, and opposed at once the King and the Moderates. The Radical majority showed itself wanting in the power of government. The Serviles became energetic in the provinces, the army and the people were almost in a condition of civil war, the King threw himself into the hands of the Exaltados, and sought the intervention of the European Powers. The Sovereigns who were assembled in the Congress of Verona, which had followed that of Laibach, sent a note to the Government

of Madrid, calling upon them to alter the Constitution and to giVe the King more power. The Cortes rejected the note with scorn, saying that they were determined to defend their Constitution and their independence at all costs. The foreign ambassadors now left Madrid. A French army had been collecting in the south of France which now prepared to cross the Pyrenees. The Court removed to Seville.

Without having to strike a blow, the French under the Duke of Angouleme crossed the Bidassoa and entered Vittoria. The Cortes in vain called the people to arms, they refused to move, and regarded the French as saviours sent to rescue them from a regimen of freemasonry. Mina resisted in Barcelona, Quiroga in Leon, Zayas in Castile, and Ballesteros on the frontier of Granada; but the soldiers showed little courage and deserted their colours. On May 24, 1823, the French entered Madrid in triumph and established a provisional regency. A reactionary terror now brooded over the land. In a few weeks northern and middle Spain were in the hands of the French and of the Serviles. In June the government moved with the King to Cadiz, the last refuge of freedom. The French now advanced against the city and began to besiege it. After the taking of the Trocadero the Cortes gave in, consenting to their own dissolution and the liberation of their captive sovereign.

Thus was Ferdinand restored to his throne by the help of foreign bayonets while the Apostolic party, as it was called, directed its energies towards avenging itself upon its political adversaries. Monks and priests led the way, and all that was learned and wealthy left the country. Ferdinand, "the Adored," returned to Madrid, and rejected the amnesty recommended to him by the Duke of AngoulSme. Riego, taken by treachery, died by the **hand of the** executioner, **while those of his**

supporters who were fortunate enough to escape, filled the capitals of Europe with homeless and starving exiles. Those who remained expiated the crime of patriotism in mouldering prisons. Such was the fate of freedom, such the triumph of those institutions which Napoleon had laboured to destroy. But, as Byron tells us, " Freedom's flag though torn yet flying, * streams like a thunder cloud against the wind," and we shall see how under happier auspices it was again able to assert its supremacy.

CHAPTER III

GERMANY AND AUSTRIA

THE wars of the Revolution and of Napoleon had profoundly modified the internal condition of Germany. Old institutions were swept away and the ground was prepared for a nation of the modern type. The clearance, however, had not been complete; the Emperor and the Diet had disappeared, but the Emperor and empire of Austria had taken their places. Germany was now governed by thirty-eight sovereigns instead of 300, and the ecclesiastical princes had entirely come to an end. Three great States, Bavaria, Wurtemberg, and Baden had been formed in the South, but many small Princes still remained in the North. The left bank of the Rhine, which had been directly subject to French government, still preserved the benefits of the Code Napoleon, and the blessings of a regular and uniform administration, while the sovereigns of Southern Germany had not altogether lost the inspiration of the power which had created them. Nor were the thrones of Germany entirely national; a King of Denmark reigned in Holstein, a King of England in Hanover, a King of Holland in Luxemburg. Many Germans ardently desired the unity of their country, but who should be at the head of it? Two great powers were striving for this position, and the rivalry between them has not been settled till our own day.

At the Congress of Vienna Germans felt the necessity of forming a new State, which should be able to resist the attacks of France, formidable even under the restored Bourbons, but the precise character which this State should take was a matter of serious dispute. Baron Stein, the liberator of Germany, was anxious to restore the ancient Empire, with a Directory of the chief princes to manage affairs of common interest.

But the Emperor of Austria did not wish to establish a system in which the influence of the King of Prussia would be superior to his own, whilst the smaller German princes had no desire to sacrifice anything of the independence which they had gained by the dissolution of the Empire in 1806. Eventually, on June 18, 1815, the day of the Battle of Waterloo, an Act of Confederation was signed between the sovereign princes and the Free Towns which united them in a permanent alliance, called the German Confederation, der deutsche Bund, the object of which was to safeguard the external and internal security, the independence and integrity of the component states.

The constitutional organ of the Confederation was the Federal Assembly generally called the " Bundestag," which sat permanently at Frankfort, and was attended by representatives from each state, under the presidence of Austria. In the discussion of ordinary affairs the eleven largest states had a vote apiece, and the rest six votes between them. The decision about important matters was given in a " Plenum " in which out of 69 votes Austria and the five kingdoms had four votes each, the five states next in importance three each, the next three, two, and all the rest one. It was the business of this assembly to draw up the fundamental laws and organic institutions of the Confederation, with reference to all its affairs, foreign, military and domestic, but each state retained its own army, govern-

ment, and diplomatic arrangements. There was no Federal Tribunal, and the Confederation sent no ambassadors to foreign powers, the princes remained practically sovereigns and the assembly was only a Congress of their ambassadors.

The assembly ought to have met on September 1, 1815, but its first meeting did not take place till November 5, 1816. It soon became a proverb for inertness and inefficiency. Nothing important could, be done without the unanimous consent of all the members. In order to veto it was only necessary to abstain from voting, a method which was largely followed by the smaller states. The slowness of the Diet was worse than that of our own Court of Chancery. The officials of the Imperial Court of Justice began to claim the arrears due to them from the year 1806 in 1816, and were not paid till 1831. The war debts contracted between 1792 and 1801 were not paid till 1843 ; the final obligations of the Thirty Years' War were not liquidated until 1850; the fortresses for which France had paid in 1815 were not built in 1825, because the Diet had not made up its mind between the comparative merits of Ulm and Rastadt.

Each sovereign Prince was master of the government of his own dominions, he could give them what constitution he pleased, or none at all. We find that practically three classes of government prevailed. In the first, which was pure absolutism, the Prince reigned alone with his functionaries and ministers, without any control or any meeting of the chambers. Such was the government of Austria and Prussia, and of some of the northern princes, notably the Elector of Hesse, who summoned his Chambers in 1816, but dismissed them immediately afterwards, and governed by himself. The greater part of the northern princes adopted the principle Landstande, or assemblies of Estates, formed from

the notables of the country for the purpose of voting taxes and guaranteeing loans, with a certain power of representing grievances. A few Princes, especially in the South, gave their countries a written constitution after the model of France. But the Prince always remained sovereign, he chose whom he pleased for ministers, and reserved the initiative of laws. The example of this liberal movement was set by the Grand-Duke of Saxe-Weimar, the friend and protector of Goethe. He gave his subjects a constitution, and placed it under the guarantee of the Confederation. His Chambers had some real power, and he abolished the censorship of the Press. Following this example, Bavaria in May 1818, Baden in August 1818, Wurtemberg in 1819, and Hesse-Darmstadt in 1820, gave their subjects written constitutions of a more or less liberal character.

The results of the Congress of Vienna were a bitter disappointment to all German liberals. A system of reaction was established in nearly all the members of the Confederation. Germany had risen against foreign domination with all the enthusiasm of youth, and, as a reward for its devotion to the cause of freedom, it found itself without a national existence, cut up into tiny states, ground down by officials, by police, and by nobles, without political rights or equality before the law. The Holy Alliance seemed to the German people an ill-omened conspiracy of Princes against the rights and liberties of their subjects. It was approved by neither section of German patriots, neither by those who had desired a restoration of the German .Empire, with reformed institutions, nor by those who preferred a constitutional government upon the English model. The sovereign princes who had been mediatised, and the nobles who had been deprived of their privileges swelled the throng of the disaffected.

Prussia had taken the lead in the national rising againat Napoleon, and the hopes of patriots had been fixed on her. But she betrayed their expectations, and attached herself to the cause of Metternich and reaction. The unstable and impulsive King neglected and slighted the men who had been most forward in the assertion of national liberty, while reactionary statesmen were decorated with orders and titles. The time for framing a liberal constitution was indefinitely postponed.

The system of reaction was not only enforced by authority, but it was taught by political philosophers. Professor Haller, of Bern, published *The Restoration of the Political Sciences*, in which he ascribed to the ruler a natural and inherent right to the personal property of his dominions. As property existed before the State, so did the ruler exist before his people, and was consequently above them. That a body of nobility should stand by the side of the Prince was equally a provision of nature, they were responsible to the ruler alone, as the ruler was to God. This book became the gospel of the aristocratic party. On the other hand, while the elder liberals looked to the teachings of history and to the examples of England and France, their younger colleagues were filled with ideal dreams of the restoration of a medieval democracy, which could lead to no practical result. The strength of the liberal party lay in the Universities, the Press, and in the provincial assemblies. Each of these bodies was marked out for vengeance. The provincial assemblies were threatened, the freedom of the Press was almost destroyed, and the universities were persecuted. The struggle between these conflicting principles lasted for half a century, and we shall have to trace its course during a large portion of that time.

Amongst liberal universities that of Jena was the most prominent, being under the protection of the

Grand Duke, Carl August, of Weimar, the bosom friend of the poet Goethe. It was the centre of an enlightened periodical press. There took its rise the Burschenschaf t, or Association of Students, the name of which demands some explanation. A German student in his first year is called a Fuchs or fox, in his second year he becomes a "Bursch," "man," or "fellow," as it may be translated. The students used the political freedom which was denied to their elders, and formed a community characterised by a scientific and progressive patriotism, with a strict morality founded upon religion. New songs were written to express these new sentiments which were sung with enthusiasm at their convivial gatherings or Kneipen. Their ensign was a banner of black, red, and gold, which are now the colours of United Germany. Giessen caught the enthusiasm from Jena, and it soon spread throughout the Universities of the Fatherland. Another movement which disguised political agitation under the veil of social enthusiasm was the Turnen or Gymnastics, founded by Father Jahn. Both these movements were regarded with suspicion by the reactionaries as the hot-beds of revolutionary ideas.

In 1817 the three hundredth anniversary of the German Reformation was celebrated with great enthusiasm. As part of this, a festival was held at the Wartburg, near Eisenach, on October 18, the anniversary of the battle of Leipzig, by the students of Jena and other Universities. Speeches were made, and songs were sung, and at the close of the festivities, the books of Kotzebue, Haller, and other writers who had defended absolutism, were burnt in a bonfire composed of pigtails, corsets, corporals' sticks, and other emblems of the military regime. This called forth an outcry of opposition, which carried away even such men as Stein and Niebuhr. The Great Powers put diplomatic pressure on the government of Weimar to stop these extravagances, and Carl August

was compelled to confine the liberty of the Press. It is difficult to restrain enthusiasm within due limits, however respectable may be its origin. The hatred of the students was directed against two " Russian spies," who had made themselves conspicuous in denouncing the excesses of the Universities. These were Stourdza, a Moldavian magnate, and Kotzebue, who edited a paper which supported the privileges of princes and nobles. A student of Jena named Sand, who had been present at the Wartburg festival, conceived the horrible idea of ridding Germany and the world of Kotzebue, the traitor to the Fatherland. In student circles assassination had been advocated as a legitimate defence against tyranny. The wretched boy betook himself to Mannheim, and approaching the unsuspecting old man with a letter, stabbed him as he was reading it. He then tried to kill himself. The murder of Kotzebue took place on March 23, 1819, and Sand, healed of his wounds, was executed on May 20, 1820. Such was the political inexperience of the " Burschenschaft," that this gruesome crime was glorified into an act of heroism. Sand was compared to Brutus and to Harmodius and Aristogeiton. Even grave professors shed a tear of pity over the murderer. A few months later, on July 1, Karl Loning, a chemist in Schwalbach, tried to assassinate Ibell, Prime Minister of Nassau. Another source of disorder was the persecution of the Jews in South Germany, where whole populations raised the ancient cry of " Hep ! Hep ! " All this led to a persecution of the democrats, and shelved the question of constitutional reform for a long interval.

The reformers indeed had been, at first, not without reason to hope. The Diet, the composition of which has been already described, met in the stately Thurn and Taxis Palace at Frankfort, on November 8, 1816, under the presidency of the Austrian deputy, Count

Buol-Schauenstein. It had guaranteed the liberal constitution of Saxe-Weimar and other small States, while it had rebuked the exercise of arbitrary government in electoral Hesse. But these hopes were soon disappointed, and the Diet either confined itself to the sphere of the higher police, or sank into the nothingness of silence.

A stronger instrument was needed to meet the excitements of the time. Austria and Prussia came to an agreement, called a "Punctation" at Teplitz, on August 1, 1819. The aged Hardenberg, the Minister of Prussia, bowed before the stronger will of Metternich. It was determined to hold a conference of the ten larger powers at Carlsbad, from August 6 to August 13.

Article 13 of the Act of Confederation had conceded to all German States the power of making provincial constitutions. Metternich and Gentz could not abrogate this article, but they proceeded to interpret it. They distinguished between a parliament of Estates and a parliament of Deputies; the first was ancient, historical, German and divine, the second modern, revolutionary, and French, inconsistent with the German Confederation and the principle of monarchy. The most important conclusions arrived at in the Carlsbad conferences were as follows: — 1. Limitation of the liberty of the Press. 2. Precautionary measures against the excesses of Universities and Schools. 3. The establishment of a central committee at Mainz to control demagogic and revolutionary movements. 4. The interpretation of article 13 with regard to provincial assemblies. 5. The creation of a provisional power to carry these measures into effect.

The Black Commission, as it was called, sat at Mainz for ten years, and created more conspiracies than it discovered. The results of the Carlsbad conferences were most disastrous. The Moderates lost all

hope of a peaceful settlement. Republican ideas now for the first time began to make their appearance, when German Princes came forward as the sworn enemies of popular freedom. The noble patriotic feeling of the War of Liberation ended in smoke. It was felt that the blood of Leipzig and Waterloo had been shed in vain. Prussia led the van in reaction, as she had before in liberty. The gymnastic halls were closed, the German tricolour was proscribed, and Father Jahn had to take refuge in Switzerland. Famous professors were deprived of their offices or subjected to police supervision. The sermons of Schleiermacher were delivered in the presence of official censors, and a new edition of Fichte's *Address to the German People* was forbidden. Even Stein and Gneisenau did not escape rebuke. To whisper the word "German Nation" was a crime, to work for it was high treason. Informers were highly rewarded. The Burschenschaft left behind it a noble hymn set to the most pathetic of melodies —"Our house is ruined, but the spirit lives in all of us, and our fortress is God."

After the Carlsbad conferences all the members of the Confederation were summoned to meet at Vienna, where the discussions lasted from November, 1819, to May, 1820. A Final Act was passed on June 8 of that year. It did not fulfil all the aspirations of Metternich, but it insisted on the sovereign rights of Princes, on their independence of Parliamentary control, and on the duty of the central authority to preserve internal order if it should be endangered, nor was freedom of expression permitted either in the Chambers or in the Press. It is useless to trace the history of the German Diet, which slumbered at Frankfort until it was awakened by the thunderclap of the Revolution of July. But it may be well to give an account of the constitutional conflict as it was repre-

sented in the several German States. Here a marked difference was noticeable between the North and the South. In the North we find a stubborn immobility, a return to aristocratic absolutism, to the Government of officials, to the policy of a Restoration; in the South are presented to us movement, innovation, and unrest. The reason is to be found in the divergent history of the two regions. In the North the reigning houses had been driven out and their places taken by the Kingdom of Westphalia, so that the return of the legitimate dynasties was accompanied by hatred of everything which had found fa^ **} in French eyes. As the government of Napoleon had, upon the whole, favoured progress, so the restored governments were hostile to progress. In the South the reigning families had been fostered by Napoleon, and had been raised by him in rank and importance. They had become familiar with modern principles of government, and were not disposed to break with their past. They remained, therefore, a nucleus of liberty, and the hopes of patriots were directed towards them rather than to the Great Powers of Prussia and Austria. It is indeed remarkable that Prussia, the very reason of whose existence was Liberal opposition to a retrogade Austria, should in this crisis have deserted the cause of freedom.

The reasons for this were various. The King Frederick William III. was weak, and his Minister, Hardenberg, was old and not inclined to make head against powerful forces. In January, 1819, William von Humboldt was recalled from his embassy in London and placed in the Cabinet as a constitutional minister. He was entrusted with the duty of calling into life the representative assembly, which had been promised by the Act of Federation. Before the end of the year he resigned, together with his two colleagues, Boyen and Beyme, disheartened by the resolutions of

Carlsbad, and disgusted by the Mainz Commission. His plan of a constitution remained unfulfilled.

Hardenberg died in November 1822, having outlived his reputation. He was hated by the reactionaries, suspected by the conservatives, and despised by the liberals. Still his death removed the barriers which had kept the reactionary party within bounds. The Church, the schools, and the Press were now kept under close supervision. The Universities were controlled with especial severity. Prussians were forbidden to attend the Universities of Jena and Tiibingen, and lectures of a suspicious character were stopped. Newspapers were forbidden to discuss internal affairs, dangerous books were confiscated, no one was allowed to dissent from the Evangelical creed of the Sovereign. At last on June 6, 1823 all hopes of a constitutional government were put an end to by the establishment of Provincial Estates, which tended to divide the kingdom instead of uniting it. The Prussian mountain after an eight years' labour produced an Austrian mouse. Even the organisation of the Estates led to conflict. The Rhine Provinces succeeded in preserving the Code Napoleon, and the French system of judicature, which included trial by jury, although it was violently attacked.

It would be beyond our province to enter into a particular description of the Prussian system of government during these years of conflict, but it should be remarked that, in spite of police supervision and the persecution of democratic opinions, the enlightened system of public education in Prussia suffered neither check nor hindrance. Next to the name of Wilhelm von Humboldt, who may be regarded as the founder of Prussian education, stands that of Karl zum Altenstein, who held the portfolio of public instruction from 1817 to 1838. He was checked in his beneficent work

neither by the Carlsbad decrees nor by want of money. In 1818 he opened the University of Bonn, a centre of enlightenment to the Catholic Rhine Provinces. Halle revived the ancient glories of Wittenberg. The number of secondary and elementary schools increased every year. It mattered comparatively little whether the system of government was democratical or tyrannical, whether the discussion of public affairs was openly allowed or hushed in ignominious silence, provided that the great school system of Prussia was building up a generation which would be able under happier auspices to vindicate once more for its country the place which she had once occupied as the head of liberalism and the champion of progress.

In Saxony, Friedrich August I., the friend and ally of Napoleon, reigned till 1827. It is curious that the old traditions of the Saxon monarchy had not been destroyed during the period of the French domination, so that after 1815 there was nothing to restore. The country pursued its sleepy way. The peasants were oppressed by their lords, but their irritation against them was chocked by their hatred of the Prussians whom they could not forgive for stealing so much of their territory. Hanover felt the full severity of a restoration under the protecting care of England. The French Codes and systems of judicature were abolished, even sorfdom and the rack were brought back. All power was in the hands of the nobles and the civil service. The Tory Cabinet of Great Britain was eager to exhibit to Europe how a German state ought to be governed. Still in December 1819 it became necessary to create a parliament of two chambers, in which the people had very little to discuss except the amount of taxes which they might be forced to pay. Thus Hanover slept in apparent peace till roused by the outburst of 1830.

Brunswick was administered by the Prince Regent, afterwards George IV., for the young Duke Charles, whose father fell at Quatre Bras. When Duke Charles came to his throne in 1823, he was found to be an ill-educated, obstinate, and conceited young man, of autocratic ideas, who threw himself with ardour into the Metternich policy of counter-revolution. He disgusted all classes, the highest as well as the lowest, until the revolution of 1830 drove him from his throne and his country.

The spirit of reaction reached its extreme limit in Electoral Hesse, which had been part of the Kingdom of Westphalia. Here all the French institutions, however favourable to freedom, were done away with, and the former state of things, however absurd and disastrous, was restored; the chaotic confusion of the law, the exaction of personal service, the guilds, the distinctions of rank, the denial of the higher education to all who were not the sons of officials, were all brought back. The ministry deserved and obtained the title of the Seven Sleepers, having slumbered through the seven years of foreign rule. The only instances in which the Elector deigned to recognise the government of Jerome, were when it was favourable to his pocket. The old taxes were recalled to life, but the new ones were not abrogated. The obligations of the Westphalian debt were ignored, while the depreciation of the old Hessian debt was maintained. The country was plunged into poverty, there was no commerce and little agriculture. The estates were convoked with the addition of an Estate of peasants, to counteract the influence of the nobles, but after a year's experience the Chambers were dissolved and the Prince governed by his own arbitrary will. His son who succeeded him in 1821 did not make things better. Threats of revolution were met with measures of the cruellest severity. In no part of Germany was

the prospect of a change of system more joyfully welcomed.

Thuringia offers to us a more cheerful prospect, where the Saxon duchies of the Ernestine line followed the example set them by Carl August, the Grand Duke of Saxe-Weimar, who had made Weimar in our modern age the representative and the rival of Athens in the ancient world. Mecklenburg, divided between the lines of Schwerin and Strelitz, still clung to the ancient ways. Serfdom was not finally abolished till 1820, and after that the position of the peasants continued to be very hard. Oldenburg was no better. Of the numerous Free Towns of the old German Empire, the treaty of Vienna left only four, Hamburg, Lubeck, Bremen, and Frankfort. The three first, known as the Hansa towns, returned to their ancient constitutions, while Frankfort, the birth-place of Goethe, as Weimar was his home, adopted reforms which corresponded to modern conditions, which have made it in our own day one of the most prosperous as well as one of the richest cities in Europe.

Among the South German States, Bavaria had been more than any other under the influence of Napoleon. This had made the people familiar with a policy of progress, and they were further influenced by a desire to act in every way contrary to the example and principles of Prussia. Bavaria was governed for nearly twenty years by the Prime Minister Montgelas, who was in sympathy with liberal ideas, and was also a devoted adherent of the French. He had succeeded in bringing his country, penetrated with medieval traditions, into harmony with modern practice. Under his rule Bavaria attained to something of an independent position in Europe, and many of his institutions have lasted to the present day. He was succeeded by Count Bechberg, who established a constitution which gave equality be-

fore the law, security of persons and property, religious toleration, and a system of parliamentary legislation. Under him popular government became a reality.

Ludwig I., who occupied the Bavarian throne from 1817 to 1848, was one of the most remarkable of German sovereigns. His services to art and literature, his creation of Munich as a home of the Muses, place him upon a pinnacle of eminence. Although somewhat eccentric, he was a most striking and influential personality. He ordered his life on democratic principles, associating with all classes of men in all parts of JEurope. But his political capacity and conduct were loss admirable than his aesthetic qualities. He had no objection to sketching out plans of popular government, but he had not the will, the tenacity, or the moderation to carry them into effect. He became the slave of his whims and fancies, and later of his passions, and his reign, which began with lofty hopes and achieved many triumphs, ended in disaster and disgrace.

Wiirttemberg was also closely connected with France. After 1815, an attempt was made to combine the traditions of feudal monarchy with the requirements of the new democracy. But it was soon found that these ideals were irreconcilable, and the conflict which resulted from the attempt to unite them was severe. King William L, who reigned from 1816 to 1864, was able to introduce a workable constitution in 1819, and Wurtemberg has continued to live under its protection till our own day. But the Swabians are less active and energetic than their Bavarian neighbours. Public affairs pursued a sleepy course, and if the rights of the people were gradually forgotten, there was no tyrannical oppression to recall them to remembrance. Charles Frederick of Baden, who died in 1811, had reigned for seventy-three years. Under his grandson Charles a constitution came into force in 1819, which gave **full**

scope to liberal legislation. Even when the Parliament gave place to a system of Estates, political activity did not disappear. Unfortunately, his successor, Ludwig, fell gradually under the influence of Metternich, and there were constant struggles between the Grand Duke and the Estates, in which the historian and publicist, Rotteck, led the opposition, while the sovereign was supported by the influence of Vienna. To this country, also, the Revolution of July gave a promise of hope for the future. We must here leave the smaller German States and pass to the consideration of Austria.

The fall of Napoleon found the Emperor Francis upon the throne of Austria, and he occupied it till 1835. The irony of fate had placed this narrow, obstinate and petty mind in the central point of some of the most important political convulsions which have ever shaken the world. His nature hated everything new either in persons or events, he longed for the uniform life of a clerk. All movement, excitement, desire of novelty was as repulsive to him as it was acceptable to his uncle Joseph II. His favourite expression, when any new project was brought before him, was "We must sleep upon it." His feeble mind had received a worthless education. He was popular with his subjects because he possessed the democratic familiarity and good humour so often found among the Hapsburgs. But this appearance of good nature was compatible with cruelty, insensibility, calculating caution and suspicion. He was jealous of the Archduke Charles, the one member of the Imperial family who was worthy of his position. He was supposed to be moral himself, but he lived contentedly in the midst of a dissolute court, and his favourites were men of abandoned character. As head of the Government he did little but interfere, and, like a weak despot, he was surrounded with spies. He mistrusted himself, but mistrusted

others a hundred-fold more. To his shallow spirit the important was an object of dread, the petty, in proportion to its pettiness, an object of importance.

It was only natural that the real conduct of affairs should be in the hands of others. The true ruler of Austria, and to a large extent of Europe, was the Chancellor, Prince Clemens Wenzel Lothar Metternich, who held that office for nearly forty years, from 1809 to 1848. Devoted to the conduct of foreign policy, he did not desire that his plans should be obstructed by any movements of internal reform. He was good looking and had the manners of a finished courtier, combined with a personal charm which fascinated those with whom he was brought into contact. But he was essentially an opportunist, endowed with a frivolous and superficial nature. He had no settled scheme of action, no strong sense of duty, no fixed moral principles, no fund of political knowledge, no statesmanlike instinct. His rule of conduct was to set himself against everything which tended either to exalt or to improve the condition of humanity. He was a spirit who always said "no," or who acted it without saying it. He had the dawdling way, the indifference, the shallowness, the immorality and the hard-heartedness of Talleyrand, but he lacked those high qualities of courage, of insight, of sanity in the conduct of great affairs, which place his French rival almost in the front rank of statesmen. Napoleon not only controlled his age, formed a new France and went far to form a new Europe, but by his very superfluity of intellect he created an opposition to himself which might suffice to clothe a characterless spirit with the appearance of reality. Metternich **found** this shell and occupied it. It was a sufficient programme for him to undo the work of the grteat Emperor, **and** to check every impulse which might again awaken it into activity.

Under the auspices of these leaders, the key-note of the Austrian Government was the preservation of so-called stability. Things were to be because they had been. The populations submitted themselves to this *regime* with passive good humour, strengthened by a memory of disturbing war. The French institutions which had found their way into Illyria, the Tyrol, and Salzburg were abolished without remonstrance. The Empire went to sleep, satisfied if its existence was assured. Even the army decayed, and became a pleasant club for the officers, and a system of penal servitude for the men. The Civil Service was inefficient and corrupt, the administration lost in circumlocution, the administration of justice slow and uncertain.

Such was the "worm-eaten house" which the Emperor was afraid to touch lest it should fall to pieces. What wonder that the Hungarian Estates were not summoned for thirteen years, nor the Transylvanian for twenty-three! The Parliaments were composed of nobles and clergy, the towns were scarcely represented and the people not at all. The object of the Emperor was rather to govern the discordant elements of his dominions by dividing them, than to weld them into a consolidated whole. All external influence was kept aloof. Books, newspapers, and even letters were subjected to a severe censure. No Austrian was allowed to attend a foreign University, nor were foreigners admitted to Austrian Universities. In the Italian provinces all Italian literature was forbidden, Dante as well as Leopardi. Austria knew nothing of the spiritual life of Germany. The present writer can remember when, under Austrian rule, it was not safe to speak aloud in Verona, Venice or Milan. Metternich had spread his spies over all the territories of the double eagle. Of the Church it is

hardly necessary to speak, of its enormous possessions, both in land and manufactures, its countless monasteries, its monks and friars, and above all its Jesuits. In education, the higher establishments presented some names of distinction in literature and art; hard, intellectual study flourished in many branches, but not in history or philosophy. Nothing, however, was done for the instruction of the people, while that of the upper and middle classes was formal and narrow. In the Austria of Metternich feudalism still held its own, and a land which might have been the granary of Europe, offered wide tracts of untilled desert to the gaze of the jaded traveller.

Metternich lived long enough to see the absolute failure of his system. His Austria had fulfilled her mission neither at home nor abroad. She had not carried German culture to the East, nor had she defended the Danubian Provinces from the attacks of Russia. She had seen the protectorate of Greece and Turkey pass into the hands of England, Russia, and France. A policy of " Bread and Circus-games " had corrupted the people, a system of spies and police had deprived it of all energy and initiative. Metternich would have made other nations what he made his own country. He did his best to crush all noble effort in Spain, Portugal, and Switzerland. The hope of the future lay in freedom and enlightenment, and he had nothing to offer but reaction and obscurantism.

CHAPTER IV

GREECE

THE flame of revolution which was shortly to spread over Europe, and to put an end to the condition of things which we have described in the preceding chapters, was first lighted in Greece. Greece was at this time a province of the Turkish Empire. The Sultan of Turkey was Mahmoud II., who occupied the throne of Constantinople from 1808 to 1839. Mahmoud was a reformer at heart, but, warned by the fate of his predecessor, Selim III., he carefully concealed his designs. To relate the treason, the betrayal, and the murder of AH Pasha of Janina, the capital of Albania, the friend of Byron, scarcely lies within our scope. He perished on February 5, 1822. After his death the standard of revolt was raised by the Christian Armatoli, who inhabited the fastnesses of the Cambunian Mountains, and who found a congenial leader in Odysseus, a Klepht or brigand, the son of a Greek father and an Albanian mother. Before this time a number of literary and artistic associations had been formed in Greece under the name of Hetairiai; they extended throughout Livadia, the Morea, and Epirus, and had branches in other parts of the Turkish dominions, in which there was a Christian population. With an outward appearance of harmlessness they were distinctly a political organisation. Their object was to

set the Greeks free from Turkish rule, with the help of Russia, and with this object they took an oath to withstand the enemies of their faith and their freedom unto death.

Their first operations were directed towards the Danubian principalities of Wallachia and Moldavia. The Hetairiai were assisted by a number of Philhellenic societies which were established in diflferent parts of Europe. The idea of the independence of nationalities and of their right to govern themselves was then beginning to make its way in opposition to the principle of legitimacy, which had inspired the counsels of the Congress of Vienna, and it was not yet weakened by the belief in force, and by the fatalistic acceptation of the doctrine of the survival of the fittest, which seems likely in our own day to bo the parent of much tyranny and injustice. One of the most prominent Philhellenes was the poet Byron, who is admired outside his own country not more for his transcendent literary genius, than for his enthusiasm for the liberation of Italy and Greece. The English Tories partly ridiculed and partly crushed these aspirations. They were afraid of losing the Ionian Islands, which had been placed under the protection of England, they mistrusted Russia, and they could not see that the liberation of Greece would produce any advantage to English trade.

On March 8, 1821, a proclamation was posted in the streets of Jassy, the capital of Moldavia, which summoned the Greeks to arms, to fight for their rights and liberties against the degenerate descendants of Darius and Xerxes. The proclamation had been drawn up by Alexander Ypsilanti, a Fanariot, or Byzantine Greek, of ancient lineage, who had fought in the service of Russia against Napoleon, had lost a hand in the battle of Dresden, and who together with Capodistrias of

Corfu, **then minister of foreign affairs at St. Petersburg,** enjoyed the special favour of the Emperor Alexander. At this time the Great Powers were assembled in the Congress of Laibach, and Metternich did his best to exaggerate the danger of the movement, connecting it with the disturbances in Spain, Portugal, Italy, and §outh America, with which it had, in fact, nothing to do. He persuaded the Emperor Alexander to withhold his support and to express his disapproval, and he found in Castlereagh a willing ally in a similar course of action. He even took the trouble to meet George IV. himself on German soil, and to secure his powerful aid. The proclamation was the direct result of the action of the Hetairiai. It was obeyed by a certain number of Greek patriots, and the Turks advanced into the Principalities to crush the insurrection. At Skuleni, on the Pruth, fell Athanasius, the first martyr of Greek freedom. In the battle of Dragatshan, fought on June 19, 1821, Nicholas Ypsilanti, the brother of Alexander, was entirely defeated after an heroic resistance. Alexander took refuge in Austria, where he died in 1828. The Turks annihilated their antagonists with their usual ruthless cruelty.

Contemporaneous with this uprising in Moldavia, was a similar awakening in the Morea. The Greek islands, Roumelia and Thessaly, followed the example; the mariners of Hydra and Spezzia threw in their lot with the Peloponnesus; the voice of freedom was heard throughout the Cyclades, the Sporades, in Euboea, and the Gulf of Volo, while Odysseus and Guras raised the standard of insurrection in Boeotia, The Turks exacted their characteristic vengeance. Gregorius, the patriarch of Constantinople, Primate of the Greek Church, was arrested after the Easter Mass, and hanged at the door of his own Cathedral. The Metropolitans of Ephesus, Nicomedia, and Anchialus, suffered the same

fate. This system of barbarity reached its climax in the massacres of Chios, which took place in the months of April and June 1822, and even in those slumberous times aroused the horror of the civilised world. This fertile and happy island was turned into a desert by the troops of the Capitan Pasha. Murder and robbery, the violation of women and children, and the desecration of sacred edifices, vied with each other in forming a carnival of lust and slaughter. Of the inhabitants, 23,000 were killed, 47,000 were sold intp slavery, and only 5,000 escaped. By the heroism of Canaris and Miaulis the Turkish fleet was attacked, the flagship of the admiral was blown up; the Capitan Pasha, severely wounded, tried to save himself by swimming, only to perish on the very spot upon which he had executed the Chian hostages.

On the mainland things went better for the Greeks. The Mainotes rose under Peter Mavromichalis. Colocotronis, of Messenia, proved himself a second, Epaminondas. He surrounded the Turks in Tripolitza. and defeated them at Valtetsi. At last on January 1, 1822, the first Greek National Assembly was held at Piadha, in the neighbourhood of Epidaurus, under the presidency of Alexander Mavrocordato, in which the essential elements of a constitution received their form. The Philhellenic Societies assisted the struggling patriots with money and with men. The Princes under the spell of Metternich looked on with indifference, but battalions of European Crusaders marched into Hellas to defend the cause of liberty and civilisation.

Up to the year 1825 the cause of the Greeks prospered. The Turkish general Dramalis, after turning Argolis into a desert, was drawn by Colocotronis into Corinth where he died. Odysseus could not be driven out of Athens, the Turks were repulsed from the walls of Missolonghi. The Sultan in his despair turned to

his vassal Mehemet Ali, the Viceroy of Egypt. After subduing Crete, by the usual Turkish methods, Mehemet Ali sent his adopted son Ibrahim to the Morea, where his well disciplined regiments soon altered the condition of affairs. Colocotronis was made a prisoner, Navarino was forced to capitulate in May 1825. During two years the Egyptian armies desolated the Peloponnesus with organised and calculated savagery. Towns and villages were reduced to ashes, the corpses of men and women were left a prey to the vulture and the dog, the churches were destroyed and the priests who served them hanged. Botsaris, the hero of the Suliotes, fell on the field of battle; Odysseus, who had been taken prisoner, was found with shattered limbs at the foot of the Acropolis. At last, on April 12, 1826, after an heroic resistance, the fortress of Missolonghi fell, which two years before had been the grave of Byron.

These misfortunes roused the ardour of the Philhellenes throughout the world. They strained every nerve to supply the Greeks with arms, money, men, and steamships. Admiral Cochrane, afterwards Lord Dundonald, gave his assistance to the Grecian lleet; General Church lent his aid to the army. Even that converted libertine, Charles X., the champion of legitimacy and absolutism, began to coquet with the Hellenic cause. Happily George Canning was at the head of the English Foreign Office. A Tory at home, he had always been favourable to liberty abroad, and was the foe of the Holy Alliance. At a banquet at Harwich he proclaimed the policy of England to be civil and religious liberty all over the world. The Greeks turned to him with hope, as to a second Byron.

In order to understand these events we must direct our attention to the position of Russia. It became obvious towards the end of 1825 that the Emperor

Alexander was gradually retiring from the position of the Holy Alliance. He was also beginning to treat with England as to an interference in the affairs of Greece. Canning met the Tsar more than half way, and an agreement was on the point of being signed when the Emperor died suddenly at Taganrog on December 1, 1825. His successor Nicholas was not supposed to be favourable to the policy of Metternich. The Duke of Wellington was sent as special ambassador to Saint Petersburg to congratulate the Tsar on his accession, and he took the opportunity of sounding him as to his attitude with regard to Greek affairs. A protocol between England and Russia was signed on April 4, 1826, by which freedom of government, of commerce, and of worship was to be secured to Greece, on the condition of her acknowledging the suzerainty of the Porte, and paying a fixed tribute. The protocol was communicated secretly to Vienna, Paris, and Berlin, as a means of putting an end to the Greek war, but at the same time it put an end to the policy of the Holy Alliance. Metternich was deeply disgusted and called it a miserable business. It soon became public property by being published in the *Times* newspaper.

In the autumn of 1826, Canning visited Paris, and found the French ministry not indisposed to join him. They suggested that the 8t. Petersburg protocol should be changed into a formal treaty. Canning, however, in deference to the opinion of Wellington, rejected the advice of Lieven, the Russian ambassador, that England and Russia should put pressure upon the Porte by themselves. The Porte raised its usual objections. " They had never interfered between England and the Irish Catholics; why should England interfere between them and the Greeks ?" How was the resistance of the Porte to be broken ? Russia was ready to send a fleet into Turkish waters and to recall her ambassador;

France was in favour of milder measures. At this moment the Liverpool ministry broke up and the groups of which it was composed separated. Canning became Prime Minister, but without the support of Wellington and the strong Tories; he was, on the other hand, joined by some of the moderate Whigs. Canning was now able to assume a firm attitude. He persuaded France to join Russia and England in breaking off diplomatic intercourse with the Porte, if she would not yield to pressure. It could not be expected that Austria would join this combination. She affected to treat in order to increase the confusion, and Prussia gave a half-hearted support to her German rival.

At length the Treaty of London was signed on July 6, 1827. England, Russia, and France agreed to take measures to put a stop to the bloodshed in Greece, and to destroy the sources of piracy in the Archipelago. The three Powers were to offer their mediation; they were to demand from each of the belligerents an immediate armistice. If the Porte did not grant this within a month, the Powers were to establish commercial relations with Greece, and if the armistice were not then concluded they were to use compulsion. The three fleets were to arm, but it was not intended that any of the Powers should at present take part in the war. Further measures were left for future consideration.

When, a few days later, the Treaty was published in the *Times*, the joy of the Philhellenes knew no bounds. They seemed to see the end of all their efforts. Metternich was beside himself with rage. He said that the liberation of Greece would be the triumph of a new revolution in Europe, that the Treaty would have every result except that which was intended by it, and would certainly lead to war between Russia and the Porte.

The glory of having concluded this arrangement rests upon the head of Canning, and it is seldom that a minister has been able to claim the credit of so pure and so beneficent a triumph.

Canning died on August 8, 1827, but his work lived after him. The collective note of the three ^Powers was presented to the Reis Effendi on August 16, offering mediation, and demanding the conclusion of an armistice ; an answer was required within a fortnight. The Reis Effendi refused to receive the note and also a second note of a more stringent character, sent on August 31. He said that till the day of the last judgment, the Sublime Porte would take no notice of mediation, armistice, or peace. The English Admiral, Sir Edward Codrington, took the command of the allied fleet, having under him the Russian Van Heyden, and the Frenchman Do Rigny. Their orders were to intercept all supplies of men, money or provisions coming from Turkey or Egypt to Greece. They were told to avoid all movements of hostility, but they wore left a certain amount of discretion in action. They were to blockade the coast from the mouth of the Aspropotamos to the gulf of Volo, round the promontory of Matapan, including the neighbouring islands with the exception of Crete and Samos. Stratford Canning wrote to Codrington from Constantinople, that he was at liberty to answer cannon with cannon. The great Turkish Egyptian Armada sailed from Alexandria on August 5, and reached the bay of Navarino on August 8, where Ibrahim was impatiently expecting it. It consisted of two line of battle ships, twelve frigates, twenty corvettes, about half a dozen other vessels, and about forty transports. It enabled Ibrahim to deal a final blow at Hydra and Spezzia. Before this the English had attempted to secure the neutrality of Mehemet Ali by means of Cradock, who was however unable to effect anything.

Codrington and De Rigny now visited Ibrahim in his tent, and found him surrounded by the captains of the fleet. He agreed to detain his fleet at Navarino until he had received orders from Constantinople and Alexandria, provided that he might send provisions to Patras and Crete. The admirals, upon this, raised the blockade of the harbour, leaving only two guard ships. De Rigny hoped that the Turkish fleet would withdraw to Alexandria or to the Dardanelles. Codrington was not so confident. The Greeks, however, continued their operations, and on September 30, Hastings, Cochrane's lieutenant, sailed into the Gulf of Patras, and destroyed a Turkish flotilla, anchored in the Bay of Salona. Upon this the Turkish fleet moved from Navarino, followed by Codrington, who complained that Ibrahim had violated his agreement. The three allied admirals effected a junction on October 13, and immediately sailed to Navarino. They found Ibrahim, informed of the determination of the Porte to accept no mediation, destroying vineyards and olive groves, and turning Messenia into a desert. The admirals, determined to put an end to this destruction, presented an ultimatum, demanding the immediate return of the fleet to Alexandria and Constantinople, and the cessation of hostilities in the interim. Receiving no answer they resolved to force an entrance into the harbour. They foresaw that this would probably lead to a battle, but the first shot must not be fired by the allies.

The allied fleets sailed, with a favourable wind, into the renowned harbour, which had played so important a part in the Peloponnesian war, at 2 p.m. on the afternoon of October 20. The English flagship, the *Asia*, led the van, and anchored opposite the ship of the Capitan Bey. The whole allied fleet numbered twenty-seven sail, armed with 1,298 guns. The Turkish Egyptian fleet comprised sixty vessels, and had more

than 2,000 guns. In everything but numbers the allies were far superior.

Moharrem Bey, who commanded in Ibrahim's absence, sent a request to Codrington that he would cease his advance; Codrington replied that he was come not to receive orders but to give them. Before the allied fleet reached their position, the captain of the *Dartmouth* asked the commander of a Turkish fire ship to make room for him to anchor. The request was refused. A boat was sent from the *Dartmouth* to cut tho cable of the fire ship, and it was met with musket shots. The *Dartmouth* and the *Sirene,* a French ship, replied in a similar manner. Then a cannon shot was fired against the *Sirene,* and the battle became general. The *Asia* hoisted the signal for action, in which all joined. It lasted for three hours, after which time the enemy's armada was more than half destroyed, and 6,000 of its complement had been killed. "When the sun rose on the following morning, it was seen that the narrow harbour was filled with corpses, and that three line of battle ships, twenty-one frigates, and twenty-four corvettes had been made a wreck. No reason existed for further action. Codrington retired to Malta, De Rigny to Smyrna, while Heyden remained in the Archipelago.

The news of the battle of Navarino brought joy to the Philhellenes of all countries. They saw in the event of October 20 the righteous punishment of deeds of blood-curdling horror, and the liberation of the Greeks from the danger of annihilation. Stein wrote to Capodistrias, "The curse of Heaven has fallen upon the rude, stupid Ottoman, and an unhappy, persecuted population will be allowed to breathe again, and to hope for a happy future." Schon said, " In the battle of Navarino Heaven has, for the first time since 1813, spoken with no uncertain voice." Victor Hugo cried, " Greece is free, six years have been avenged by a single day."

The natural consequence of these events was the outbreak of a war between Russia and the Porte, which began at the end of the year, and was put an end to by the Peace of Adrianople, signed on September 14,1829. It was favourable to the Russians, and comprised the surrender of frontier territory in Asia, the razing of fortresses in Wallachia, the payment of ten million ducats, and the recognition of the policy of the Powers with respect to Greece. The independence of Greece was finally determined by a conference held in London. The protocol of February 3, 1830, fixed the northern frontier by a line drawn from the Gulf of Volo to the mouth of the Aspropotamos. Greece was made a constitutional monarchy, and the crown was offered, in the first instance, to Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, who had married the Princess Charlotte. His refusal led to a civil war in Greece, during which the Admiral Miaulis blew his fleet into the air that the ships might not fall into the power of his arch enemy, Capodistrias, while Capodistrias himself was murdered on the steps of the cathedral of Nauplia by two members of the family of Mavromichalis. Eventually the frontier was extended on the West to the Gulf of Arta, and the crown was bestowed upon Otho, a prince of Bavaria. The island of Samos, which had never been captured, came again into the hands of the Turks.

CHAPTER V

FRANCE, TO THE REVOLUTION OP JULY

Louis XVIII. died on September 16th, 1824, and was succeeded by his brother, the Comte d'Artois, under the title of Charles X. Under similar circumstances did James II. of England succeed his brother Charles. The new King tried at first to create a favourable impression. An avowed enemy of the Charte, he promised the Peers at his first interview with them that he would support it. He released political prisoners, and abolished the censure of the Press. But he was in the hands of a priestly Camarilla, and if he could have been so untrue to his nature as to be liberal, such a course would not have been permitted by his surroundings. Vill&le still continued in office. The signs of clerical reaction were not long in appearing. Heroes of the Empire, such as Vandamme, Drouot, Ornano, and Excelmans, were placed upon half-pay, on pretence of economy, but really with the object of clericalizing the army. In December three bills were brought forward, the first of which made it easier for ladies of noble family to enter nunneries, the second punished the violation of the host or the sacred vessels of the Church with death, and the third gave the Emigres, who had lost their estates, a sum of money in compensation, which, if capitalized, would amount to nearly a milliard of francs.

The coronation of the King at Rheims, on May 29th, 1825, recalled all the splendours of the medieval monarchy. In the following year the Papal Jubilee was celebrated by great processions through the streets of Paris, in which the whole Court took part, including the King himself, clad in the violet robes of a prelate. The Court religion took gradually a deeper tone of fanaticism. Villele did his best to steer the ship of State between the opposing dangers of Liberalism and Ultramontanism. But the strength of France lay in its intellectual forces ; they formed the aliment of the best qualities of the nation, and were its best hopes for the future. While the King was following the insane policy of building an antiquated clericalism as a barrier against the dangers of revolution, Guizot, Villemain, and Royer Collard were attracting crowds of students to their lectures on History, Philosophy, and Politics. The opposition Press, the *Globe,* the *National^* and the *Constitntionnel,* were marking an epoch in journalism. Beranger was writing the songs of a people eager for a future which should rival its past glories. Paul Louis Courier was teaching a new style in controversy. Thiers and Mignet were telling the truth about the Revolution, while the writings of Voltaire were disseminated in cheap editions, and eagerly studied.

It was natural that war should break out between the opposing forces. The Government proposed a severe measure against the Press. All books were to be submitted to censure before publication, under pain of confiscating the whole edition, or of paying a fine of 3,000 francs ; all pamphlets were to be stamped. The bill threatened the suppression of all thought and all intelligence. It was opposed throughout the country. The Academy protested, Royer Collard launched against it a masterpiece of eloquence. It passed the servile

Chamber of Deputies, but was so violently attacked by the Peers, especially by Broglie and Portalis, as well as by Chateaubriand, that it had to be withdrawn. The defeat of the bill was celebrated as a national festival, but the National Guard, having presumed to express their sympathy with the joy of France, was summarily dissolved.

Villtile met the opposition with confirmed stubbornness. He determined to create for himself a majority in the Upper House by creating a number of new peers, chosen from his adherents in the Lower House, and to fill up the gap by new elections. In September, 1827, he issued four ordinances, dissolving the Chamber, summoning the Electors, and creating seventy-six new Peers; to save appearances he abolished the censure on the Press. The result was entirely different to his expectations. The Society called "Aide-toi, le Ciel t'aidera," led by Guizot, Duvergier de Hauranne, Remusat, and Joubert, conducted a vigorous electoral campaign. Their cry was "The Charte, the whole Charte, and nothing but the Charte," which was afterwards repeated in England in 1832. Royer Collard was elected in seven constituencies, and out of 428 deputies only 125 were supporters of Villele. Charles X. had once said to Villele, "I am with you, my dear Count, for life or death." The Duchess of Angoul3me maintained that to dismiss Villele was to descend one step of the throne. It is possible that he might have remained in office, if it had not been for the influence of Pozzo di Borgo, a Corsican, the sworn enemy of Napoleon, but also the foe of Metternich, who had never forgiven Villele for supporting the Austrian statesman.

In January, 1828, Villele was succeeded by Martignac. The new minister endeavoured to hold a middle course, and introduced laws which favoured purity of election,

the liberty of the Press, and the supervision of the religious orders. But Charles soon became tired of coquetting with Liberalism. The ministry of Wellington in England encouraged the hopes of the Ultras. The reception which the King had met with in Lorraine and Alsace confirmed his belief in his personal popularity. In August, 1829, he dismissed Martignac and placed his friend, Jules Polignac, a high-minded but narrow Tory, whose mother's friendship had been so fatal to Marie Antoinette, at the head of the Foreign Office and of the Cabinet. The Home Office was given to Labourdonnaye, a violent reactionist, whom Chateaubriand had called "a male Megaera," the War Office to Bourmont, the traitor of the Waterloo campaign. These changes of policy pointed already to revolution, and the rats hastened to leave the sinking ship. Chateaubriand resigned his embassy at Rome; Lafayette began to assert himself. The *Journal des Debats,* the organ of the Constitutionalists, cried "Unhappy France! Unhappy King!" The society of "Aide-toi" resumed its operations. A powerful stream of popular feeling set itself the spirit of reaction, determined to release Government and society from the bands which constrained it, and the desire for liberty of thought and action, setting out from France, pursued its conquering course through a regenerated Europe.

The ministry and the opposition were ranged against each other in battle array. The New Year's Day receptions gave the Court an opportunity of expressing their dissatisfaction with the Liberals. The *Courier Franfais,* written by Thiers, Mignet, and Armand Carrel, discussed the burning question of the refusal of supplies, and the free choice of the Ministers by the King with pertinent references to the English Revolution of 1688. The new Chambers met on March 2, and

Royer Collard was chosen President. The address to the throne contained the suggestion that the King was, according to constitutional principles, bound to choose his ministers from the majority of the Chamber. The King answered coldly, and prorogued the Chambers till September 1, being determined to govern without them. A war against Algiers, a nest of pirates which infested the Mediterranean, which had been in contemplation for some years, was now actually begun, partly with the view of diverting public attention from political affairs. The enterprise was successful and Algiers was conquered in three weeks, the Dey taking ship for Naples. The reception accorded to the Dauphin on his return to Paris after seeing the troops sail from Toulon emboldened Charles X. to dissolve the Chambers and to order a new election. The elections, held in the middle of July, gave the opposition 272 votes, the government only 145. The choice now lay before the Sovereign of surrendering to the Liberals or of violating the spirit, if not the letter, of the constitution.

On July 25, 1830, Charles X. affixed his signature to three ordinances presented to him by Polignac. Ho said to his Cabinet: " You may count on me as I count on you ; we are henceforth bound together for life and death." The first of these edicts re-established the censure of the Press in all its severity ; the second dissolved the Chamber of Deputies ; the third reduced the number of the second chamber from 430 to 252, and made alterations in the method of election, which would have the effect of placing the elections entirely under the control of the Government. The ordinances were published in the *Monitetcr* on the following day. They were received with dismay and horror; the funds fell, the King went out shooting. Thiers and Carrel drew up a protest in which they stigmatised this act of authority as the most flagrant violation of the laws,

On reading the protest crowds assembled in the streets with shouts of "Vive la Charte!" "A bas les Ministres!" Polignac's windows were broken, and barricades were formed. Marmont, the traitor of 1814, received from the King the command of the garrison of Paris. On Wednesday, July 28, the civil war broke out. The troops were powerless against the resistance of the mob. The number of the insurgents increased every hour; they were joined by the pupils of the Polytechnic School, of the School of Law, and the School of Medicine. Officers and soldiers who had served under Napoleon were placed at the head of the throng of artizans, workmen, boys, and youths. The people had the advantage in every quarter, opposing their knowledge of the city, their enthusiasm, and the sympathy of the inhabitants to the half-hearted distraction of the regular soldiers. After ten hours' conflict the people gained possession of the H6tel de Ville. Eventually ammunition failed and the troops were compelled to retire to the Tuileries, the Louvre, and the Palais Royal. The King was urged to give way, but obstinately refused. Thursday found the streets cut up by barricades at every twenty yards. The ministers attended the King at the palace of St. Cloud. Two regiments of the line deserted the Royal cause and joined the insurgents. The Swiss Guard remained faithful, but by an error of Marmont they evacuated the Tuilleries, and the palace was occupied by the mob. The Louvre was soon afterwards similarly seized, and the tricolour flag waved over the two buildings. Marmont was forced to withdraw his soldiers to the Barriere de l'Etoile. A provisional government was formed at the Hotel de Ville; Lafayette was made commander of the National Guard, a post to which he had been appointed at the beginning of the Revolution forty years before. He thus became the military head of the

insurrection. By the afternoon the tricolour was hoisted on all the public buildings. Charles still remained obstinate; he deprived Marmont of his command, and put the Dauphin in his place. It was only the sight of the defeated general, accompanied by his exhausted and dust-disfigured officers, which shook the monarch's resolution, and he at last consented to parly with the revolutionary Government. In the meantime the son of St. Louis had gone to bed, and he had to be awakened to sign decrees for the repeal of the Ordinances, the nomination of Montemart, Gerard, and Casimir Perier as ministers, and for the meeting of the Chambers on August 3. But it was too late.

On Friday, July 30, it was determined to make Louis Philippe, the Duke of Orleans, who had always sympathised with Liberal opinions, King, and Thiers went to Neuilly to offer him the crown. Ho was not to be found, but Madame Adelaide, his sister, offered to go to Paris and to speak on his behalf. The nomination of an Orleanist sovereign was accepted by the H6tel de Ville. The world of commerce, finance and industry, and the well-to-do classes generally, saw that it was the only way to escape a Republic, which would mean a prolongation of the Civil War. The Republicans themselves felt their case to be hopeless. The Deputies, assembled in the Palais Bourbon, agreed to create Louis Philippe Viceroy of the kingdom, with the tricolour flag. His task was made easier by the retreat of the Court, first to the Trianon, and then to Rambouillet. But the Duke of Orleans still could not be found, and it was not till midnight that he entered the Palais Royal on foot and unrecognised.

On Friday, July 31, Louis Philippe still hesitated as to the part which he should play. He at length decided to accept the office of General-Lieutenant of the kingdom, as the only means of preventing civil war and anarchy. The tricolour flag was to be adopted, the

government was to be committed to the Chambers, and the Charter was to be upheld in its integrity. The final decision between monarchy and republic lay in the hands of Lafayette. At two o'clock in the afternoon, Louis Philippe rode from the Palais Royal to the Hotel de Ville, in the uniform of a general with the tricolour cockade, Lafayette, the President of the Assembly, carried by his side in a litter, as he had sprained his foot and could not walk or ride. It was an act of courage, as he had to pass through the barricades and the throngs of insurgents, and a single bullet might have ended his life. He made his way with difficulty through the crowd which filled the staircase, and reached the hall Lafayette took his arm and stood by his side on the balcony of the Hotel de Ville, as he had, forty-one years before, stood by Louis XVI. and his Queen, on the balcony of Versailles. The effect was electric. The crowds which thronged the Place de Greve shouted with enthusiasm, and he soon afterwards returned to his palace the chosen sovereign of France. The provisional government laid aside their power. The Viceroy nominated Lafayette commander of the National Guard, and Dupont de l'Eure, Broglie, Gerard, Guizot, and Jourdan, as ministers. But the new arrangement was a compromise which left abundant room for future disputes. Some regarded Louis Philippe as a legitimate sovereign, bound to abide by constitutional principles; others considered that in him had been founded a new monarchy, of a popular and democratic character, differing but little from a crowned republic. These two parties contended for the mastery during the whole of his reign, and their divergence led eventually to the Revolution of 1848. Outside these two rival camps lay the threatening hosts of the Republicans, the Legitimists, and the Bonapartists, each of whom despised a government of compromise, and looked for the unconditional establishment of their own political ideals.

In the meantime the situation of the old Court had become ludicrous. The Dauphin commanded 15,000 men with forty cannon at St. Cloud, but he was obliged to stand by at Sevres whilst a Swiss regiment gave its cartridges to the people, and whilst two companies of the Guards marched away to Paris. The royal troops had nothing to eat. Charles X. summoned his ministers to Rambouillet, and advised them to look after their own safety ; some escaped, but Polignac and others were imprisoned. Charles now abdicated in favour of the Duke of Bordeaux, the son of the Due de Berry, afterwards so well-known under the title of Henry V., but the step found no favour in Paris. He was at last compelled to fly by the march of 20,000 persons towards Rambouillet. With great reluctance he took the road to Cherbourg on August 4, still hoping for a counter revolution. The journey lasted twelve days, the King in a fool's paradise of hope, the Dauphin silent, his wife in tears, the Duchesse de Berry playing the hero in man's attire. It was indeed a hard trial for that much suffering man, who had, all his life through, been possessed by the illusions of a former age, to emigrate, in his grey hairs, once more and for ever. After landing at Cowes, and setting up a Court for some time at Holyrood, he died on November 6, 1836, at Gorz, • enjoying the hospitality of Austria.

The Chambers met on August 3. They set to work to amend the Charter in a more democratic sense. Catholicism was no longer called the religion of the State, the censure of the Press was abolished, the suspension of laws by the Crown was forbidden. The initiative of legislation was given to the Chambers as well as to the King and the conditions of the franchise were made easier. Louis Philippe took possession of the throne at the request of the Chambers on August 9 and the Revolution was closed.

CHAPTER VI

THE REVOLUTION IN BELGIUM

THE Great Powers were glad enough to accept the results of the Revolution of July, although it was not based on the principles of legitimacy or of the Holy Alliance. On the contrary, it called a revolutionary propaganda into existence, and dealt a death blow to the creations and to the fundamental objects of the Congress of Vienna. It undoubtedly contributed to the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832 in England. It aroused a sentiment of democracy in Switzerland, which, bearing fruit some years later, made that country a model of democratic government to the world. It produced changes of government in Brunswick, in Saxony, in Electoral Hesse, and in Hanover. It brought about a movement in Italy towards unity and self-government, which failed at the time, but without which the Italian Kingdom of a later epoch could not have been formed. In the Netherlands it had the effect of separating Belgium from Holland, by a course of events which we will now proceed to describe.

The provinces of the Low Countries, which had been separated by their revolt against Spain in the seventeenth century, were again united under the powerful hand of Napoleon, Belgium as an integral part of

France, Holland with some relics of self-government, after the deposition of her King. When the Prince of Orange was restored to the country of his fathers, he became King of Holland, but also took possession of Belgium as a derelict of the French Empire. This violent act was sanctioned by the Treaty of Vienna, and the victory of Waterloo as well as the personal popularity of the Crown Prince of Holland, the Prince of Orange, made it acceptable in both countries, in which June 18, the anniversary of the great battle, was consecrated as a common festival. At the same time the two countries were little suited for a political marriage. It was an ominous fact that the constitution, proclaimed in 1815 by William L, was accepted without question at the Hague, but was rejected at Brussels. Indeed the Flemings and Walloons, which make up the population of Belgium, are different in every respect, in nationality, in character, in religion, in language, and in mode of life, from their Batavian neighbours. Some of these differences might have been accommodated, but there always remained the difference of religion, which had been the original cause of their separation. The Dutch were devoted adherents of religious liberty, the Belgians were devout Catholics, and these divergences were irreconcilable. King William did his best to fuse his people into one; Dutch legislation was favourable to education and industry, Belgian merchants were encouraged to settle in Holland, and Dutch merchants in Belgium. A middle class grew up in the Southern provinces devoted to the Orange dynasty. It was unfortunate that the unsympathetic character of the King of Holland and his love of personal government cooled the enthusiasm which, under happier circumstances, have been accorded to a sovereign of so distinguished a race and of such excellent intentions.

The accession of Charles X. and the clerical reaction which followed it gave new strength to the Catholic opposition in Belgium. At the same time the Dutch government began to interfere with the higher education, and to give it a more secular character. A tax on mills and slaughter-houses had also offended the liberals, so that the two parties, usually opposed to each other, made a coalition against the government. De Gerlache was the head of the Church party, and de Potter of the liberals. In December, 1828, de Potter was condemned to a fine and imprisonment for an article written against the government, and the result was a strong outbreak of journalistic opposition.

The King was extremely enraged at this demonstration. At the opening of the States General he sent a message abusing the Press for creating disturbances in the midst of peace, and getting a part of the nation in conflict with the laws. The message went on to say that the grievances were for the most part unfounded, that the King was determined to maintain the machinery of government intact, and that the rest of the grievances were being remedied, that he would accept a new Press law, but would allow no other ministerial responsibility, except what was provided for in the constitution. The officials of the Ministry of Justice and of the Interior were ordered to express their consent to this message within two days.

This message has been called the Belgian ordinances of July. The effect which it produced was tremendous. There was talk of refusing supplies, and the Budget was passed through the Chambers with great difficulty. De Potter wrote a letter signed Demophilus, in which he severely attacked the measures of government, and originated a system of insurance to protect Government officials from arbitrary dismissal. For this de Potter was condemned to eight years banishment. This

exercise of authority produced a momentary calm. The days of July passed without disturbance, and the Belgian towns celebrated, on August 24, their King's fifty-eighth birthday with unusual splendour. How often is a day of brilliant weather the prelude to a violent storm ! On August 25 Auber's opera of " Masaniello," which had long been forbidden, because of its revolutionary tendencies, was given in the theatre of Brussels. After it was over the excited mob stormed unpopular printing presses, attacked the houses of unpopular ministers, and the office of the director of the police. On the following day several commercial houses met with a similar fate, and as the Government did little or nothing to suppress these disorders, a national guard and a kind of provisional government were formed. The King's arms were removed from the Palace, and the Belgian tricolour, red, yellow, and black, hoisted in its place. Before the end of the third day, this national flag, the symbol of the union of Hainault, Flanders, and Brabant, was seen in every part of the town.

William I. was under the influence of van Maanon, who may be called the Belgian Polignac. He refused to make concessions and consented with difficulty to allow the Prince of Orange to go to Brussels, to confer with the heads of the insurrection, while Prince Ferdinand, his brother, led the garrison of Antwerp also to the capital. The two brothers reached Vilvorde, a few miles from Brussels, and were met by a deputation of the municipality, wearing the Belgian tricolour. The princes insisted that the royal arms should be immediately restored, and the troops admitted without hindrance. This was the signal for a general rising of the population of Brussels, which defended the streets with fifty barricades. The Prince of Orange, who was personally popular, visited the barri-

cades, and witnessed the success of the movement; but when it was suggested to him that he should play the part of the Duke of Orleans, he replied, "Never shall it be said that a Prince of the House of Nassau tore the diadem from his father's head to place it upon his own." He left the city in the hope that a compromise might be found in a personal union of the two kingdoms under the same crown. The King hoped that the Powers would not allow their work to bo destroyed, and that they would intervene in force, but when the answer given in London put an end to this expectation, it became certain that the only issue was civil war.

The Dutch were burning with enthusiasm to put down the rebels, and in Liege and Namur the two parties had already come to blows. In Brussels a Committee of Government was formed, of which Yan de Weyer, Gendebien, and Count Felix Merode were members, in order to connect the revolution with the more respectable classes, and to keep it out of the hands of the mob. But all efforts were in vain, and for three September days war raged in the streets of Brussels. Prince Ferdinand of the Netherlands, at the head of 11,000 troops, was unable to capture the barricades, or to stop the destruction which burnt palaces and turned the Park into a wilderness. On September 27 th it was found that the Prince had retired to Vilvorde, and De Potter came back in triumph. A provisional government was established at the Hotel de Ville, and the Belgians were set free from their allegiance to Holland. This had the effect of weakening the discipline of the Belgian army, so that most of the fortresses were deserted by their garrisons. Antwerp, however, Maestricht, Venlo, and Luxemburg remained in the hands of the Dutch.

The Prince of Orange made a final attempt to prevent the catastrophe. He proposed a separate Government

for Belgium, complete freedom in the matter of education, and an amnesty for all political offences; but the revolutionary party would not be satisfied with anything short of entire independence. They demanded the evacuation of the country by the Dutch troops, and the committal of its future destinies to the decision of a congress. The Prince of Orange offered to recognise the independence of Belgium, and to accept the Congress, provided that the government were left in the hands of the House of Orange, and he went to London to advocate the interests of his family. Any chance of these offers being accepted was destroyed by the bombardment of Antwerp by General Chass^ in October, 1830, which lasted two nights and produced incalculable damage. This made reconciliation impossible; a river of blood and tears separated Belgium from Holland and the House of Orange. A suspension of hostilities was brought about by a conference of the Great Powers, which met in London. In November a national congress assembled in Brussels, which, under the influence of De Potter, the French Lafayette, proclaimed the independence of Belgium, and the exclusion of the House of Orange from the throne. De Potter would have preferred a republic, but the London Conference, in which Talleyrand played an important part, decided for a constitutional monarchy. The House of Orange was unpopular in Europe, and its claim found no support among the Great Powers. On January 20, 1831, Belgium was created a kingdom; its perpetual neutrality was secured by a guarantee; freedom of navigation was secured in the rivers which are common to Holland and Belgium, as well as a proportion of the public debt. Various candidates were proposed for the new throne. France supported the Due de Nemours, the second son of Louis Philippe; Russia the Duke of Leuchtenberg, the son of Prince Eugene

Beauharnais, the step-son of Napoleon; England, Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg. The Belgian Congress chose the Due de Nemours, but Lord Palmerston absolutely refused the consent of England to the proposal. Eventually the English candidate was chosen, and it was arranged that he should marry a French Princess.

Leopold entered Brussels as king on July 21, 1831, but he did not gain possession of Antwerp till December 23, 1832, and then only by the active intervention of France and England. The creation of the Kingdom of Belgium has been justified by success. Inhabited by two races, Flemish and Walloon, speaking different languages, attached to different religions, Belgium has presented the spectacle of a free, intelligent, and progressive society. The development of its mines, manufactures, and industries has been remarkable. Europe has learnt much from her in the matter of education, and in the midst of difficulties the constitution has never been violated. It is refreshing to turn from the failure of the Congress of Vienna to enforce the principle of legitimacy to the success of a government founded on national aspirations, and popular consent.

CHAPTER VII

THE REVOLUTION IN POLAND

THE successful results of the July revolution in France and Belgium stimulated Poland to make a serious effort to recover her independence. The Poles had been well governed by Russia, and had attained a high degree of prosperity. The Emperor Alexander had ruled them with temperance and wisdom, he had maintained their parliamentary constitution, and had acted mainly through Polish officials. He had established a national bank, constructed roads, favoured industry and the development of science and literature. The nobles and the peasants had become friends, and a middle class had grown up. These results were greatly due to the Grand Duke Constantine, and to the Prime Minister Lubocki. Still the Poles are conspirators by nature, and the knowledge that Poland was honeycombed by secret associations opposed to the government had broken Alexander's heart.

Nicholas began bis reign with a feeling of mistrust against so ungrateful a country. He desired to substitute an absolute for a parliamentery government, and to Russianise the population. In this he was assisted by his brother Constantine, whose stern and narrow character well fitted him for such a task. The popular cause was defended by Prince Adam Czartoryski, who

was descended from the royal family of the Jagellons, and by Count Plater, a Lithuanian nobleman, although they can hardly be considered responsible for the revolution which broke out.

The revolution burst forth in Warsaw on November 29, 1830. At six o'clock in the evening, twenty students of the Cadet School, fully armed, under the guidance of Lieutenant Wysocki, broke into the palace of the Belvedere to kill the Viceroy. At the same time others roused the population of the capital, and a third band, under Zaliwski, obtained possession of the arsenal. Constantino saved his life with great difficulty and many of his suite were murdered.

The Grand Duke, instead of acting with vigour, fixed his camp at Wierbzna, ten miles from Warsaw, and conferred with deputations, both of supporters and of foes. This gave the insurgents time to gain over the Polish regiments to their cause, and they were joined by a number of generals on the following day. Constantino, disgusted at the infidelity of the army, in which he had placed complete confidence, left the city and the country on December 4, accompanied by all the Russian officials. In eight days the revolution was complete; the army, munitions of war, and the public treasury were in the hands of the Poles. But dissension, that curse of Poland, soon made itself felt. A party of conservative aristocrats under Lubecki were contented with a reform of the constitution in the spirit of the Paris Charter, while men of more ardent temperament would not bo satisfied with anything short of absolute separation from Russia.

In order to prevent anarchy a provisional government was formed, of which Chlopicki was the head, other members being Lubecki, Czartoryski, and Niemcewicz. Instead of making use of the prevailing enthusiasm for an immediate attack upon the Russians,

they began nogotiations, and fell under the suspicion of treachery. An advanced party was formed to adopt more energetic action under the leadership of Professor Lelewel, the head of the "Patriotic Club." He was supported by Maurice Mochnacki, Adam Gurowski, Xavier Bronikowski, the lawyer Ostrowski, and the popular priest Pulowski. Chlopicki, who had served under Kosciusko, and had fought in the French army in Spain, was appointed Dictator to hold office until the Diet should bo summoned. He might have known that the only hope of success lay in audacity, and that negotiations would only be entertained by Russia in order to gain time. The cloud of Imperial vengeance was gradually forming. Whilst the Poles, with characteristic frivolity, were celebrating the recovery of their independence with songs and dances, Nicholas was collecting an army of 120,000 men and 400 cannon, under the command of Diebich and Toll, for the in-, vasion of the country.

The proceedings of the Diet, which met on December 20, were not very wise. They adopted the insurrection as a national movement, and confirmed the appointment of Chlopicki: they drew up a manifesto which set forth all their grievances against Russia, in the hope of recommending their cause to the sympathies of Europe. They sent two emissaries to the Tsar to present their demands, which were: strict adherence to the Constitution, the withdrawal of Russian troops, and the union of the former provinces of Poland to the kingdom. The terms of Nicholas were unconditional surrender. Chlopicki, in despair, laid down his office on January 17, 1831, and was succeeded By Prince Michael Radziwill, assisted by five councillors, two of whom were Adam Czartoryski and Lelewel. On January 25 the Diet pronounced the dethronement of the Emperor Nicholas and of the House of Romanoff*;

when their freedom had been secured the country should be formed into a Constitutional monarchy. At the same time the nobles refused to abolish serfdom or to redeem personal service by money payments. France declined to intervene; Louis Philippe was fully occupied in the establishment of his recent monarchy. The Poles found, as their fathers had found before them, that Heaven was too high and France too distant to lend them help.

The Russian armies marched into Poland, but the Poles bore themselves bravely in the struggle. Chlopicki and Skrynecki proved themselves excellent generals, and Prince Radziwill exhibited heroic courage. There was hard fighting in the middle of February: Skrynecki withstood a Russian army of twice his numbers at Dobre, Dwernicki conquered and dispersed the troops of Geismar at Stoczeck, while Szenbeck and Zymirski held firm countenance against Rosen and Pahlen at Wawr. Diebich advanced towards Warsaw, but a regiment of Russian cavalry was nearly annihilated at Grochow on February 25, and the capital was saved. Chlopicki was wounded, and Radziwill resigned; Skrynecki, the hero of Dobre and Grochow, took the command, but, brave in the field, he made some political mistakes. He neglected to make use of the Lithuanians, who had risen under the command of Countess Plater, and who might have attacked the Russians in the rear. Opportunity was frittered away in fruitless risings. In April Dwernicki was compelled to retreat to Austrian territory, where he was taken prisoner with 6,000 men.

At last the fatal blow fell at Ostrolenka, on May 21, when Skrynecki was entirely routed by Diebich. For a moment the patriots were supported by a mightier hand than their own. On June 11 Diebich died of cholera, at that time a new disease. The Grand Duke Constantino and Clausewitz, the chief of his staff, were

carried off by the same plague. The place of Diebich was taken by Paskievich, called Erivanski, from his conquests in Persia, He was permitted to approach through Prussian territory, the Prussians being afraid of losing their Polish provinces. As he was threatening the capital a deed of horror was consummated within its walls. On August 16 the populace rose, burst into the castle, and murdered many of the generals and statesmen who were entrusted with the conduct of affairs. The cry of treachery has always been the people's remedy for ill-success. Czartoryski, the noblest hero of the struggle, was forced to fly disguised into Dembricki's camp, and Krukowiecki, a democratic general and an enemy of Skrynecki, was made Dictator and Commander-in-Chief. He was either a bungler or a traitor, or a compound of the two. Warsaw was captured on September 7, but 11,000 Russians had given their lives in sacrifice, and the churchyard of Wola, the scene of Polish heroism, lives in many a Polish ballad. The last defenders of their country, 24,000 strong, were disarmed on Prussian soil, and kept in prison till, on November 1, the Emperor Nicholas allowed the majority of them to return to their country. Thousands, however, of Polish patriots, notwithstanding, the clemency of the Tsar, wandered as exiles into France, England, Switzerland, and other countries, eating the bread of affliction on a foreign soil, and pouring the woes of their fatherland into the ears of a sympathetic Europe, which had not yet lost its faith in liberty. At the same time the mines and highlands of Siberia were crowded with Polish convicts.

By the Organic Statute, passed on February 26, 1832, Poland lost its Constitution, its Diet, and its Council of State. It became a Russian province, under a special government and the strictest police supervision. The Universities of Warsaw and Wilna were

dissolved, the Polish Eagle was broken in pieces, and the national army was dispersed. Paskievich ruled the country with an iron hand till his death in 1856. The failure of Poland to achieve independence was due not only to the strength of Russia, but to her own weakness, to the jealousy of her leaders, and to the eternal war of classes, which paralysed her force.

CHAPTER VIII

EUROPE BETWEEN TWO REVOLUTIONS

THE Revolution of July, in France, and the convulsions which followed it in Belgium and Poland, were looked upon with horror by those who remembered the epoch of the French Revolution and Napoleon, and who dreaded its return. Metternich and Alexander had laboured to form a system of government which rested on repression of all spontaneous movement on the one hand, and a supposed brotherhood of Christian States on the other. The Holy Alliance had two faces, with one it looked upwards with mystical emotion, with the other it frowned with threatening anger. Statesmen and philosophers who could have little sympathy with either phase supported the continuance of the present order from dread of what might take its place. When, however, it was seen that the new government of France was peacefully inclined, that the Belgian revolution was a gain for constitutional monarchy, when Paskievich could say to Nicholas, " Sire, Warsaw lies at your feet! " and the French Minister of Foreign Affairs announced to the Chambers, " Order reigns at Warsaw," the fear of the anxious disappeared, and it seemed as if no momentous change of system were imminent. The Holy Alliance had lost its glamour, the dream of a Christian brotherhood of nations had vanished, the

romantic theories of legitimate monarchy and unquestioning obedience had received a shock, but princes were still able to oppress their subjects without fear of rebellion, and Metternich was contented to have saved a large residuum from the shipwreck of his hopes.

The states of Europe were now divided into two groups; the constitutional West, under the influence of France and England, and the absolute East, dominated by Austria, Russia, and Prussia. In the smaller states, which composed Scandinavia, Germany, and Italy, the people were on the side of Western freedom, whereas the governing classes looked to the support of Austria and Russia. We will leave to a future chapter the various fortunes which attended the alliance between France and England. The three military monarchies on the East were held together by other sentiments. The populations of Austria were politically exhausted, and were estranged from the intellectual life of Germany; Prussia, which might have occupied a commanding position amongst constitutional states, was led by her sovereign to act a subordinate part in the cause of despotism, while Russia, whose ruler Nicholas had no sympathy with the rights of man or nations, or with popular freedom, was under the absolute control of a strong and unbending will, which ruled without dispute both in Churcli and State. The smaller states of Germany, estranged from politics, gave their strength to the development of literature and art. Spain and Portugal were under the influence of France and England. In April, 1834, they formed a quadruple alliance for defence of the constitutional principle against the abuses of absolutism. The Courts of Stockholm and Copenhagen were friendly with Russia, but exercised no influence over European politics. In Italy the July revolution produced risings in Bologna, Modena, and Parma, and the last two duchies drove

out their sovereigns. Order was soon restored by the influence of Austria, and the sovereigns were brought back again. Pope Gregory XVI. had greater difficulty in reducing his subjects to obedience, even with the help of Metternich, and the advice of the Western Powers to introduce reforms into the States of the Church was supported by a French expedition to Ancona in February, 1832.

Two new forces are apparent in the movements which we are about to describe, the power of the Press and the power of Nationalities. It would have been quite impossible to have given scope to popular political aspirations or to have discussed political questions in intelligent manner if a system of well instructed journalism had not existed in Europe. Also the claims of nationalities to recognition, if not to independent government, began at this time to be generally admitted. It is curious that the idea of German unity should have been greatly stimulated by the struggles of the duchies of Schleswig-Holstein to resist absorption by the Danes. The unity of Italy, first imagined by the first Napoleon, came within the sphere of practical politics by the establishment of "Giovane Italia," ("Young Italy"), a society founded by the Italian patriot, Mazzini, The East of Europe witnessed the struggle of three great nationalities for mastery or for existence, the Germans, the Slavs, and the Magyars. The Germans have had great difficulty in holding their own against the two vigorous nationalities which spring from a Slavic and a Mongol stock. We cannot now tell what the Slavs are destined to do for Europe in the coming centuries, but it is certain that this highly gifted and original people have been systematically misrepresented by the Germans, and that if we desire to know the truth about them we must seek it in other than in German sources. The Magyars are much

smaller in numbers, and have hitherto been contented with a position of independence and equality in the Austrian Empire, but the vigour of their native tongue, and their great capacity for literature, will make them increasingly a powerful factor in the European family.

We will now proceed to trace the history of the several states of Europe during this momentous period and will begin with France.

CHAPTER IX

THE REIGN OP LOUIS PHILIPPE

Louis PHILIPPE ascended the throne as King, not of France, but of the French. He was supported by the heads of the Liberal opposition and by the members of the Napoleonic party who had returned from exile. The new monarchy was essentially middle class, finding favour with the manufacturers and shopkeepers, who dreaded a republic on the one hand and an aristocratic autocracy on the other. But we have already shown that the friends of the monarchy of July did not form a homogeneous body. They were divided into parties, the party of movement and the party of resistance. The first, represented by Lafitte, La Fayette, and Odilon Barrot, sympathised with the popular risings, which, as we have shown, were taking place in various parts of Europe, and wished France to take the side of the peoples against the kings. The second agreed with their sovereign in thinking that the revolution of July had been closed on the ninth of August. The leaders of this party were Guizot, the Due de Broglie, and Casimir P^rier. The King, however, was obliged to include both these sections in his first ministry, and we find in it a long list of incoherent names : Lafitte, Dupont de TEure, Bignon, Gerard, Mole, Louis, Casimir PtSrier, Dupin, Guizot, Broglie. La Fayette commanded the National Guard and Odilon Barrot was Prefect of the Seine.

The fundamental divergence which existed in the ministry was shown in the discussion as to the punishment to be inflicted on the ministers of Charles X., who had signed the ordinances of July. Polignac, Peyronnet, and two others were imprisoned in the castle of Vincennes. The Chamber at the end of September had voted their accusation, and many people were in favour of their death. The Chamber presented an address to the King recommending that capital punishment for political offences should be done away with, and the sovereign expressed his satisfaction. Nothing, however, was done. On October 17 rioters came down to the Palais Royal, crying " Death to the ministers !" and on the following day a mob of ruffians marched to Vincennes to lynch the prisoners. They were resisted by Daumesnil, who declared that if they forced the gates he would blow the castle into the air. Louis Philippe was too cunning to dismiss his more democratic ministers, whom he really detested, so he sent away the others, and the ministry was reconstituted with Lafitte and Dupont de TEure at its head, The trial of the ministers took place on December 21 before the Chamber of Peers. They were condemned to imprisonment for life, but a revolution nearly broke out and it required all the efforts of the army and the national guard to preserve order.

On February 14, 1831, the anniversary of the death of the Due de Berry, the Carlists, who supported the elder branch, determined to hold a funeral service in the church of St. Germain FAuxerrois, where a collection was made for the soldiers of the royal guard who had been wounded in the days of July, The church and the presbytery were attacked by a mob, which on the following day ravaged the Archbishop's palace and nearly pillaged Notre Dame. There ensued an outbreak of rancour against the clergy, both in the capital and

in the provinces. The King had to give up attending mass. This violence made the Liberals unpopular, and Lafitte eventually resigned when the King refused to support the Italian duchies against an Austrian intervention.

The party of resistance came into power under Casimir P^rier. The new minister was a man of large fortune and of a commanding temper. He had a clear head and an energetic spirit, but above all the consciousness of authority and the passion for power; he knew how to give orders, and desired to be strictly, almost passively, obeyed. His manners were imperious, his tone of voice stern and occasionally offensive. He kept the King under strict discipline, every despatch was submitted to him before it met the eyes of the sovereign, no communication was made by the King to the *Moniteur* without the previous approval of the minister. He was always ready to take upon himself either responsibility or hatred. He aimed at the establishment of a free but regular government, exercising no violence, either abroad or at home. He dissolved the Chambers on May 31, and did his best to procure a majority for the Government. Ho attained his object, but he could not prevent the election of the heads of the opposition, Arago, Odilon Barrot and Lafitte.

The Government had to conduct a violent campaign against the Press, as the *Caricature,* the *Tribune,* the *Globe,* the *Nemesis,* and the *National* were incessantly attacking the minister and the King. Seizures, arrests and prosecutions did no good. The opposition was equally alert and pitiless in the Chamber itself. The cholera, the scourge of God, which broke out in Paris on March 26, after a masked ball, and made nearly twenty thousand victims in three months, brought about a kind of truce, as most of the deputies had fled from

before it. Casimir P^rier, with rare devotion, paid a visit to the hospital, the H6tel Dieu, accompanied by the Duke of Orleans, the eldest son of the King; but he was attacked by the disease, and died on May 16, after five weeks' illness. He disappeared from the scene just at the moment when the monarchy was about to undergo its most serious trial.

In the night of April 28, 1832, the Italian steamship *Carlo Alberto* set on shore, in the neighbourhood of Marseilles, the Duchess of Berry and some of her faithful friends, with the object of regaining the crown for her son, the Duke of Bordeaux. The attack on Marseilles failed, but she determined to make another attempt in La Vendee, and with superb audacity traversed the south of France, entering Bordeaux in an open carriage. Reaching in this way the Chateau de Plassac, she issued to the people of La Vendue a summons to arms for May 2^. A few hundreds only answered the call, and two engagements, one at La Ch6ne, and the other at J^a Penissi&re, sufficed to crush the movement. The defeated duchess wandered about from cottage to cottage, in strange disguise, recalling the adventures of Charles I I. She reached Nantes with great difficulty, and after five months' concealment was betrayed by a Jew. She was imprisoned in the citadel of Blaye; here she was delivered of a daughter, the fruit of a secret marriage with Count Hector Lucchesi di Palli, chamberlain of the King of the two Sicilies. This somewhat ludicrous, but not dishonourable, occurrence rendered her politically powerless for the future.

A still more serious insurrection broke out in Paris on June 5, on the occasion of the funeral of General Lamarque. It began by a conflict with the Municipal Guard at the Bridge of Austerlitz; the quarters of the Temple, Saint Martin, Saint D^nis, and the Place de la Bastille, were soon covered with barricades. The in-

surgents had little chance of success : the workmen did not join them, the middle class was enraged against them, while the National Guard gave assistance to the troops of the line. On the following day they were dispersed; they were treated with clemency, and only a few of them were punished.

Similar disturbances occurred in the month of April 1834 in several towns of France, and eventually in Paris. The most serious was at Lyons, which lasted from April 9 to April 13. On receiving the news of the insurrection at Lyons, the Republicans began to raise barricades in the neighbourhood of the Church of St. Merry. Thiers immediately arrested the most active members of the Society of the Rights of Man, who were the leaders of the revolt, and held 40,000 men in readiness to march. In the morning of the 14th the insurgents had lost all their positions. The last of these movements took place at Luneville on April 14.

However foolish these Republican attempts at revolution were, and however much they tended to discredit the idea of Republicanism in France, it was necessary that the Government should punish them in order to discourage similar disturbances in future. A very severe law was passed against any one who was in possession of concealed arms or munitions of war. The Press was treated with redoubled rigour. Not that the administration had been lenient; during the last four years there had been 529 Press trials, and journalists had been condemned to 106 years of prison, while the fines paid for the same offences amounted to 400,000 francs. The *Tribune,* the principal organ of the Republicans, had been prosecuted 111 times, and its editors had been condemned twenty times to nineteen years of imprisonment. The *National,* the organ of Armand Carrel, had been treated nearly as badly. The Government now determined to bring the whole of these

political offenders before a special High Court, composed of the Chamber of Peers. Two thousand persons had been arrested, and 164 were brought to trial. The trial did not begin till March 5, 1835, and it was not concluded till January 23, 1836, by which time 4,000 witnesses had been examined. Certain offenders were condemned to various lengths of imprisonment or transportation, but they were all amnestied on the occasion of the marriage of the Duke of Orleans, which took place on May 8, 1836.

Before this date a terrible crime had convulsed Paris with horror. On July 28, 1835, as Louis Philippe was riding with the most distinguished members of the Court, the Government, and the Army, to attend a review in honour of the revolution of July, a so-called infernal machine was fired at the head of the cortege, in the Boulevard du Temple. It consisted of a row of musket barrels, filled with a*number of bullets, and placed in a window which commanded the procession. The machine, on being fired, killed eighteen persons in the immediate neighbourhood of the King, amongst whom was the aged Marshal Mortier, Duke of Treviso, and wounded many others. The King was slightly injured, but continued his march with commendable courage. The author of this conspiracy was Joseph Fieschi, a Corsican adventurer of abandoned character, who, having served under Murat, had since filled up his life with every variety of crime and folly which vice and vanity could suggest. He appeared to have only two accomplices, who were guillotined with him on February 16, and were regarded as martyrs by the democrats and socialists. The result of the conspiracy of Fieschi was the passing of the " Laws of September," which were three in number, dealing with the Courts of Assize, Trial by Jury, and the Press. The first gave the Minister of Justice power to create as many Courts

of Assize as he might deem necessary for trying offences against the security of the State, the second reduced the number of the jury required for a condemnation to a bare majority, while the third re-established in their most repulsive form the most violent laws against the Press which the Restoration had devised. This Press law was directed equally against Legitimists and Republicans. The first had command of large sums of money and was able to hold out, but the *Tribune* and the *Reformateur* fell under crushing blows. These laws were in vain opposed by Odilon Barrot and Royer Collard, but the Broglie Ministry did not long survive their enaction. The King had always disliked the Doctrinaires. He took advantage of a discussion on the budget to ally himself with the "tiers parti" who were in opposition. In February, 1836, a new ministry was formed, in which the Presidency of the Council and the Portfolio of Foreign Affairs were held by M. Thiers.

The first ministry of M. Thiers lasted from February 22 to September 6, 1836. The King, notwithstanding his constitutional principles was determined to be master, his chief objects being to preserve peace with European powers, and to impress his own will upon his servants. Lamartine once said to Thiers, "You have in you a restless, jealous, insatiable spirit, which nothing can appease, and which brooks no rival. You have a passion for governing, for governing alone, for governing always, for governing with a majority, or with a minority, for governing either with or against all, for reigning alone, for reigning always, and at any price." It was scarcely likely that a minister of this temperament would remain long in office under a monarch like Louis Philippe. The cause of difference was the civil war between the Carlists and the Cristinos which still continued in Spain. England had already intervened according to the terms of the Quadruple

Alliance, and France was summoned to do her share of the work. Thiers was anxious to accede but the King objected, and it was not till the Moderate party had come into power, and Queen Cristina had held out a hope of a French alliance with her daughter, that a body of 12,000 men was sent to the Pyrenees. Then followed the revolution of La Granja, during which the Queen-mother was forced by the party of progress to accept the Liberal constitution of 1882. This produced a change of feeling in France, and the force was withheld. Thiers desired to keep the soldiers under arms, to meet future emergencies, but the King insisted on disbanding them. The consequence was that Thiers resigned his offices, and a new ministry was formed with MoltS as President of the Council, and Guizot as Minister of Education.

The new ministry was soon obliged to concern itself with the affairs of Algiers, th6 conquest of which, it will be remembered, was among the last acts of the former dynasty. Under the new reign the subjection of the country had been continued with varying success. General after general had applied himself to the task, without producing any decisive result, while the resistance of the Algerians had been strengthened by the alliance of the neighbouring states. In February 1834, after some victories had been gained in the province of Oran, peace was made with the young Emir, Abd-el-Kader, who had justly obtained a supremacy in the counsels of his countrymen. The French Government now determined to retain possession of Algeria as a French colony, it being valuable to them as a training ground both for generals and soldiers, so that in 1835 hostilities broke out again, at first with results disastrous to the French. Marshal Clauzel was appointed to the command, and Mascara, the capital of Abd-el-Kader, was stormed, a victory which the light-

hearted French qualified by the name of "mascarade." Clauzel returned to Paris to consult upon future operations, and just at this time the change of ministry took place. Thiers had been eager for the conquest of the colony, but Mol^ cared less about it, and the English Government viewed this extension of French colonies with natural suspicion. Clauzel, however, was sent back to Africa with a sufficient force for his purposes, but at the end of 1836 signally failed in an attack upon the strong fortress of Constantino, the Cirta of the ancients, one of the most remarkable natural strongholds in the world.

After the events which we have described above, the Government might feel secure against the attempts of Republicans and Legitimists, but a new danger was at hand in the revival of Napoleonism, which might have been thought to have become extinct by the death of the Duke of Reichstadt, the son of the Great Napoleon, in 1832. The head of the family was now Prince Louis Napoleon, son of Louis Napoleon, formerly King of Holland, and Hortense Beauharnais, daughter of Josephine. He had long brooded over his fortune and his star, and had succeeded in gaining over some members of the frontier fortress of Strasburg. The garrison of this fortress consisted of three regiments of infantry and three of artillery, one of which was commanded by Colonel Vaudrey, who hoped to carry his own regiment and the rest of the garrison with him in his enthusiasm for the Napoleonic cause. The plot was by no means ripe when on October 29, 1836, Prince Louis suddenly appeared in Strasburg, and demanded fulfilment of his friend's promises. Vaudrey hesitated but at last gave way, and at 5 a.m. on October 30 summoned his regiment to the court-yard of the barracks. Then Louis Napoleon appeared in the well-known uniform of his uncle, accompanied by a few

officers, one of whom carried an eagle. The soldiers responded to the appeal, and marched through the deserted streets, arresting in their bedrooms Voirol, the commandant of the place, and the Prefect of the city. They then proceeded to the artillery barracks, where their summons found no response, and where Prince Louis was arrested without bloodshed. The artillery regiment marched quietly back to its barracks and the incident was at an end. After a few days imprisonment, Prince Louis was allowed to go free to America, and his accomplices were tried and acquitted.

Louis Philippe had performed this act of clemency in deference to the entreaties of Queen Hortense, and with the hope of gaining popularity. He had, indeed, pursued the policy of connecting the July monarchy with the glories of the Empire, as contrasted with the monarchy of the Restoration. Thiers, the panegyrist of the Great Emperor, had confirmed his sovereign in this policy, and treated the Bourbon monarchy of the Restoration as an interlude of reaction. The illustrious survivors of the Empire were conspicuously honoured in the Tuileries, the palaces of Paris and Versailles were adorned with pictures of Napoleon's battles, the Arc de l'Etoile was completed as an apotheosis of the popular hero, whilst the column in the Place Vendome was surmounted by the statue of the "Little Corporal," in cocked hat and grey overcoat, as he lived in the imagination of the people. Squares, streets, and bridges were named after Napoleon's victories, the National Museum of Versailles placed his name by the side of the Great Louis, Bonapartism, idealised by poetry and legend and consecrated by the tragic death of its hero, was the political creed of the large majority of the nation. The Memorial of Saint Helena was in every one's hand, Napoleon's name was the burden of the national poetry, but the party was not yet strong

enough to carry Prince Louis into the Tuileries as it had carried his uncle on the return from Elba. No reader of Balzac can fail to observe that a large proportion of the healthiest elements in French society at this time were derived from the traditions of the Empire ; they were, indeed, the best antidote to the commonplace vulgarity, the smug, shopkeeping respectability which was the prevailing note of the monarchy of the middle class.

The new ministry gained some credit by their success in Algeria; an advantageous peace was made with Abd-el-Kader, and the fortress of Constantine was at length taken by storm. The new elections of the autumn were, on the whole, favourable to the government. The Republican party had almost ceased to exist; indeed, it gave up its old name and called itself the Left, its chief members being Dupont de l'Eure, Lafitte, and Arago. Lafitte was defeated in the elections. From these were severed the party of the extreme left of the Radicals, of which Gamier Pages was at this time the only important member, although it included at a later period Henri Martin and Ledru Rollin. The dynastic Left under Ledru Rollin were partisans of a democratic monarchy. Next followed the Left Centre under Thiers, whose ruling principle was a spirited foreign policy. The Right Centre, composed mainly of prosperous merchants, supplied the chief support to the ministry, and among these were reckoned Guizot and the Doctrinaires. Between the two Centres a middle party tried to maintain its independence. The Right, consisting of Legitimists and half Legitimists, numbered between twenty and thirty members. The Right Centre was as largo as all the other parties put together.

This year may be considered as the height of Louis Philippe's prosperity. Shortly before the end of the

previous year an attempt had been made upon his life by a man who was wanting in the bodily and mental faculties of a human being, and who was punished by banishment. Mole and Montalivet, the leaders of the Cabinet, were especially dear to him, and Thiers had promised not to make their work unnecessarily hard by opposition. Charles X. had died in exile, and in May, 1837, the King was able to grant an amnesty to political offenders. The young Duke of Orleans, the heir to the monarchy, won the favour of the Courts of Berlin and Vienna. It was hoped that he might have married an Archduchess, but he gained as his bride a lady of heroic character, worthy to fill any throne, Princess Helen of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, a niece of the sainted Queen Louise of Prussia. The marriage festivities added brilliancy to a brilliant summer, and the House of Orleans was definitely received into the circle of reigning families.

In the meantime the enemies of the Government were uniting their forces. The two sections of the Left, under Thiers and Odilon Barrot, the Doctrinaires under Guizot, the whole coalition, as it was called, under Duvergier de Hauranne, were held together by the cry that the King should not only reign but govern. Tho conflict took place in the debate on the address. On January 19, 1839, after twelve sittings, each of which had lasted five hours, the ministry won by a majority of thirteen, but it was regarded as a defeat and the Chambers were dissolved. The verdict of the elections was in favour of the Coalition, but it was obvious that although they had combined to destroy, they could not unite to govern. Mole, however, resigned, and there was great difficulty in finding any one to take his place. At last, on May 12, stimulated by a republican conspiracy, a Cabinet was formed, of which Soult was the head, and Duch&tel,

Dufaure, and Villemain the principal members. An Eastern Question now made its appearance, which affected the relations between France and England. Mahmoud, Sultan of Turkey, had always resisted the Treaty of Kutajah, made in 1833, which surrendered Syria to the Pasha of Egypt, and he now thought that a favourable moment had come for the declaration of war. His armies crossed the Euphrates, but were defeated by the Egyptian troops at Nisibis, on January 24, 1839, and the road to Constantinople lay open to Mehemet the conqueror. The Great Powers of Europe united to preserve the integrity of the Turkish Empire. Soult had done his best to preserve peace, and he now prevented the Egyptians from invading Asia Minor. At this juncture Sultan Mahmoud died, and was succeeded by Abdul Medjid, a boy of sixteen. The Turks suffered a severe blow by the treachery of their admiral, who carried over his fleet to swell the Egyptian forces.

The speech with which the King of the French opened the Chambers in 1840 spoke of the concert which existed between France and England, but the relations of the two countries were really strained. The English were afraid, on the one hand, lest a too powerful sovereign in Egypt should close the road to India; and, on the other, lest a weakened Turkey should fall a prey to Russia. The ill-feeling between the two powers showed itself in different parts of the world—in South America, in Mauritius, and in Mexico. When, in 1839, Abd-el-Kader raised the standard of a religious war in Algeria, the movement was ascribed to the machinations of England. The young Sultan offered Mehemet Ali, as conditions of peace, the hereditary possession of Egypt in his family, and the government of Syria for life. Four of the Great Powers supported these proposals, but France took the side of Egypt and demanded more.

Guizot was sent as ambassador to London to make matters smoother, and his colleagues in Paris were not sorry to get rid of him. Shortly after this, a proposal made to grant an allowance to the Due de Nemours on his marriage brought about the fall of the tottering ministry, and on March 1 Thiers became President of the Council, with Remusat and Cousin as his colleagues.

The first work of the new Cabinet was to induce the English Government to perform a great act of national expiation. A quarter of a century before, the Emperor Napoleon, after his defeat at Waterloo, had invoked the hospitality of the English people, but had been sent a prisoner to the island of St. Helena, where he spent six dreary years of enforced idleness, and died of a painful and lingering disease. His mother had been refused access to him; he had not been allowed to communicate with his friends; the title of Emperor, which had been acknowledged by England in the Congress of Chatillon, was now refused to him; and his unfortunately chosen jailor inflicted upon him a number of those petty insults which are especially galling to a high, proud, and sensitive spirit. A copy of Coxe's "Life of Marlborough," which Napoleon, as a soldier, desired to present to the officers of a regiment quartered in the island, was retained in the private library of the Governor because it was stamped with the Imperial eagle on the fly-leaf. The English Government were the chief culprits, and they found a willing instrument in the Secretary for the Colonies, Earl Bathurst. At the very time when Napoleon was dying, and was so feeble that he could not enter or leave his bath without assistance, Sir Hudson Lowe was warned to redouble his precautions, because vigorous efforts were being made to effect the prisoner's escape. Now, on May 12, to the surprise of every one, the Cabinet announced that the English Government had con-

sented to allow the bones of the Great Napoleon to be brought from St. Helena to Paris, that they might repose, according to his own wish, on the banks of the Seine, in the midst of the French people whom he loved so well. The Prince de Joinville, son of the King, accompanied by Bertrand, Gourgaud, Las Cases, and Marchand, the companions of Napoleon's exile, sailed in a French frigate to bring home the ashes of the hero. When the coffin was opened, the faithful servants recognised the features of their master, as they saw him in his favourite dress, his heart in a silver casket resting between his knees. The coffin was covered with a velvet pall decorated with golden bees, and the English Governor walked behind it bareheaded the whole distance between the grave and the coast. Some months afterwards, on December 15, the remains were laid to rest under the dome of the Invalides, with every circumstance of military pomp and popular enthusiasm.

One effect of this act of reparation was to revive the hopes of Louis Napoleon. Embarked on an English vessel, he landed, on August 6, at Wimeroux, near Boulogne, with about sixty followers. He attempted to obtain possession of the town and the garrison, but failed in both attempts. In a short time he and his accomplices were arrested, and the ship in which they had arrived secured. On board were found a wardrobe of Napoleonic properties, and a tame eagle, typical of the glories of the Empire. Decrees were discovered appointing Clauzel Commander-in-Chief, and Thiers Prime Minister. Louis Napoleon was tried before the Chamber of Peers, condemned to imprisonment for life, and confined in the castle of Ham, where he remained for nearly six years. He eventually escaped, with the help of Dr. Conneau, in the disguise of a workman named Badinguet, and found an asylum in England.

In her conduct towards Mehemet Ali France still

continued to pursue a policy different to that of the other Powers. On July 15, 1840, a Convention was signed in London which established a quadruple alliance between England, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, for the settlement of the Eastern difficulty. By this Mehomet AH was offered the hereditary possession of Egypt, and the Pashalic of Acre for life. If ho did not accept within ten days he was to lose Acre; if he delayed ten days more he was to lose Egypt. In any case he was to restore the Turkish fleet, and to pay tribute to the Porte. This treaty was not communicated to the French Ambassador until after it was signed, and France was then invited to urge Mehemct Ali to accept the terms. This slight fell upon the French like a thunderclap, and wounded their national pride in its tenderest part. Just at this time a column was erected in the Place de la Bastille to commemorate the revolution of July, the collected crowds sang the "Marseillaise," which fanned the hereditary hatred against England into a flame. A hundred thousand National Guards marched past the Tuilleries clamouring for war. The King declared that he would place the cap of liberty on his head and lead a crusade against Europe. Even Thiers seemed to lose his usual composure, the army and the fleet received large reinforcements, and a plan was prepared for the fortification of Paris. The cry of the conquest of the Rhine was revived. Gradually feelings became more moderate. The English Press subdued its tone, the opposition in Parliament combated the warlike policy of Palmerston. It was felt, on the one hand, that France had a right to be consulted about the Eastern Question, and on the other, reflection convinced the King and his minister that France could not stand alone against a united Europe.

This change of sentiment came too late to save the Viceroy. Relying upon the support of France, he had

rejected with scorn the arrangements proposed to him. The tribes of the Lebanon rose against him ; an English squadron bombarded Beyrout; St. Jean d'Acre was occupied by an English force, and Alexandria was attacked. In accordance with the terms of the Convention of London, the Viceroy was deposed by the Sultan. Now was the time for the French fleet to sail into the Mediterranean and rescue its ally. The majority of the nation desired it, the democrats, the radical opposition, the revolutionary mob, the republican societies clamoured for war; but the King was alarmed. On October 8, a note was addressed by France to the Powers to the effect that the French Government could not recognise the deposition of Mehemet Ali, and asking for his restoration. A better security for peace was found in the resignation of Thiers, whose Cabinet was replaced by one under the Presidency of Soult, of which Guizot was the ruling spirit. By the Treaty of London, signed by all the five Powers on July 13, 1841, Mehemet Ali was secured in the possession of Egypt. It was also declared that the Porte had a right to close the Bosporus and Dardanelles to warships of all nations, while the Red Sea and the Persian Gulf were to remain open. France thus entered again into the circle of the European concert, but her unhappy diplomacy had ruined her ally, and weakened her own prestige in Europe.

The Ministry of October 29, as it was called, was entirely of one mind with the King, and gave him valuable assistance both at home and abroad. It was loyally supported by the majority of the Chamber. The landed proprietors, the industrial magnates, the aristocratical merchants, which composed the majority of the deputies, had no inclination either for war or for revolution. It was therefore natural that the parties of progress should direct their efforts to a reform of the electoral system. In the Press, in meetings, in petitions,

demands were made for an extension of the franchise, both for the electors and for the eligible. The Radicals and Socialists asked for Manhood Suffrage, whether with direct or indirect election. This agitation for reform was supported in the lower house by the leaders of the Left, Gamier Pages, Arago, Lafitte, Dupont, and Odilon Barrot. In many largo towns banquets were held, at which " Vive la Reforme " was the toast of the evening. Lamennais who, it was said, had transferred his beliefs from Papal to Democratic infallibility, wrote a strong pamphlet against the rule of the Optimates, while Quinet lent his valuable assistance to the same cause. In some towns popular risings took place, which had to be suppressed by force. But the Government resisted all these efforts, and earned a reputation for obstinate immobility.

The reason for this is to seek in the character of the chief minister. Guizot was now fifty-three years of age. Ho had been liberal in the days of the Empire and the Restoration, but he had crystallised into irrefragable dogma the liberal conceptions which he had formed in the days of Decazes, the popularity of the Doctrinaires and of the society "Aide-toi, le ciel t'aidera." Guizot could not convince himself that since that time ideas had advanced, that a new conception of liberty had been formed, that the number of persons interested in politics had largely increased, and that whole classes had awoke to the realities of political life. The corner-stone of his creed was the Charter of 1814, modified by the Revolution of July. That Guizot should discourage a policy of great conquests, great wars, and great revenges, that he should base the influence of France in the world on its material prosperity, its freedom, wealth and intelligence, demands our entire sympathy. But unfortunately the system of government was corrupt. In the Chamber

of 1846 there were 184 placemen, and it was easy to gain the small additional number necessary to form a majority by the judicious use of public contracts. It was the irony of fate which made Guizot, the most incorruptible of ministers, erect the methods of corruption into a system.

Democratic agitators were punished, Lamennais was condemned to a year's imprisonment and a fine, Odilon Barrot, the leader of the Liberal party, was punished for his election speech by four months' imprisonment and a fine of 3,000 francs, while the opposition Press was subjected to heavy penalties. The unpopularity of the Ministry gradually increased, and an attempt was made on the life of the Due d'Aumale as he was riding through the streets of Paris with two of his brothers.

In June, 1842, the Chamber was dissolved. It had passed through many vicissitudes; it had overthrown the Cabinet of Mote, endured the government of Soult, forced Thiers on the King, and at last accepted Guizot. The new elections were favourable to the existing ministry. On the very day on which they took place a terrible accident occurred. The Duke of Orleans, the heir-apparent to the throne, was driving to Neuilly, when his horses ran away in the Champs Elysees ; he jumped out of the carriage, was dashed to the ground, and died four hours afterwards from concussion of the brain. He was thirty-three years of age, popular and well-beloved. Much sympathy was felt for the Royal family, and especially for his wife, Helen of Mecklenburg, who was to prove herself an heroic mother in the hour of danger. This was a serious blow to the dynasty. The Comte de Paris, now heir to the throne, was only four years old, while Louis Philippe was seventy. The Due de Nemours was appointed Regent in case of a minority, in accordance with the will of his

deceased brother, but against the wishes of the Opposition.

Abd-el-Kader had been now, for four years, in arms against the French Government. The war had been carried on with vigour by General Bugeaud, the successor of General Vallee. Supported by the brave general, Lamoriciere, and by others whose names became afterwards famous, Baraguay d'Hilliers, Canrobert, MacMahon, Pelissier, St. Arnaud, Cavaignac, and not least, by the Due d'Aumale. Step by step, each fortified place had been wrested from the Emir, but he still continued to hold his ground. In the spring of 1842 he led an army of 6,000 men against the French, among whom were his allies from Morocco, inflamed with the zeal of a holy war. In May, 1843, the Due d'Aumale gained a great success. Marching at the head of a flying column of cavalry he came suddenly upon the Smala, *of* travelling camp, of the Emir at a little distance. lie attacked without waiting for his infantry, forced the resistance of the camp guards, and brought his prisoners and his booty back in triumph to Algiers. Abd-el-Kader himself escaped with difficulty, and he was barely able to rescue his mother and his wife.

In September, 1843, the Queen of England and her husband paid a visit to Louis Philippe at his country palace of Eu. The visit was intended to confirm the *entente cordiale,* the cordial understanding which was supposed to exist between the two countries, and which it was certainly the object of both monarchs to maintain. The Duke of Bordeaux was preparing at this time to reside in London, and opportunity was taken to urge the Queen not to receive him at Court. The presence of the legitimate heir of the Bourbons at only a day's journey from Paris gave occasion to numerous pilgrimages to his house in Belgrave Square. The

opening of the new session in December gave Guizot an opportunity of attacking the pilgrims with severity. The address to the King was made to assert that the public conscience had been " branded " by their action. In the disputes which arose about this word, Guizot displayed to the utmost his qualities of pride, eloquence, and courage. Surrounded with a seething crowd of antagonists, who charged him with having himself visited Louis XVIII. at Gheni, he told them, as they were climbing the tribune, that their calumnies, reiterated as they might be, would never reach the level of his contempt. The " branding" clause was retained, and the minister enjoyed a well-deserved triumph.

The cordial understanding between France and England was fast becoming a subject of ridicule in Europe. The interests of the two nations were found to clash in many parts of the world, notably in the Society islands and in Morocco. The French were anxious, for many reasons, to extend their influence in the South Seas. They had already acquired the sovereignty of the Marquesas islands, and they had persuaded Queen Pomare of Tahiti to place herself under French protection. Shortly after the signature of this treaty, Dr. Pritchard, who had been British Consul, and had acted as General of the Queen's forces, returned to the island after a short absence, and urged her to hoist the flag of independence, and to shake oft the chain of French domination. The French Admiral, on his return to Tahiti, found the position of affairs completely altered. He deposed Queen Pomare, and claimed possession of the island for the French. The English made a serious remonstrance. The opposition in the French Chambers clamoured for the recognition of the Admiral's action, the annexation of Tahiti, and the rejection of foreign interference. When the

ministry made known in the *Moniteur* their intention to abide by the terms of the original treaty, there was a cry of indignation throughout France. At a later period, Pritchard, who had ceased to be British Consul, was arrested by the French Admiral as an intriguer, confined on board a French vessel, but afterwards transferred to an English ship. On reaching England he brought his grievances before the Government, but they steadily refused to replace him in Tahiti, and he was obliged to content himself with an indemnity in money. The French acted throughout this difficult business with great moderation and firmness, but the French nation cared more for brilliant bluster and passionate activity than for the well-balanced pondering of careful compromise.

Before this matter was settled another cause of quarrel had arisen. Abd-el-Kader in his extremity had taken refuge with Abdur Rahhian, Sultan of Morocco, and was using every art to excite him against the French, as in ancient times Jugurtha had stirred up Bocchus of Mauretania against Rome. The Moroccans took up arms to avenge the insult which Bugeaud had inflicted upon them by occupying with his camp their sacred place of pilgrimage, Lalla Magrania, close to the frontiers of their Empire. Although they were five times as numerous as the French, they suffered a complete defeat on the banks of the river Isly, on August 14, 1844. The English were at this time without rivals on the Moroccan sea-board, and they looked with jealousy at any extension of French influence in that region. The French demanded a money payment from the Sultan, and the surrender of Abd-el-Kader. When the Sultan refused, the English Government, dreading the result of war, sent Mr. Drummond Hay, their Consul at Tangiors, to persuade him to yield. By this time the Prince de Joinville had destroyed the fortifica-

tions of Tangiers and Mogador, and the battle of Tsly had been won, so that peace was made easier. Abd-el-Kader was compelled to leave Morocco, but from regard to the feelings of England, the French exacted neither a cession of territory nor the payment of an indemnity.

In the session of 1845 the ministry was violently assailed in the Upper House by Mole, and in the Lower House by Thiers. The questions of Tahiti, of Morocco, and of the right of search, were made grounds for a charge of subserviency against England, which was accentuated by the return visit which the King, accompanied by Guizot, paid to Queen Victoria at Windsor. Guizot was saved from defeat only by a majority of 3ight. He now tendered his resignation, but it was not accepted. The opposition was emboldened by success. Strict laws against the residence of the Jesuits in France had been in existence since the ministry of Martignac, but they had not been enforced. The fashionable society of the capital entrusted to them the education of their children, so that they were even more powerful than under the Bourbons. Thiers now demanded the execution of the laws against them, and they defended themselves by pleading for freedom of education. The demand for their suppression was eventually carried by a large majority, and the Government escaped a difficulty by sending an envoy to the Pope, who ordered the Jesuits to close their establishments.

The session of 1846 was comparatively uneventful. It was marked chiefly by the cruelties of the Austrian government in Galicia, which called forth no remonstrance in France, and by the escape of Prince Napoleon from the fortress of Ham. The Chamber was dissolved, and the new elections gave a substantial majority to the ministry, a result which was not without suspicion of corruption, The Government, however, soon lost what-

ever credit it might have possessed by the question of the Spanish marriages. The marriage of the young Queen of Spain had long been a matter of discussion. The long-standing suspicion of a dynastic alliance between France and Spain, leading to a revival of the family compact of the Bourbons, had induced England to oppose her marriage with a French prince, while France was equally anxious that she should not marry a Coburg. Louis Philippe agreed that neither alliance should take place, but he wished that his son, the Due de Montpensier, should marry the Queen's sister. The English Government stipulated that this marriage should only take place after the Queen of Spain had given birth to a child, and Guizot consented that the two marriages should not be celebrated at the same time. These negotiations had continued between the two governments for several years, but when Lord Palmerston came to the Foreign Office there was again talk of a Coburg alliance. When the Queen came of age, she determined to marry her cousin, Don Francis of Assisi, who was believed to be so physically weak as to exclude all hope of offspring. The Queen's sister was married on the same day to the Due de Montpensier. Guizot had manifestly broken his word, and he could only allege that the two marriages had not taken place in a manner literally simultaneous. His conduct was universally condemned by England and the rest of Europe. Nor was it accepted as a triumph by France. The French did not rise to the cry that the Pyrenees had ceased to exist; for once they set more value on national honour than on a supposed advantage gained at the expense of England. This clumsy diplomacy entirely failed of its results, for the Queen had children contrary to Guizot's expectation; both she and Louis Philippe were driven from their thrones; the Due de Montpensier was not suffered to reside in Spain, and his

daughter, who married Queen Isabella's son, died within six months of her marriage.

The truth is that the Orleans dynasty was gradually declining in popular favour, and its stability was more than doubtful. In April 1846, the King was fired at in the forest of Fontainebleau. He became moody, and seldom left the Tuilleries. Appearing on the balcony of his palace on the anniversary of the July Revolution in the same year, two pistol shots were fired at him by a crazy workman. In order to protect himself from a revolution, he surrounded Paris with costly fortifications, which neither in 1848 nor in 1870 proved of any value, while the money spent upon them might have covered France with a network of railways. The people were weary of politics, they were, as Lamartine said, bored by a dynasty, which gave them neither the glory of the Empire nor the freedom of a republic ; whether Guizot or Mole were in office the policy was' always the same. On the first day of the year 1847, Princess Adelaide died, the beloved sister of the King, his wise and faithful adviser, the confidant of his policy. She was spared the sight of the coming storm, the account of which we must leave till a future chapter.

CHAPTER X

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL

THE last ten years of the reign of Ferdinand VII. in Spain are known as the years of Calomarde, after the name of the minister who was the incarnation of the policy of reaction. Don Tadeo Calomarde, an Aragonese of humble origin, was a man of a narrow and limited intelligence, an enemy of all reform, of all liberty, and of all culture. He had belonged to every party in turn, and seeking only his own advancement, had betrayed them all. Ferdinand appointed him minister on January 17, 1824, and Calomarde attached himself to him until he saw a better chance of advancement in following the fortunes of Don Carlos. The condition of Spain at this epoch can hardly be conceived. Eight thousand patriots, the flower of the nation, lived as exiles in foreign countries, in France, in Belgium, or in England, looking passionately for the day of their return. The gallows was the true emblem of the Catholic Monarchy, which gave itself up at this time to a carnival of revenge. The place of justice was taken by military commissions, and the police kept a large book in which the behaviour of every one during the years of revolution was carefully noted down. It was the reign of a white terror; the Society of the Exterminating Angel hunted the Liberals, dragged them to the pillory, threw

them into prison, tore out their hair, tarred and feathered them, and shot them. The French Government, which was finally responsible for the establishment of this regime, did what it could to moderate its excesses. But the amnesty demanded by France on February 19, 1824, was not granted by Ferdinand till May 1, and then suppressed till May 20, in order that Calomarde might have a final raid upon his enemies. Even then it was looked upon as an act of treason by the absolutist party. In the meantime citizens were condemned to death for comparatively slight offences, the Universities were closed, literary academies broken up, while the recently elected members of municipalities were expelled from their seats.

At the same time the King incurred the anger of the Apostolical, or ultra-royalist party, whoso excesses he was compelled sometimes to check. They and the Army of Faith turned their eyes in hope to the Infant Don Carlos, in whose fanatical soul there was not a spark of toleration, and whose narrow spirit was made worse by the influence of his ambitious and bigoted wife, the sister of Don Miguel. Many intrigues were on foot, both in Madrid and in Lisbon, for raising the banner of absolutism and ultramontanism under the two Infants Don Miguel and Don Carlos, in order to carry it to victory with the blessings of Metternich and of the French Congregationists. On November 1, 1826, the Apostolical party issued an appeal to the Catalans, and in the following August a Superior Apostolic Junta was established at Manresa, and the country was covered with armed bands. The Junta induced the peasants to believe that the King was the prisoner of the Freemasons, and Don Carlos was not ignorant of these proceedings. On this occasion the King acted with energy. Accompanied by some of his ministers he went to Catalonia, and with the help of the Comte

d'Espignac, a former French emigre, he restored order by somewhat cruel means, and resided four months at Barcelona. The defeat of "los Agraviados," as the aggrieved rebels were called, was a serious blow for the Apostolic party, and a still more serious loss was the death of the Queen Amalia of Saxony, who died without offspring on May 18, 1829.

On December 11 in the same year, Ferdinand contracted a fourth marriage with Maria Christina of Naples. She was twenty-three years of age, pretty, intelligent, and well-educated. Her journey from Barcelona to Madrid was a triumphal procession. The marriage was hailed by the Liberals as the beginning of a new era, as the dawning of a better day for Spain. In the month of March, 1830, hopes were entertained that an heir might be born, and on the last day of the month Ferdinand published in the Gazette the Pragmatic Sanction of 1789, which established the ancient right of the succession of females to the throne. This law, which had been voted in the Cortes, had up to the present time been kept secret. The rage of the Apostolics and the joy of the Moderates knew no bounds. Just at this time the Revolution of July broke out in France. The Spanish Liberals tried to re-enter Spain by armed force, but they were opposed by the Government, and were beaten at Eraso, Urdax, and Vera. Ferdinand executed without mercy all the prisoners who fell into the hands of his troops, and when in the following year General Torrijos attempted to raise Algesiras, he was shot with his fifty-two partisans.

If Ferdinand had been the father of a son, it is possible that the cause of absolutism might have continued to triumph. But he only had two daughters, Isabella, born October 10, 1830, and Maria Luisa, born on January 30, 1832. In the summer of this year,

when the Court was at the palace of San Ildefonso, Ferdinand became seriously ill, and on September 17 he appeared likely to die. The Queen was greatly troubled about the future of her children. Calomarde assured her that the Pragmatic Sanction would be of no validity unless it were accepted by Don Carlos, and advised a compromise. This Don Carlos refused to accede to, and the Queen, worn out by watching, and hard pressed, urged the King to withdraw the Pragmatic Sanction, a request which was supported by Calomarde, Alcudia, and the King's confessor. The King gave way, and the Apostolics hastened to pay their court to the rising sun. Contrary to all expectation, the King recovered, and the situation was changed. The Infant Don Francisco arrived with his energetic wife, Luisa Carlota, from the baths at Cadiz. It is said that she tore up the letter of revocation with her own hands. Calomarde was dismissed and banished from the Court, and all the ministers with the exception of Ballesteros shared his fate. The Queen found herself at the head of a powerful party, which included all friends of constitutional government, of enlightenment, and of intellectual freedom. Spain took her part in that great conflict of principles which was soon to be fought out in every part of civilised Europe. There were now two parties in Spain, the Cristinos, and the Carlistas.

At the beginning of October the Queen was appointed Regent during the illness of the King, and Zea Bermudez, Ambassador in London, was put in the place of Calomarde. His programme was neutrality abroad, and moderate reform at home, together with the maintenance of the Pragmatic Sanction. At the end of the year the King solemnly declared before the Notables of his kingdom that the letter of September 19, which revoked the Pragmatic Sanction, had been ex-

torted from him by the devices of wicked men, and that he now declared it null and of no effect. On January 4, 1833, Ferdinand reassumed the reins of government, writing a letter to the Queen in which he praised the care and wisdom with which she had conducted the government, and assuring her of his entire confidence.

Zea Bermudez showed great political wisdom in persuading Ferdinand to reassume the government, because Don Carlos had feelings of loyalty towards his elder brother, and the Ultras were kept in check. The Apostolic army refused to take the field, the King's confessor fled to Portugal, the Princess of Beira, and the chief mover of the revolt, was ordered to join her brother Don Miguel in the same country, whither Don Carlos and his wife accompanied her. Their departure was the signal for conflicts between the Liberals and the Carlists in the streets of MadHd and other Spanish towns. This made the Queen anxious for the rights of her daughter, and she persuaded the King to summon the Cortes, *in* order that they might take an oath of homage to the Infante Isabella, as the legitimate heir to the throne. This was done on June 20, 1833; but every one knew that the validity of the Pragmatic Sanction would have to be fought out after the death of the King. This event was not long in coming; the King died suddenly on September 29, without receiving the consolations of that religion for which he had sacrificed so much. Spain never had a worse ruler; he left his people without energy, without prosperity, a prey to civil war, the mockery of the world. He had returned to his country welcomed by the blessings of his subjects; he sank into the grave amid their curses.

It is possible that if Don Carlos had been in Madrid at the moment of his brother's death he might have

established himself on the throne. But the possession of the capital was a great advantage for his rival. As it was, he assumed the title of Charles V. on October 1, and a civil war ensued which is known in Spanish history as " The Seven Years' War." It may be considered generally as a popular insurrection undertaken for the purpose of preserving the ancient liberties, or Fueros, of certain parts of Spain against the spirit of Liberal centralisation, which had its headquarters in Castile. The war did not have much effect on the Castilian provinces; it was mainly confined to the Basque provinces, and to Navarre, Aragon, Catalonia, and Valencia. In these countries the large towns were faithful to the Liberal cause, whereas the small towns and the villages were partisans of Don Carlos. The principal battles of the war were fought in the Basque provinces, where Don Thomas de Zumalacarregui was the principal figure, and in the mountainous territory south of the Ebro, known as the Maestrazgo, in which Cabrera held command. The Carlist forces sometimes reached the number of 70,000. The war may be divided into three periods. During the first, which lasted from 1832 to 1836, the two parties were organising their forces and fortifying their territory. In the second, which occupied the years 1836 and 1837, the Carlists took the offensive, and at one time nearly gained the victory. In the third, which came finally to an end in 1840, the Carlists were weakened by treason, and discouraged by the lassitude of their partisans.

The Regent first wished to preserve Zea Bermudez in power. Don Carlos was declared conspirator and usurper, and his property was confiscated. But llussia, Austria, and Prussia refused to acknowledge Isabella, and the Carlist insurrection spread over the whole of northern Spain, and a part of Old Castile. The

Regent now determined to take a more decided step, and summoned to her counsels Martinez de la Rosa, who had won his spurs as a moderate Liberal. But party antagonisms were too strong to make any moderate course of action possible. Cries were raised for the summoning of the Cortes, the recall of the exiles of 1823, a constitution after the manner of the French, and the creation of a national guard. A Royal Statute was promulgated on April 10, 1834, which summoned a Cortes for the purpose of granting taxes and making laws. The new parliament was to consist of two arms, or Estamentos: one, the house of Proceres, or peers, composed of grandees, bishops, and high officers of state, nominated by the sovereign for life; the other, the house of Procuradores, was to be chosen out of the propertied classes by double election. The power of initiating legislation remained with the Crown, the Chambers had only the right Of petition.

It may be supposed that this constitution satisfied neither party. The exiles who returned from France and England felt no enthusiasm for an arrangement which gave so much power to the Crown. Their ideal was the Spanish Constitution of 1812, modified by dreams of French democracy. The Cortes when it met offered a promising field for the development of rising talent. Saavedra, Duke of Rivas, orator, statesman, and poet, who had devoted himself to study and literature during his exile in England, Italy, and France, led the opposition in the Upper House, a function which was performed in the Lower House by the passionate orator, Joaquin Maria Lopez. Mirailores, the Spanish Ambassador in London, had persuaded the English Government to support, in conjunction with France, the two young queens of Spain and Portugal, Isabella and Maria da Gloria, against the respective attacks of Don Carlos and Don Miguel. This arrange-

ment was called the Quadruple Alliance; but it was well known that the King of France was more afraid of the revolution in Spain than he was of Don Carlos, and that he would not give effect to the treaty by armed force. Still the guarantee tended to strengthen the constitutional and liberal West against the absolute East.

In pursuance of the Quadruple Alliance, a Spanish army of 10,000 men, under General Rodil, crossed the frontier of Portugal, and compelled Don Miguel to renounce his claims and to leave the country. Rodil also wished to capture Don Carlos, but the English admiral, Parker, was persuaded by Valles to convey the pretender to England. A few weeks later, two travellers sailed from Brighton to Dieppe, furnished with French passports. They passed through Paris on their way to the south, and on their road passed by the French royal family who were driving out to Neuilly. They were Don Carlos and Valles. With the help of French legitimists they crossed the frontier of the Pyrenees into Navarre, where Zumalacarregui came to meet them on July 12. It is most unfortunate that the English Government should have permitted his escape.

It will be as well to give a short sketch of the progress of the war before we deal with the internal affairs of Spain which are contemporaneous with it. The arrival of Don Carlos was followed by several defeats of the Cristinos. At the end of October, Mina took command of the Queen's army, and obtained some successes, but being badly supported by the Government, he resigned his command in April, 1835. By the month of June, the Basque provinces were almost entirely in the hands of the Carlists, and Zumalacarregui laid siege to Bilbao with fourteen battalions. He was mortally wounded here on June 14, and his place was taken by General

Eraso, who converted the siege into a blockade. Don Fernandez de Cordova now took command of the army of the north, and defeated the Carlists at Mendigorria on July 16. Eraso was forced to retire from Bilbao, and was beaten in his retreat by Espartero, who boldly crossed Biscaya, and established himself at Vittoria. The campaign was finished in October by the capture of Estella by Cordova. In the meantime Cabrera, who had been educated for the priesthood, was fighting in the mountainous district on the other side of the Ebro, and at the close of 1833 had undertaken the siege of Alcaniz. In the beginning of 1836 the Cristino general Nogueras had the barbarity to shoot the aged mother of Cabrera, This not only produced the natural result of exasperating the Carlists and of making peace impossible, but Cabrera retaliated by shooting the mother of a Cristino colonel and thirty wives of officers who fell into hifc power. We now reach the second period of the war, which the Carlists opened by making two expeditions, one against Castile and the other against Bilbao. The expedition into Castile was entrusted to Gomez, who successively occupied Oviedo, Santiago, and Leon, and joined Cabrera in September. In November he seriously threatened Madrid, but made the mistake of separating himself from Cabrera, who was forced to retire into Andalusia. The second siege of Bilbao lasted from October 20 till December 25. The town would have fallen if Espartero had not marched to its assistance. The year 1837 was chiefly noticeable for the march of Don Carlos upon Madrid. He left Navarre in May with an army of 12,000 men and 1,700 cavalry, and succeeded in joining Cabrera; but he lost two months in Valencia, and did not advance against Madrid till the beginning of September. On September 12 he actually arrived in view of the capital. He expected that all the inhabitants would come out to

meet him, but when he found that it was otherwise he did not dare to attack, and gave the order to retreat. The Regent drove down the lines with Queen Isabella in an open carriage, and was received with enthusiasm, while Don Carlos retired to Chiloeches, to celebrate the festival of Our Lady of Sorrows, who was the commander-in-chief of his army. In the meantime Espartero cut him off from Madrid, and he was obliged to recross the Ebro and retire into the Basque provinces, which were still faithful to him. The cause of Don Carlos was now morally lost. In 1838 an attempt was made to march into Castile, but without success. The Carlists began to quarrel amongst themselves. Maroto set himself against the friends of Don Carlos, and in 1839 shot three hostile generals. Don Carlos at first proclaimed him a rebel and a traitor, but he had the army on his side. The Apostolic party was without a head, and Don Carlos was no longer master in his own camp. All parties were now tired of the war. Maroto entered into negotiations with Espartero, and proposed to terminate the struggle by a marriage between the son of Don Carlos and Queen Isabella, with a promise that the Fueros should be respected. At length the peace of Vergara was signed on August 29, 1839, which put an end to the civil war. Don Carlos crossed into France, and was confined at Bourges by Louis Philippe, where he remained for six years. In 1845 he abdicated from his pretensions in favour of his son, the Conde de Montemolin, and died at Trieste in 1855. Cabrera still continued the struggle with considerable forces, and was not finally driven into France till July, 1840.

The internal history of Spain during this period is very complicated, and we can only touch on some of the principal points. Martinez de la Rosa resigned the presidency of the Ministry to the Conde Torreno on June 7, 1835. Insurrections made their appearance in

different parts of the kingdom. In order to put them down, Toreno obtained the assistance of an English legion, of a French legion, and of 6,000 Portuguese troops. But it took two days' fighting to reduce Saragossa to obedience, and Barcelona proclaimed the Constitution of 1812. General Bassa, who tried to appease the rebels, was murdered. Similar disturbances broke out at Tarragona, Valencia, in Murcia, and in the island of Majorca. At this juncture the Captain-General of Madrid, Quesada, took occasion to provoke a Liberal demonstration. The National Guard signed a petition to the Regent, and paraded the streets in arms, clamouring for the Constitution of 1812. Toreno resisted the movement, and placed Madrid in a state of siege. The provinces answered this by rising one after the other; Valladolid, Salamanca, Malaga, Cadiz, Seville, Grenada, Cordova, Ferrol successively caught the flame. Corunna established an insurrectional Junta; demanded the suppression of convents; the liberty of the Press ; and the summoning of the Cortes, for the purpose of making a constitution.

Toreno now gave place to Don Juan Alvarez de Mendizabal, who was supposed to have extraordinary talents for finance. The first acts of the new minister were excellent. He persuaded the insurrectional Juntas to disarm; he placed the government of the provinces in the hands of Liberals ; he suppressed all monasteries, and most of the religious orders; he levied 100,000 troops, and established a National Guard. At the same time, he did not venture to proclaim a new constitution, and the Progressive party accused him of treason. The Cortes were dissolved in January, 1839, and the elections took place in the midst of anarchy. Massacres of Carlist prisoners occurred at Saragossa and Barcelona; and Valencia drove out its Captain-General. The elections gave a progressive majority to the Lower Chamber,

but the Upper House remained Conservative. Mendizabal was violently attacked for his financial measures, and for the sale of the property of the clergy. He had against him the Carlists, the Ultras, a large part of the Cortes, and the Regent did not care for him. On May 15, 1836, he resigned, and his place was taken by Isturiz, the leader of the Moderates.

The new minister immediately became a mark for the attacks of the Progressives. The idea occurred to him of leaving Madrid, of carrying off the Regent and the Queen to the Army of the North, and of opening the Cortes at Burgos under their protection. This was prevented by a Court intrigue. Aragon, Estremadura, and Andalusia proclaimed the constitution of 1812. On August 3 a terrible insurrection took place in Madrid, and Isturiz could only look for assistance to the intervention of France.

Now followed what is known as the revolution of La Granja, a country palace in which the Court was accustomed to pass the summer season, and where the Queen was now staying in the company of her despised favourite, Muiioz. A large part of the garrison had been won over to the cause of the revolution, being discontented with their commandant, San Roman, and because their pay was in arrear. In the night of August 12 they marched up to the palace, with cries of " Long live the Constitution of 1812," " Long live the Queen." The Regent consented to receive a deputation of the mutinous soldiers, and, after a long resistance, ordered the publication of the constitution. On the following day a still more serious mutiny broke out, and the Queen consented to call to her counsels the head of the progressives, Don Jose Maria Calatrava. Unfortunately, General Quesada, whom we have heard of as Captain-General of Madrid, perished a victim of the hatred of the populace. A few days later theJEtegent

made her entry into her faithful city of Madrid, rather as a prisoner than as a queen, followed by the "heroes of La Granja," and acclaimed by a democratic mob. The military revolution of La Granja left the Regent humiliated, and placed the country in the hands of the Progressives, whose political programme was impossible. Louis Philippe was estranged, the Moderates began to regard Don Carlos with less repugnance. Spanish liberty was never more seriously endangered than at this moment.

The Cortes, whose duty it was to draw up a new constitution, met on October 24, 1836. Fortunately the conflicting parties were in a moderate frame of mind, and the result was that such alterations were introduced into the constitution of 1812 as to make it generally acceptable to all liberally-minded persons. The most important prerogatives of the Crown were maintained, and the legislative power was divided between a Senate and a Chamber of Deputies. It is doubtful how far the Queen-Regent was in favour of a constitutional government, or was able loyally to carry it into effect. At the same time the most powerful personality on the Progressive side was Espartero, who was created Duke of la Vittoria. A conflict between the sovereign and the subject seemed inevitable, although the Regent did all she could to win over the General to her views. In the summer of 1840 Cristina left Madrid with her daughter, Isabella, to meet Espartero at Barcelona. At this time the whole of Spain was excited about the question of local government in the communes, which the Moderates were anxious to destroy, and the Progressives to maintain. The law of the Ayuntamientos, which destroyed these privileges, had passed the Cortes, and now awaited the royal signature. The people of Aragon violently opposed it, and Espartero begged the Regent not to sanction

the law. She, however, did so, and on the following day Espartero resigned. The battle of parties raged around this law for a period of three months. Barcelona rose, and the sovereigns were compelled to escape to Valencia in a merchant vessel. At length Espartero was made Prime Minister, and Queen Cristina resigned the Regency, leaving her two daughters to the honour and patriotism of Espartero.

When Espartero, as Duke of la Vittoria, entered Madrid in triumph, on September 16, 1840, he was the most popular man in Spain. As Prime Minister he gave internal order to the oountry, and made it respected abroad. In May, 1841, he was appointed Regent by the newly elected Cortes. He failed for the reasons which made it impossible for any one to succeed—the incurable party rancour of the Spaniards and their unfitness for parliamentary government. It would be tedious and unprofitable to narrate in detail the various quarrels which distracted the ministry of Espartero and made its continuance impossible. On July 13, 1842, a terrible revolt broke out in Barcelona, by which the Captain-General was driven out of the town. After six weeks of useless negotiations, Barcelona was bombarded by Espartero, and 400 houses were burned down. The Spaniards would never forgive this severity, however necessary it might be. On the one hand, Espartero came more and more to rule by force, and on the other he steadily lost the confidence of the country. We have said nothing hitherto about the rivalry between Narvaez and Espartero, which seriously affected the fortunes of the Carlist war. The political cohesion of Spain has always been weak, and it is the habit in that country for discontented politicians to raise the standard of rebellion as the best means of getting their own way. At this time Alicante, Cartagena, Murcia, Valladolid, and

Seville all pronounced against Espartero, and on June 27 Narvaez offered to the Valencians his sword against the destroyer of Barcelona. The Regent left Madrid, and Narvaez contrived to enter it. Espartero had an army of 10,000 men, and could have made a good fight, but his troops deserted him, and Cadiz declared against him. He therefore embarked on board an English vessel, and sailed to England.

The coalition which had turned out Espartero was formed of Progressives, but Narvaez was a Reactionary, and the nation seemed inclined to take the side of the Moderates. The Moderate Cortes declared the Queen to have attained her majority, although she was only thirteen years of age. She appointed as Prime Minister Olozaga, a Progressive. He lasted for six days, and was succeeded by Bravo, a Reactionary. He proclaimed the whole of Spain in a state of siege, crushed the Press, and imprisoned Progressive deputies. Bravo had been only the instrument of Narvaez, and on May 2, 1844, this powerful man took the reins of government into his own hands, and the triumph of the Reaction was complete. The history of the next three years in Spain may be passed over in silence, except to mention that Narvaez did not sully his reputation by the disgraceful business of the Spanish marriages, which we have spoken of in a previous chapter. He resigned rather than marry the Queen to a husband in every way distasteful to her, in order that the throne of Spain might at some time fall into the hands of the grandson of Louis Philippe. The double marriage which took place on October 10, 1846, was presided over by a Conservative Government, of which Isturiz was the head. Eventually, in October 1847, Narvaez was again recalled to power.

The history of Portugal, after Don Miguel left the country and Queen Maria da Gloria reigned as a con-

stitutional sovereign with the help of the Cortes, has a strange similarity with the history of Spain during the same period, except that in Portugal England was the predominating influence, and in Spain France. We find the same division of parties, the same incapacity of the sovereign, and the same palace intrigues. At the death of John VI., in March 1826, Don Pedro, Emperor of Brazil, was proclaimed King of Portugal. He first gave the country a charter, and then abdicated in favour of his daughter Donna Maria da Gloria, and betrothed her at the age of seven to his brother Don Miguel, who was aged twenty-four. In February 1828, Don Miguel came to Lisbon, and was proclaimed King by the Absolutists. Donna Maria, on hearing of the usurpation of her uncle, at Gibraltar, gave up her journey to Portugal, and went to England. In 1831 Don Pedro, being turned out of Brazil, came to Europe to support the cause of his daughter, and placed the seat of his government at the Azores. After the conclusion, three years afterwards, of the Quadruple Alliance, above mentioned, Don Miguel was compelled to leave the country. Don Pedro dying shortly afterwards, Donna Maria was declared Queen.

On September 9, 1836, a revolution broke out very similar to that of La Granja, which we have described above. The populace of Lisbon rose in insurrection, with the cry of "Long live the Constitution of 1822!" The sovereigns were obliged to accept a Progressive ministry, and the pallid Queen showed herself on the balcony of the palace, to receive, unwillingly, the acclamations of the crowd. The Septembrists, as they were called, remained substantially in power for six years, in spite of riots, pronunciamientos, or attempts at military government, and constant changes of ministry. **But** in 1842 the garrison of Oporto proclaimed the charter given by Don Pedro in 1826, and the movement

was supported by one of the ministers, Costa Cabral. The charter was accepted, and Costa Cabral, created Count Thomar, became Prime Minister, and exercised for four years a virtual dictatorship. This lasted till May 1846, when the whole of Portugal rose against the intolerable tyranny. There seemed to be a fixed determination to change the dynasty. The Duke of Saldanha exerted himself to save it< but he would not have succeeded without the assistance of England. Oporto indeed held out for more than a year. Other insurrections of a similar nature followed, but they lie outside the limits of our subject.

CHAPTER XI

GERMANY

THE revolution of July in France and the stirring events of Brussels and Warsaw produced a powerful effect on the Rhine and in the rest of Germany. The moment seemed to have arrived when the German nation might again recover its unity, its freedom, and its political importance. But it was difficult for a country, divided like Germany into a number of small states, to make any general movement with success. Each province attempted to redress its own grievances, without troubling itself about its neighbour. In Brunswick, Saxony, Hesse, and Hanover revolutionary movements broke out which had the effect of extorting certain tardy reforms from the reigning princes; in some of the large towns, in Aix-la-Chapelle, Mainz, Hamburg, Berlin, and Breslau conflicts arose between the people and the soldiers. But the German governments were able to unite in a manner which was impossible for their subjects, and on October 21, 1830, the Diet declared that every German State was bound, if called upon, to assist its neighbours with military force for the preservation of order. The Polish exiles who took refuge in Germany added to the excitement of the population. The position of Prussia was at this time peculiar; on the one hand she was undoubtedly working

for the unity of the Fatherland, but on the other she supported the strictest principles of absolutism. She therefore became an object of terror to all Liberals, especially in South Germany, who were more inclined to rest their hopes on a democratic republic in Poland, or on French intervention, than on a national movement towards unity.

One of the most remarkable demonstrations in favour of the Liberal cause took place at a great popular festival, which was held at the end of May 1832, at the ruined castle of Hambach, near Neustadt, in the Hardt, a portion of the Bavarian Palatinate. The thirty or forty thousand persons present were treated to speeches on freedom and fatherland, on the sacred struggle against despotic power, on the tyranny of princes, the servility of officials, the brutality of soldiers, and the pride of aristocrats. Dr. Wirth, the leader of the meeting, brandishing a sword of honour in his hands, called for a thrice repeated cheer for the Republican party in Europe, and for a threefold curse against the German princes, which was responded to with enthusiasm. The number of Poles and Frenchmen present at 'this festival showed its cosmopolitan character. It would have been better to have treated it with contempt, but it was too good an opportunity for Metternich to lose. Another event of a similar kind was the Frankfort rising of April 3, 1833, which would more appropriately have taken place two days earlier. A number of students, journalists, and Polish refugees made an attack upon the Guard House, situated in the middle of the town, killed some soldiers, and summoned the people to freedom and a republic. The call was not responded to, and the rioters were taken prisoners after a slight resistance. These excesses gave ample scope to the spirit of reaction. Arrests, inquisitions, confinement in prisons and for-

tresses, and even executions, followed each other in dismal sequence, accompanied by a system of informers, police and spies which was worse than the evil which they affected to remedy. A new political crime was invented, treason against the German Confederation, and all military excesses committed in its discovery or punishment were condoned. In Baden, Rotteck, and Welcker, the famous professors of Political Science, were dismissed from their chairs, and the University of Freiburg was closed. In Darmstadt a democratic clergyman, named Weiding, was so brutally ill-treated that he died in prison; in Electoral Hesse the trial of Professor Jordan of Marburg roused the indignation of the whole country.

The German Diet, which was under the control of Austria and Prussia, passed, in the summer of 1832, new laws for the preservation of order. Besides the regulations which we have mentioned above, it forbade the issue of all foreign papers and pamphlets of less than twenty pages without the consent of the Government. All badges, colours, and banners of political societies were forbidden ; all popular assemblies, and festivals were placed under supervision; all foreigners, especially Poles, were carefully watched; and the Universities were placed under police control. A coping stone to this policy was set, two years later, by secret conference of Ministers at Vienna, which among many other provisions reduced the exercise of constitutional rights by local parliaments to a minimum. This was the last blow aimed by the Metternich system at constitutional government, the high-water mark reached by the united governments of Germany in their attempts to crush spiritual and political freedom. The German nation was now divided into two camps : one consisting of the governments, supported by the soldiers, police, and paid officials, and the other of the large majority

of the people of all ranks and classes. It resulted from this that all pamphlets, poems, or newspapers which attacked princes, courts, or officials, were eagerly read, while writings of the opposite tendency gradually ceased to exist. The one redeeming feature of this system was that as men's minds were less occupied with administration they had more leisure for politics or the cultivation of literature and art.

Whilst these movements were taking place in different parts of the country, Prussia was working for unity by the establishment of a uniform system of custom duties,,which is known by the name of Zollverein, and which it succeeded in carrying through, not only against the opposition of Particularists, but also in the teeth of many liberal and patriotic but short-sighted statesmen. In the darkest days of the fortunes of Germany, and in the deepest ^basement of her national aspirations, the corner stone of German unity was laid in economical reform. The Prussian Zollverein was the most effective blow aimed at the German Confederation. The men to whom the credit of this reform is due are Motz, Maassen, Eichorn and Hoffmann. The movement began in the early twenties, but it was not till the later years of that decade that important results were obtained. The first commercial treaties with a Customs Union were made between Bavaria and Wiirttemberg in 1827, which was followed by a Customs Union between Prussia and Hesse Darmstadt. It now became almost necessary for Electoral Hesse to join the Union, but it was some time before the Court of Cassel could be persuaded to take this view. On the contrary a commercial union for Central Germany was established, chiefly from jealousy of Prussia, which delayed better arrangements for some time. It was now a question which of the two unions the southern states would join. Two motives influenced them, first jealousy of

Austria, which protected the Central League, and secondly the conviction that the policy of Prussia was sounder financially than that of her rival. In 1829 a kind of union was made between the Prussian and the Bavarian groups, which had the effect of bridging the river Main. This was a fatal blow to the Central League.

In 1830 the Finance Minister Motz died, but his work was continued by his successor Maassen. The French and Belgian revolution of the same year both assisted the Zollverein, the one by shaking to its foundations the absolutism of the smaller German states, and the other by opening to navigation the whole course of the Scheldt. Soon after this Electoral Hesse was compelled by force of circumstances to desert her former friends and to join the Zollverein, and she was followed at no great interval by Saxony and the Thuringian Duchies, At last the great epoch arrived, the new year's night of 1833-34. On all the roads of Central Germany there stood before the turnpike gates long rows of heavily laden waggons, surrounded by crowds of excited peasants. With the last stroke of the old year the barriers were lifted and the waggoners drove their horses on joyfully through the enfranchised land. By those who recall the Great Exhibition of 1851, it will be remembered how large a space the Zollverein occupied in that building. Germany was justly proud that she was no longer a geographical expression, but that she was united by an economic tie, and would not have long to wait for the political union. Maassen died just after he had seen the triumph of his labours. The history of America teaches us the same lesson as the history of Germany; in that country also the political union which is represented by its present constitution was made possible by an economic union brought about by the genius of Washington.

The Schleswig-Holstein question, which plays so large

a part in the internal history of Germany, at this time began to enter into a new phase. It would not be suitable to enter into a detailed examination of this matter, which so few, even in Germany, have thoroughly understood. Suffice it to say that Schleswig and Holstein are two provinces lying to the south of Denmark, and therefore between Denmark and Germany; that Holstein is certainly German, and, indeed, an integral part of the German Empire ; that Schleswig, or Slesvig, as the Danes prefer to call it, may or may not be Danish, but has certainly been long claimed as a part of the kingdom of Denmark, or as a duchy attached to that kingdom. It would seem, therefore, that justice would have been satisfied if Holstein could have belonged to Germany, and Slesvig to the Danes. But unfortunately for this settlement the two duchies considered themselves bound together in an irrefragable union, so that " Schleswig-Holstein, sea-surrounded," as their national hymn describes them, always considered themselves as a pair whom God had joined together and no man could put asunder. It was therefore necessary for Denmark and Germany to fight out between them the possession of the two duchies. The difficulty was further complicated by the fact that, whereas the crown of Denmark might descend through females, the duchies could only pass in the male line, although Danish lawyers declared that this limitation applied to Holstein alone. Consequently, on the accession of Frederick VII., who had no children, the heir to the crown of Denmark would be the eldest son of the Prince of Hesse Cassel, who had married the sister of Christian VIII., while the duchies would pass to the younger line of Holstein-Sonderburg-Augustenburg.

In the early forties the Prince of Noer, brother of the Duke of Augustenburg, was viceroy of the duchies. Holstein and Lauenberg were members of the German

Confederation, and Schleswig asked to be admitted to it, while all three duchies refused to be separated. On July 8, 1846, King Christian VIII. published an open letter in which he said that the right of female succession was indisputable in Slesvig and Lauenburg, that there might be some doubt about it in Holstein, but that all three duchies were an integral part of the Danish monarchy, and followed the laws of the Danish, succession. By this the duchies seemed to have lost their hopes of an independent existence, and the Prince of Noer resigned his viceroyship. The excitement was intense ; the hymn, " Schleswig-Holstein, sea-surrounded, " was sung throughout the duchies; their claim to independence was asserted in petitions, addresses and protests; the Diet began to stir itself; and all these movements were naturally repressed with a strong hand by the Danish Government. Christian VIII. died on January 20, 1848, and was succeeded by his son Frederick VII., who defended the integrity of his kingdom in a manner which increased the difficulties of the situation, and which led to important consequences, which is outside the scope of this history to record.

The accession of Frederick William IV. to the throne of Prussia on June 7, 1840, was looked upon as a new era for that country. His character is difficult to understand. He was able, intellectual, and romantic, gifted with many powers, witty, original, and eloquent, but filled, on the other hand, with an idea of his position as King, which was not only rooted in absolutism, but in a mystic belief in Divine right, with a tendency to glorify and idolise the Middle Ages, which made him little suited to cope with the pressing difficulties of the moment. The great need of Germany at this time was unity. The King recognised this, and many plans and thoughts for carrying it into execution occupied his

mind. But they were rendered inoperative either by his pride, which would make no concessions, or by his sentimentality for the past, which made him dislike modern Liberalism, or by his strong religious beliefs, which made it difficult for him to sympathise with the religious views of others. His life was a constant struggle between high aims and deep-seated prejudices, between a desire for popularity and an exaggerated consciousness of his own Divine mission. The consequence was that, under him, reaction reached its height, education was confined within the narrowest limits, and even the independence of the judges was tampered with. To write an account of his reign would lead us into too much detail. He formed project after project, plan after plan, in which he endeavoured to reconcile the irreconcilable, the liberty of his subjects and the freedom of his own fancies. This led in time to complete anarchy in government, administration was paralysed, and authority was enervated. Those who directed the state had no confidence either in themselves or in their sovereign. At last, after much discussion, the King issued, on February 3, 1847, a patent which convoked a general assembly of provincial Diets, which aroused the greatest disappointment. The powers given to the new Parliament were much too restricted; there was little guarantee for their permanence ; and the power given to the nobles was excessive. The King made matters worse by his opening speech, in which he said : " Never will I allow that a sheet of written paper should interpose like a second Providence between our Lord God in Heaven and this country, to govern us by its paragraphs. The King cannot and ought not to depend upon the will of majorities. I should never have called you together, if I had the least idea that **you** could dream of playing the part of so-called representatives of the people."

In the other states of Germany matters were gradu-

ally leading up to the coming revolution. In Saxony the leader of the Liberal party was Robert Blum, a man of humble birth, but of such eloquence that his friends compared him even with Mirabeau. He conducted his party with praiseworthy moderation. On August 12, 1845, Prince John, the heir to the throne, a pious Catholic and a profound Dante scholar, was passing through Leipzig. A mob assembled before the Prince's hotel, sang Protestant songs, abused the Jesuits and broke the windows. That matters were not worse was due to the influence and wisdom of Robert Blum.

Hanover belonged to England, and up to the revolution in July was governed by Count Munster. In February 1831 he was succeeded by tho Duke of Cambridge, who gave his consent to a new constitution, which enlarged the power of taxation possessed by the Chambers, and established freedom of religion, equality before the law, ministerial responsibility, and freedom of the Press. Unfortunately, the Duke of Cumberland, who succeeded to the throne of Hanover on the death of William IV., adopted a different policy. He refused to acknowledge the new constitution, and restored the Estates of 1819. Seven professors who, in consequence, refused to take the oath of allegiance, were deprived of their chairs, and three of them were banished. The names of the "Gottingen Seven" became celebrated throughout Germany, like those of the Seven Bishops in England. They were the two brothers Grimm, Dahlmann, Gervinus, Ewald, Albrecht, and Weber. A long quarrel ensued between the King and the Chambers, who refused to recognise the validity of the Estates of 1819. Eventually a new constitution of a reactionary character was established in 1840, and the spirit of opposition slept for a few years.

Duke Charles of Brunswick had been a witness of the July revolution in Paris, but it taught him no

lesson. His rule was detested by all classes of his subjects, by the nobles as well as by the people. A long-threatened revolt broke out on September 6, 1830, and continued during the following day. The Palace was stormed and set on fire, and the Duke fled for his life. His brother William, who succeeded him, pursued a different policy, and entered upon a course of salutary reforms, which his exiled brother did his best to interfere with. His efforts to delude his people and to return were of no avail, and he died in Geneva, forty years afterwards, where a statue, paid for by himself, preserves the memory of his name. Electoral Hesse had long been waiting for relief, and the July revolution supplied the needed stimulus. The hatred of the Hessians concentrated itself on Hassenpflug, who became minister in 1832. The Hessian constitution was liberal enough, but th^ combined efforts of the Prince and the minister succeeded in reducing it to a nullity. The Press was crushed, the civil servants were reduced to the position of slaves, the law was disregarded, and a system of pure absolutism was set up. The minister united in himself the characteristics of the bigot, the schoolmaster, the tyrant, and the miser. When Hassenpflug retired from office in July 1837, others were found as bad as himself ready to take his place. A distinguished professor, member of the Chamber, was kept in prison for four years.

Ludwig I. was King of Bavaria during the period of which we are now treating, and Abel was his minister from 1837 to 1847. Abel gave himself up to bigotry and devotion to the Papacy; during the ten years that he remained in office the monasteries reached the enormous number of 132. Protestant soldiers were compelled to kneel before the host, which produced an outcry in Germany. Education was starved in the interests of the Church. The King ruled absolutely

under the cover of constitutional forms. At last an event occurred which broke the patience of the most enduring. In October 1846 the Spanish dancer, Lola Montez, came to Munich, a fascinating if somewhat faded beauty, full of passion and ability, ambitious but not grasping. The Church had hitherto overlooked the King's failings, but Lola Montez was a Protestant, and a sworn enemy of the Clerical party. Under her influence he took away from Abel the control of education, and the whole ministry resigned. Abel was succeeded by the Protestant* Von Maurer. Lola, the people said, had conquered Loyola. She was created Countess Lansfeld and consulted about all political affairs. The Maurer ministry was soon found to be too constitutional for the King's taste, and he made way for Prince Wallenstein, in what was known as the Lola, or Spanish, ministry. The Clerical party naturally attacked the King's mistress, and the simple-minded Bavarians were easily roused to view the situation of their King with horror. The storm broke out even before the revolution in Paris, and the King was obliged to send Lola Montez away. She went to America, where she died in a hospital in 1861.

Wiirttemberg need not detain us, because in that country both reaction and opposition showed themselves in a mild form. It should be mentioned that the poet Uhland was one of the leaders of the opposition, and that Robert von Mohl, the great teacher of political science, was deprived of his professorship at Tubingen for criticising the system of government administration. Baden showed a more active political life, which had a deep effect upon the development of German liberty. The government of the Grand Duke Leopold was excellent, and the Liberal party contained the names of Rotteck, Welcker, and Mittermaier. Indeed the liberal tendencies of the Baden Chambers and of the prime

minister, Winter, had to be held in check by the central Diet at Frankfort. After Winter's death, in 1838, the government of Baden entered into a new phase under the ministry of Blittersdorf, who was a blind and servile instrument of Metternich's policy. After his departure, in 1843, public affairs did not recover their former happy condition, so that when the revolution broke out there was plenty of work for it to do.

CHAPTER XII

AUSTRIA

THE revolution of July had little effect in Austria. The people had no desire to rise, and the Government could peacefully pursue its course of reaction and repression. The Holy Alliance between the three absolute monarchies seemed to be more firmly established than over, and when the Emperor Francis died, on March 2, 1835, he might close his eyes with the belief that his system was established and secure. The successor of Francis was his son Ferdinand I., now forty-two years of age, a man of good heart and excellent intentions, but of little ability, of weak will, whose health was undermined by attacks of epilepsy. He was naturally an instrument in the hands of his ministers. The result was that Austria was governed by a kind of Regency, consisting of Metternich, Kolowrat, and two archdukes. Metternich was now an old man, and although he retained most of his former charm, and much of his past authority, yet he left the real work of administration to be done by others.

Although Austria remained quiet, the subject populations began to bestir themselves. We find the idea of Panslavism arising in Bohemia; the discovery of a collection of Bohemian heroic ballads of great antiquity gave an impulse to the study of the Bohemian

language, and a corresponding demand for self-government in Bohemia. The feeling was shared by other branches of the Slavonic race, by the Croatians, the Slavonians, and the Servians, while even the Slovaks in the north of Hungary began to put forward their claims to recognition as a separate nationality. The Hungarians, on their side, who had hitherto used a corrupt Latin as the means of official communication, clamoured for the acknowledgment of their own strong and beautiful tongue, the Magyar. In 1844 a law was passed which admitted the employment of Magyar in laws and other public documents. The Croatians, who were subject to Hungary, were anxious to obtain similar privileges for their own language, but the jealousy with which the Magyars have always regarded the Slavs prevented the fulfilment of their wishes. In Galicia the lluthcnian peasants had always been badly treated by the Polish landowners, from whom they differed in origin, speech, and religion. The Polish patriots, who secured the admiration of Liberal Europe, passed on to their inferiors the insults which they received from a tyrannous Government, and it was obvious that a Polish rising against Austria would be accompanied by a civil war in Galicia itself.

Cracow was at this time a free state, the last remains of Polish independence. It was, however, under the police superintendence of Austria. In February, 1846, the Polish exiles had arranged for a general rising in their country, in the hope of recovering their ancient independence. It was to begin with the seizure of Danzig and Thorn, but the Prussian Government was on its guard, and the enterprise was nipped in the bud. Austrian troops were marched into Cracow to prevent a similar catastrophe in that republic. The forces of the Austrian general, Collin, were not able to cope with the insurgents; they were compelled to retire to

Galicia, and a provisional government was set up in Cracow, of which Dr. Tyssowski, a young physician, was dictator. In Galicia the peasants refused to rise with their lords against the Austrians, and the Austrians were able to employ them to put down the insurrection. But they were not able to control the power which they had called into life. The peasants took matters into their own hands, and the province became the scene of the most horrible atrocities, which the Austrians were not able to prevent. When peace was at last restored neither party found that they had gained much. Cracow was reduced to order with the help of the other two partitioning powers. Tyssowski tied to America. The three military monarchies, in spite of the public feeling of Europe, and the strong protest of England and France, incorporated Cracow with Austria, and drove another nail into the arrangements of the treaty of Vienna.

After the July revolution the movement for reform in Hungary continued to progress, under the leadership of Count Stephen Szechenyi, who was a great admirer of England. The programme of the reformers included the abolition of guilds, of the robot, or compulsory labour of peasants, of tithes, of the exemption of the nobility from taxation, equality of rights and duties, guarantees for the permanence of the constitution, and better economical conditions. At the head of the Radical opposition stood Louis Kossuth, an agitator and a demagogue, an eloquent orator and journalist, and by his side the far more important personality of Francis Deak, who for his wisdom, moderation, and tenacity, for his unselfish striving after practical ends, which ho eventually succeeded in obtaining, deserves to be placed in the first rank of statesmen. Archduke Joseph, brother of the Emperor Francis, who had for fifty years held the oilice of Palatine of Hungary, a wise and

noderate man, well acquainted with the circumstances of the country over which he ruled, and therefore leservedly beloved, died in January, 1847, and his son ind successor, Archduke Stephen, was not equal to the task. The Diet summoned in November, 1847, was still continuing its stormy sittings when the great revolution reached the plains of Hungary, and we cannot be surprised that it found in that country a favourable ground for its operations, and threatened to tear Hungary for ever asunder from the Empire of which it formed part.

CHAPTER XIII

ITALY AND SWITZERLAND

BEFORE we approach the revolution of February in Paris, with which our narrative ends, we must give some account of the events in Italy and Switzerland which preceded it, and to some extent led up to it. We have seen how the earlier attempts to effect the unity of Italy and its freedom from foreign domination had failed. In 1831 Francis IV., Duke of Modena, was guilty of a rare act of treachery. Having failed in an attempt to exclude the house of Carignan from the Sardinian succession, he seemed to be attracted by the plan of a Liberal rising, which might have the effect of making him sovereign of Northern Italy. He entered into relations with Ciro Menotti, the head of the Carbonari of Modena, whom he had formerly imprisoned, but being threatened with deposition by Metternich, he changed his conduct, and threw one of his former accomplices into prisQn. Menotti, however, proceeded to carry out the plan already agreed upon, and at nightfall on February 3, collected in his house thirty-five young men, who were at midnight to go into the streets, proclaim the revolution, and open the gates to the insurgents who were waiting outside. Francis, who knew all about the scheme, from having been himself

a party to it, surrounded the house with a battalion of infantry, blockaded it for five hours and then bombarded it. Menotti was taken with his companions, and the Duke wrote to the Clovernor of Reggio to send him the executioner.

On the following day Bologna rose, imprisoned the Pope's legate, deposed the Pope from the government of the Romagna, and proclaimed a provisional government. The other towns of the province declared themselves independent, the Marches revolted, Ancona was occupied, Francis was driven from Modena and Marie Louise from Parma. Within a single week the national colours waved from Piacenza to Ancona, from Ferrara to Kieti. A month later the revolution was crushed and the old Governments restored. Pope Gregory X Y I. wrote to the Fmperor Francis to demand his assistance in putting down the revolution. An Austrian army setting out from Piacenza, restored Marie Louise to Parma, took Modena in its stride, marched on Bologna, where it met another column coming from Ferrara, and advanced by Rimini to Ancona, where the provisional government of the United Provinces was holding its sittings. No resistance was attempted, but those who pleased were permitted to retire into exile. Duke Francis on his return executed Menotti, and established a system of terror in his states ; while the capitulation of Ancona was disavowed by the Pope, and violated by Austria, so that a number of Liberals, in spite of the promise of pardon, where sent to languish in the prisons of Venice.

After the failure of these outbreaks the problem of how best to achieve Italian unity entered upon a new phase. Between 1830 and 1840 a new generation entered into the arena of Italian politics, who devoted themselves to the problem : why had these movements failed in the past, and how were they to succeed in the

future. The efforts which succeeded these ideas, and which eventually culminated in the unity of Italy, are generally known as II Risorgimento d'Italia, the resurrection of Italy. The supporters of this movement were divided into two parties or schools, of which one pursued more ideal, the other more practical methods. It is, however, probable that neither would have succeeded without the other, although ono party might have been called revolutionist and the other reformers.

The first was the party of "Giovane Italia," Young Italy, founded by Giuseppe Mazzini. Mazzini was born at Genoa, in 1809 ; as a young man .he studied literature and philosophy, he founded two newspapers which were successively suppressed, and was exiled at twenty-one as a Carbonaro. He remained in exile nearly the whole of his life, and he preached the gospel of Italian liberty for forty years. Exiled in 1830, he founded "Giovane Italia" in 1835. Its fundamental principles were that Italy should be one, and that it should be a republic. Italy, he said, must be one in order to bo strong, and it must be a republic, because no other form of government would satisfy Italian reason or Italian traditions. *lly* asserting these principles, Mazzini broke with all the conspirators who had preceded him. They had formed secret societies with secret objects, and for the benefit of some small part of the peninsula ; he substituted for this the rising of a whole people, conscious of its rights and of its power. He wished to attain his object by education, and he was ready to wait till the instruments were ready for their work. Ho soon gathered round him a large number of adherents, but it was difficult to inspire them with the example of his own patience, and consequently Young Italy was drawn into adventures of which its founder did not approve. Such was the rising of the brothers Iluffini at Genoa, in 1833, which caused a terror in Piedmont .

such the attempt of Ramorino in Savoy, in 1834, of the Italian Legion in Romagna, in 1843, and that of the brothers Bandiera, in 1844, who disembarked in Calabria with a small body of men, were caught and executed. It was easy for those who did not understand Mazzini's principles to imagine that he differed from the Carbonari only in name, and the distinction between one Italian conspirator and another was scarcely perceivable.

The programme of the reformers was less definite and precise, because they waited upon events, and were united less by a principle than by an aim. They were anxious for the unity and the liberty of their country, but they respected both the Church and the Throne ; indeed, they were less a party than a collection of individuals who by their writings produced a common state of feeling, and by their advice and action contributed to bring it about. Thd foremost of them was Vincenzo Gioberti, a Catholic priest from Turin. In 1843 ho published his great work, *Del Primato morale e civile degli Italiani.* In this book he first attempted to prove that of all the nations of the world Italy alone possesses the qualities necessary for the post of mistress of the world, and then, after admitting that this supremacy had been lost, he showed by what means it might be recovered. This "was to be effected by forming the states of Italy into a confederation, of which the Pope was to bo the head. By these means the three great needs of the Italians—unity, independence, and freedom—would be attained, the first two by the creation of an independent federal state, and the third by the beneficial influence which the Pope would exercise over the princes of the federation. Thus, indeed, all questions which were now in agitation would be solved, without, foreign intervention, without civil wars, and without revolutions. It un-

doubtedly did good, because it brought the problem of the unity of Italy prominently forward, and showed that the solution of the Giovane Italia was not the only possible solution.

Two other names must be mentioned in this connection, those of Cesare Balbo and Massimo d'Azeglio. The first, who had devoted himself to the study of history in Paris, published at Turin in 1844 *Delle Speranze d' Italia* (" On the Hopes of Italy "). He followed to a great extent the views of Gioberti, but showed that no independence or confederation was possible so long as Austria maintained her strong position in the peninsula, and determined the counsels of the Italian princes with all the weight of her army. He scarcely expected to be able to drive her out by force, but he thought that the solution of the Eastern question, and the break up of the Ottoman Empire, which seemed in those days more imminent than it does now, would provide means of compensating Austria in the Balkan Peninsula for her sacrifices in Italy. We have been told on the best authority that the key-note of the foreign policy of Napoleon I I I . was his desire to liberate Italy from the yoke of Austria, and this idea may have been inspired or confirmed by the study of Balbo's work. D'Azeglio, a writer and an artist as well as a statesman, contributed his share to the discussion by a book entitled *Gli Ultimi Cast di Iiomagna* (" The Recent Occurrences in the Romagna"), which ended with the words: " I t is the first duty of Italians to use our courage as citizens to obtain from our Governments all the reforms and all the liberal institutions which are compatible with public order; there will come at a later period the military courage which will enable us to conquer our independence."

On June 1, 1846, died Pope Gregory X V I . , a man of high character, but an enemy of the new political ideas,

He was succeeded by Mastai-Ferretti, who took the title of Pius IX., Pio Nono, as he will be always known in history. He was in entire sympathy with the national aspirations, and was willing to place himself at their head. His election was received with enthusiasm by his subjects, a feeling which he justified by releasing all political prisoners, and recalling all exiles from banishment. He began a series of reforms, he reduced the expenses of his household, gave freedom to the Press, improved the course of justice, built railways, admitted laymen to high offices of state, taxed the monasteries, formed a representative Council of State, accorded to Rome a liberal municipal government, and prepared the way for a Customs Union and a confederation for the whole Italian peninsula. When Austria and her princely myrmidons attempted to coerce him, he resisted with strength and dignity. In short, he placed himself at the head of the national movement and made the Papacy once more the political centre of Italy. "Kvviva Pio Nono!" was the popular cry of the day, the watchword of Liberals, the hope of patriots, but at the same time a punishable offence in Naples, in Modena, and in Lombardy. The influence of the new Pope was soon felt in other parts of Italy; there arose a passionate desire to get rid of the foreigner and to obtain civil freedom and constitutional government from Italian rulers. The course of these events, the hopes, the disappointments, the ultimate fulfilment, lies outside the scope of this work. The Italians were now fully roused to the attainment of their object, and two obstacles stood in their way, the Jesuits and the Austrians. The bitterness between the two nations reached such a height that the Austrian garrison lived as in an enemy's country, and in February, 1848, the Austrian Government was obliged to declare the Lombard provinces subject to martial law.

Disturbances in Switzerland, which had a religious origin, tended also to hasten the coming catastrophe. Switzerland was divided into two camps, Radical and Conservative. The last were mainly supported by the seven Catholic cantons, Schwytz, Uri, Unterwalden, Lucerne, Zug, Freiburg, and the Valais, called in German Wallis. Lucerne attempted to strengthen its position by placing its education ia the hands of the Jesuits. The Radicals accepted the challenge, and demanded the expulsion of the Order. Tn September, 1845, the Catholics made themselves into a separate confederation under the name of Sonderbund. The cantonal government of Geneva and the Pays do Vaud came into the hands of the Radical party, while Bern, by far the most important part of the confederation, exchanged a Conservative ministry for a Democratic. In July, 1847, the party of progress demanded the expulsion of the Jesuits, and a Diet held at Bern declared the institution of the Sonderbund incompatible with the Swiss constitution, and ordered its dissolution. The Pope counselled peace, but hesitated to take the decisive step of recalling the Jesuits from Switzerland. Lucerne refused to give way, and nothing remained but the arbitrament of the sword.

Siegwart-Muller, who was the head of the extreme party in Lucerne, hoped for an armed intervention of the Great Powers, as he knew that the Swiss Radicals were detested by Austria, Prussia, and France. The war, however, was soon over; it began on November 4 and ended on December 1. General Dufour, whose name occupies in Switzerland something of the position which that of Washington does in the United States, first conquered Freiburg without difficulty, and then after storming the camp of Colonel Salis-Soglio, entered Lucerne, upon which the remaining cantons submitted of their own accord, and accepted the conclusions of the

Diet. The, three Great Powers had no time to intervene. When Guizot's courier arrived at Lucerne, he found the Sonderbund vanished into air, and its leaders fled to Italy. He followed them over the Alps, and roused the laughter of Europe. England, as might be expected, supported the Liberal cause. Lord Palmerston did not object to hold a congress of mediation in London, but he said that the expulsion of the Jesuits must he accepted as a preliminary condition. Sir Stratford Canning, who had been formerly minister at Bern, visited that capital on his way back to the east, and conveyed to the Swiss the sympathy and the advice of England. The result of the war was that the constitution of Switzerland was changed from a looser to a closer confederation, from a Staaten Bund to a Bundes Staat. It received then the form which it still keeps, except for some modifications introduced in 1874, and is the most democratic and perhaps the most successful constitution in Europe.

CHAPTER XIV

THE FALL OF THE MONARCHY OF JULY

WE have now arrived at the event which is the closing of one epoch and the opening of another, the fall of the monarchy of July. We have seen how the Government of Louis Philippe was gradually becoming unpopular. Discontent was aggravated by distress. For some time past a series of bad harvests had produced suffering in France. The corn laws were suspended, but the hard winter in the Black Sea, and impassable roads in the south of France, prevented the expected relief of Russian corn from reaching the starving population. The Bank of France was nearly exhausted, and was on the point of suspending cash payments, when it was saved by the timely assistance of the Emperor of Russia. The provinces were overrun by bands of armed men, demanding food and money. Corn shops were attacked in the towns, and waggons carrying corn were plundered in the country. Similar scenes had preceded and accompanied the great revolution of 1789. The troops did their best to put down these disorders, but every exercise of their authority increased the irritation. As soon as the Chambers met, in which Guizot had a decisive majority, matters came to light which caused great scandal. It was shown that the Government had

employed methods of corruption, and that Emile Girardin, tho editor of the *Presse,* who had killed Armand Carrell in a duel, was in the pay of the ministry. In August, 1847, the ghastly murder of the Duchesse de Praslin by her husband threw a lurid light on the corruption of society, and undermined tho stability of the throne, as that of Louis XVI. had been shaken by the scandal of the diamond necklace.

The action of the Government had not been more fortunate in foreign affairs; Louis Philippe had always been ambitious of being received on a footing of equality by the ancient dynasties, but as he approached the policy of the Holy Alliance, and coquetted with the favour of the absolute monarchies, so he lost the good will of the classes which had originally helped -him to the throne. Yet he was treated with contempt by the courts of Austria and Russia. At Vienna he found the doors closed against him,* and on the Neva his ambassadors had to accept a position of inferiority. The attitude of Guizot in the affair of the Sonderbund had not conciliated the enemies of the Government, either by his sympathy with the Clerical party or by the ludicrous failure which accompanied his interference. In Home the French Ambassador had orders to restrain the reforming ardour of Pio Nono, in Italy Guizot went hand in hand with Metternich, and opposed the Liberal inlluence of England, while in Toulon and Port-Vendres, two squadrons were being held in readiness to intervene in Italy on the side of reaction. The feeling that the monarchy had gone astray from the principles which it was originally founded to maintain penetrated the whole nation and all political parties.

The opposition now determined to concentrate their efforts on obtaining a reform of the representation, as a large increase of the franchise would make corruption difficult or impossible. Electoral reform was regarded

as the question of the day alike by Legitimists, Constitutionalists, and Republicans, although they did not agree as to the manner or the extent to which it should be carried out. In order to create a public opinion in favour of this change, reform banquets were held in several towns of France, at which a deputy would be present, belonging either to the left, the Radicals or the dynastic opposition, and would make strong speeches in attack upon the present condition of things. Men like Odilon Barrot, Duvergier de Hauranne, Thiers, and Remusat had taken part at these banquets, and Lamartine used this occasion to make a fiery speech at Macon. He declared emphatically that the monarchy would fall, not in blood as in 1789, but in the snare which it had laid for itself.

The Chambers met on December 28, 1847, under gloomy auspices. France was impoverished in funds, discredited abroad and disaffected at home. In the debate on the address the ministry was violently attacked. Guizot was accused of selling offices ; Thiers said that they had protected the Jesuits, made an alliance with Austria, and betrayed the Swiss, who had been their allies for centuries ; he charged the Cabinet with representing the counter-revolution. Lamartine said that ever since France intervened in the affairs of Spain, she was always acting at variance with her traditions and interests; she was Ghibelline in Rome, Guelph in Bern, Austrian in Piedmont, and Russian in Cracow, French nowhere, reactionary everywhere. Notwithstanding this opposition, the address to the throne was carried. The opposition was embarrassed. They had no means of appealing to the people. It was even suggested that they should resign their seats, so as to bring about the excitement of *a* new election. At last it was determined to hold a large reform anquet in Paris. The day was fixed for February 22,

the place was the Champs Elys^es, They knew that this would bring them into direct conflict with the Government, because the King's speech at the opening of the Chambers had intimated that in virtue of an old law of 1790, such banquets would be disallowed.

Both parties seemed anxious to avoid a struggle. The validity by which it was sought to forbid the banquet was doubtful. It was proposed as a compromise that the banquet should be formally held, that those present should be summoned to disperse, that on their refusal the question should be tried by the courts and finally settled. The programme of the festival was published, and it was obvious that a large crowd would be present. The National Guard was invited to assemble in the Place de la Madeleine, armed with sabres but not with guns. The Government regarded this as a menace ; the reformers defended it as a precaution against disorder. The assembly in the public square was forbidden by the minister, who had the undoubted right to do so. The reformers had but little time for deliberation, but they determined not to run the risk of a collision, and they announced that the banquet would not take place. The King boasted that he had always known that if he showed the necessary firmness the opposition would give way.

In spite of all precautions a large crowd assembled in the Place do la Madeleine. Some did not know that the banquet had been put off, others were eager for disturbance. They were unarmed, and had many women and children amongst them. A column formed of artizans in blouses, of students, of pupils of the Polytechnic School, and of Paris gamins, forced its way over the Place de la Concorde towards the Chamber of Deputies. It was driven back by cavalry into the neighbouring streets, and erected a few barricades. During the night of February 22 Paris was quiet, but

the troops were unwisely left in the streets under arms. The consequence was that, on the following morning, the people had become much more excited; they had furnished themselves with arms, and erected many more barricades. The National Guards began to fraternise with the people. The King, at last convinced of the danger, summoned Mole to the Tuileries, dismissed Guizot and promised reform. For a moment the storm was stilled. The troops and the people felt that a load was taken off their hearts, and the Republicans believed that their cause was lost. As darkness came on the city was spontaneously illuminated, and crowds thronged the boulevards; they were most thickly massed before the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, where a force of fifty soldiers was protecting the house of the fallen minister from a possible attack, a useless and, as it proved, fatal precaution. Suddenly, about eight o'clock, a shot was fired, either from the soldiers or the crowd. The troops replied by a volley. The effect of this was terrible: fifty corpses lay on the ground, and many more were wounded. In a few minutes the whole of Paris resounded with the cry, "Murder! Treason! To Arms!" A number of carts were collected on which the corpses were placed, and dragged through the streets—men, women, and children, their bleeding wounds exposed. As they marched by the light of torches, the tocsin sounded from the towers the knell of the monarchy of July.

At midnight Thiers came to the Tuileries by the King's command, but he refused to form a ministry unless he received Odilon Barrot, the leader of the Reform party, as his colleague. The last act of Guizot as minister was to entrust the military command of Paris to Marshal Bugeaud. He was worshipped by the troops, but there was a fear lest his well-known severity might tend to exasperate rather than to dismay the mob. On the morning of February 24 Thiers and

Odilon Barrot came to the Tuileries at daybreak, but they found the King asleep. When he awoke he agreed to their programme, which was: to withdraw the troops, to dissolve the Chambers, and to grant electoral reform. The aged Marshal Gerard superseded Bugeaud in the command of the garrison. During the night the greater part of Paris had been covered with barricades, held by thousands of armed men. The troops were exhausted by their unbroken service of thirty-six hours, and made no resistance. The proclamation of the new ministry excited no enthusiasm, Odilon Barrot had lost his popularity. In the course of the morning the Palais Royal, the private property of the Orleans family, was attacked by the mob, and its valuable contents, books, furniture, and works of art destroyed; the municipal guard, which was posted under the windows, making no effort to save it. The King was at breakfast with his family when he was informed that the troops were giving their muskets to the insurgents. The Queen urged her husband to mount his horse and place himself at the head of the troops, to save the honour of his crown, if he could save nothing else. Attended by his two sons, Nemours and Montpensier, the King rode through the lines of soldiers, but he was received with chilling silence and cries of "Reform!"

The royal family were collected in distress and anguish in the King's apartments, when, about two in the afternoon, Emile Girardin burst into the room and told Louis Philippe that the only hope of saving the monarchy was to abdicate and to proclaim the Duchess of Orleans Regent. The King and the Queen were unwilling to take this step, but the others present, especially the Due de Montpensier, pressed it upon him with unseemly vehemence. Bugeaud came too late to prevent the fatal act. The King wrote, slowly and in

capitals, the following words : "I lay down the crown which I was summoned to wear by the voice of the nation, and which I only accepted to bring peace and unity to the French. As I find it impossible to fulfil this task, I make it over to my grandson, the Comte de Paris. May he be more fortunate than I have been." The abdication was of no use, and it destroyed the last hope of saving the throne. The King took off his uniform, dressed himself as a private citizen, gave his arm to the Queen, and passed through the Tuileries gardens, amidst the tears of all who saw him. As the royal carriages were in the hands of the mob, the exiled family drove in two hackney coaches at a gallop to Saint Cloud.

The King's abdication was received by the mob which surrounded the Tuileries with shouts of "Long live the Republic!" By the order of the Due de Nemours the troops were withdrawn from the defence of the Tuileries, which was then occupied by the mob. The Duchess of Orleans was advised to place her son under the protection of the Chambers, in order to secure his claim to the throne. Accompanied by Nemours, she passed on foot out of the palace, through the famous garden in which the faithful Swiss had perished in defence of their monarch, and across the Place de la Concorde to the Chamber of Deputies. Before she reached it the mob had already stormed the Tuileries and thrown the furniture out of the windows. The Duchess arrived, with her two children, one nine the other seven years old. A painful scene ensued. The Deputies were afraid to accept her son as King or to proclaim a Republic. The Duchess did not know whether to go or stay, and it was difficult for the Chamber to deliberate in her presence. At last a Republican Deputy proposed a provisional government. This was received with applause by the galleries, which

Cham,;..
the widow and ,
" The power of the Chamber is no more.
were justified by the fact; an armed throng broke into the hall, a butcher with a blood-stained apron, and a slaughtering knife in his hand, strode up and down the floor. Ledru Rollin and Lamartine spoke in favour of a National Convention. A new throng now flooded the Chamber—ruffians drunk with the wine of the, Tuileries cellars, who cried: "Down with the Regency! Down with the Bourbons, the new as well as the old'! Down with the corrupt Chamber ! Down with all traitors ! " At these words most of the Deputies sought safety in flight. The Duchess and her , children were hurried through the nearest door, but they were nearly crushed to death, and with difficulty reached the President's house through the garden. In the struggle the two children were separated from their mother. The eldest was soon restored to her, rescued from the hands of a. murderous ruffian, but the younger could not be found till the following day. The Monarchy, of July had fallen and lay in fragments beyond the hope of restoration.

THE END.