CHAPTER V

THE UNITY OF ITALY
(1815-1870)

For centuries Italy, in the phrase of Metternich, was nothing more than a geographical expression. One attempt after another to weld the Peninsula into a united kingdom had failed. The barbarians who overran Western Europe after the fall of the Roman Empire rapidly established themselves in Britain, Spain and Gaul; but Italy was too choice a prize to remain the undisturbed possession of any one people. The very greatness of her traditions conspired to retard her political development by making her the target of every ambitious conqueror. The Ostrogoths who ruled the Peninsula in the sixth century did not long survive the death of their great King, Theodoric, and the State which he had built up soon crumbled to the dust. Their successors, the Lombards, only achieved a temporary triumph, and served but to add one more element of disunion to those which already existed. At a later period Italy was distracted by the rival claims of the Empire and the Papacy, and the strife of their supporters—the Ghibellines and the Guelphs—turned every city into a hotbed of faction and disorder. At the close of the Middle Ages a new, and even darker, page of Italian history opened with the expedition of Charles VIII. across the Alps. Italy now became the cockpit of Europe, where foreign Powers contended for mastery. Her native princes sacrificed national aspirations at the altar of self-aggrandizement, and did not hesitate to invoke the aid of the foreigner in their internecine quarrels. Deprived of her natural leaders, Italy sank into the degraded condition
from which all the efforts of patriots like Machiavelli proved powerless to raise her.

In the nineteenth century more than one obstacle impeded the path of Italian unity. The most important was the fact that Italy lay under the heel of foreign domination. Austria was entrenched in the north; her satellites—princes of Austrian birth—ruled in Tuscany, Modena and Parma; while in the south a Bourbon dynasty governed the Two Sicilies (Naples and Sicily). Yet scarcely less important was the temporal power of the Papacy, which cut Italy into two halves, and was an insurmountable barrier to the unification of the Peninsula. The States of the Church had been created by Gregory I., the founder of the mediæval Papacy, at a time when the spiritual authority of the pontiff was the sole bulwark against Lombard aggression; and the temporal lordship then established was consolidated and extended by his successors in the chair of St. Peter. The weapon which Gregory had forged in the interests of Italy proved in the long run, however, detrimental to the best interests of Italy. It was impossible to unite Italy so long as she was divided by the Papal States; it seemed equally impossible to take from the Papacy a power backed by all the spiritual resources at its command. Lastly, the Italian people themselves had not yet attained to a full sense of national consciousness. Italy, like Greece, is a land where almost every spot has its own traditions and genius loci, a circumstance which served to accentuate local jealousies and to retard national growth. "In Italy," wrote Metternich, "provinces are against provinces, towns against towns, families against families, and—men against men." ¹

A new epoch began when Italy was drawn into the vortex of Napoleonic conquest. The Austrians and the Bourbons were driven from the Peninsula, the Papal States were annexed, and a uniform system of law and administration was everywhere established. These effects of French rule were evanescent: "Throughout Italy one stroke of the pen erased all our liberties, all our reforms, all our hopes. The old regime reappeared, pernicious as before, but
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surcharged with vengeance.”¹ Yet the lesson that Italy was a nation, once learnt, was never forgotten. The Italian people had caught a glimpse of the Promised Land which was to be the goal of all their efforts for half a century, and its memories could never fade completely from their minds. Apart, moreover, from the temporary union which Italy had acquired, there was the priceless heritage bequeathed by the French Revolution, the privileges of equal rights before the law, religious liberty, freedom of the press, and self-government. As the tangible fruits of a national system of administration, they served to intensify the ardour and patriotism of the people.

At the Vienna Congress national aspirations were ignored, and Italy was treated merely as a pawn in the diplomatic game. Austria emerged as the preponderant Power in the Peninsula, and the sole arbiter of Italian destinies; not only was she in actual possession of Lombardy and Venetia, but her influence controlled all the other States. A glance at the accompanying map will indicate the geographical situation of the different Italian States, whose political condition we have now briefly to describe. Lombardy and Venetia were constituted a kingdom under the direct rule of the Habsburg monarchy, but for administrative purposes they were divided into two provinces with separate governments centred in Milan and Venice. Elementary and secondary education were not neglected, but their effects were largely neutralized by the failure to give the educational system adequate scope. Fiscal burdens were extremely heavy; although the population was not one-eighth of the Empire, it paid more than a fourth of the total revenue; and all political activity was mercilessly repressed by a rigorous censorship and a tyrannical police system. Metternich confessed that “general dissatisfaction was prevalent.” “The tedious progress of business”; he wrote, “the design attributed to Your Majesty of wishing to give an entirely German character to the Italian provinces; the composition of the courts, where the Italians daily see with sorrow German magistrates appointed to offices... are the main
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causes to which this discontent is ascribed." Conditions were better in Parma, which was ruled by the widow of Napoleon, the well-meaning but weak Marie-Louise, and in Tuscany, "the only Italian State in which the corruption of a mild despotism has been preferred to the system of terror elsewhere dominant." On the other hand, in Modena all the evils of the Austrian 'system' were reproduced, while the restoration of Victor Emmanuel to the throne of Piedmont was at once the signal for the introduction of a reactionary regime. His first act was an attempt to deprive his subjects of the benefits which the French Revolution had brought in its train: "Setting aside all other laws, henceforward our subjects shall obey the Royal Constitutions of 1770, together with the statutes made by our Royal predecessors before June 23, 1800." The attachment of the people to the House of Savoy served to postpone for a time all chance of successful opposition, though the situation was full of menace for the Government. But nowhere were conditions so wretched as in Naples and the States of the Church. The Papal administration exhibited all the vices of an unregulated and chaotic tyranny, while Bourbon rule—which was disfigured by the worst excesses—was later to be described by William Gladstone as the "negation of God."

"We are a people," wrote Mazzini in 1845, "of from one-and-twenty to two-and-twenty millions of men, known from time immemorial by the same name, as the people of Italy; enclosed by natural limits the clearest ever marked out by the Deity—the sea and the highest mountains in Europe; speaking the same language, modified by dialects varying from each other less than do the Scotch and the English; having the same creeds, the same manners, the same habits... proud of the noblest tradition in politics, science and art, that adorns European history; having twice given to Humanity a tie, a watchword of Unity—once, in the Rome of the Emperors, again, ere they had betrayed their mission, in the Rome of the Popes; gifted with active, ready and brilliant faculties... rich in every source of
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material well-being that, fraternally and liberally worked, could make ourselves happy, and open to sister nations the brightest prospect in the world.

"We have no flag, no political name, no rank, among European nations. We have no common centre, no common fact, no common market. We are dismembered into eight States—Lombardy, Parma, Tuscany, Modena, Lucca, the Popedom, Piedmont, the kingdom of Naples—all independent of one another, without alliance, without unity of aim, without organized connexion between them. Eight lines of custom-houses, without counting the impediments appertaining to the internal administration of each State, sever our material interests, oppose our advancement, and forbid us large manufactures, large commercial activity, and all those encouragements to our capabilities that a centre of impulse would afford. Prohibitions or enormous duties check the import and export of articles of the first necessity in each State of Italy. Territorial and industrial products abound in one province that are deficient in another; and we may not freely sell the superfluities or exchange among ourselves the necessities. Eight different systems of currency, of weights and measures, of civil, commercial and penal legislation, of administrative organization, and of police restriction, divide us, and render us as much as possible strangers to each other. And all these States among which we are partitioned are ruled by despotic Governments, in whose working the country has no agency whatever. There exists not in any of these States, either liberty of the press, or of united action, or of speech, or of collective petition, or of the introduction of foreign books, or of education, or of anything. One of these States, comprising nearly a fourth of the Italian population, belongs to the foreigner—to Austria; the others, some from family ties, some from a conscious feebleness, tamely submit to her influence." ¹

In these circumstances the prospects of a United Italy seemed remote. Confronted with arbitrary and suspicious Governments, debarred from freedom of political discussion,
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jealously and rigorously controlled in all their movements, Italian patriots could only find an outlet for their energies in secret societies, or 'sects,' which now everywhere sprang up, but were particularly formidable in Naples. Whatever our opinion of these societies, whose activities were so marked a feature of the generation which followed the Vienna Congress, it must be remembered that they were the outcome of a system which closed up all other avenues of political activity. "We Italians," cried Mazzini, "have neither Parliament, nor hustings, nor liberty of the press, nor liberty of speech, nor possibility of lawful public assemblage, nor a single means of expressing the opinion stirring within us." He added, in words from which we can still draw inspiration: "Whenever a way remains open to you in a just cause for the employment of moral force, never have recourse to violence; but when every moral force is seared up—when tyranny stretches so far as formally to deny you the right of expressing in any manner soever what you conceive to be the truth—when ideas are put down by bayonets—then, reckon with yourself: if, though convinced [that] justice is on your side, you are still in a weak minority, fold your arms and bear witness to your faith in prison or on the scaffold—you have no right to imbrue your country in a hopeless civil war: but if you form the majority, if your feeling prove to be the feeling of millions, rouse yourselves, and beat down the oppression by force." "It is not the country," he told the English people, "that honours the memory of Hampden, of Pym, of Vane, and of other great republicans, that can successfully adduce against us a theory of Oriental submission." In Naples the Carbonari, as they were called, were recruited from all the discontented elements whom the rule of Ferdinand I. had stirred up against his throne, and their influence was seen in the revolt which broke out in 1820. Inspired by the example of the revolution in Spain, the insurgents forced the hand of the Neapolitan King and wrested from him a Constitution, but elated by their easy victory they neglected to take adequate precautions against their real
enemy—Austria. Ferdinand, in violation of his pledges to his subjects, treacherously summoned the Austrian army to his assistance. The rebels misjudging the difficulties of their situation wasted valuable opportunities, and their overthrow at the battle of Rieti speedily brought the insurrection to an ignominious conclusion. Whilst the embers of one revolt were being stamped out in Naples, another was being lighted in Piedmont. Here, also, the object of the rising was to establish a Constitution, and the King was faced with the alternative of giving way to the wishes of his people—a step involving war with Austria—or crushing the revolution by force. Victor Emmanuel shrank from either course, and cut the Gordian knot by abdicating the throne. He was succeeded by his brother, Charles Felix, during whose absence the regency was vested in Charles Albert. The latter, who was destined to play a conspicuous part in the liberation of Italy, was already known for his Liberal sympathies, and he was induced by the insurgents to proclaim the Constitution. But the concession was immediately revoked by the new King, and Charles Albert, remaining loyal to his allegiance, abandoned the movement. Civil war ensued, and at the battle of Novara the support of Austria was again decisive in bringing victory to the side of absolutism.

The years which followed these abortive attempts at revolution in Naples and Piedmont were clouded with gloom for the Italian people. Reaction had triumphed, and it spared no efforts to intimidate the nation into complete submission. The severity of the Austrian regime was intensified, but while the immediate outbreaks which it provoked were ruthlessly repressed, it paved the way for its ultimate downfall by the hatred which it everywhere excited. Italy did not escape the effects of the French Revolution of 1830, which was the cause of outbreaks in Modena, Parma and the Papal States. The hope of French assistance proved, however, illusory. Louis Philippe was admonished by Metternich not to "embarrass the protective action which we may be commissioned from the highest quarters to take." Austria was given a free hand, and her
intervention proved fatal once more to all prospects of success.

The experience gained in these premature revolts, though purchased at a heavy price, was not without value. It focussed attention upon the real problem which confronted the Italian people—the need for the expulsion of the foreigner. It imprinted upon the heart of every Italian the supreme lesson that all efforts were unavailing, unless directed first and foremost towards the overthrow of Austrian domination. Upon the consummation of this design all parties in Italy were now agreed. No argument, indeed, was needed to convince the nationalists that Italy could never achieve an independent existence, or work out her national destiny untrammelled, whilst she still remained under the Habsburg yoke. But the constitutionalists equally recognized that the principles of their faith, 'Liberty, Equality and Humanity,' would continue to bear barren fruit so long as the hand of Metternich choked all the seeds of Liberalism. The pettiest Italian tyrant, as the events of 1821 and 1830 had demonstrated, was omnipotent against his subjects, when backed by the resources of the Austrian Empire; and since Austria was committed irrevocably to the doctrine of 'Legitimacy,' her forces were always at the disposal of every ruler, irrespective of the merits of the dispute. "The political order of things established in 1815," said Metternich, "has made Austria the natural warder and protector of public peace in Italy." Accordingly, he set himself with sleepless vigilance to resist all innovations in government from the conviction that the wheels of revolution, once put in motion, would travel beyond the course intended by its authors. This was doubtless true, but it was a fundamental error not to recognize that progressive tendencies, when artificially checked, are only apt to produce more violent forms of change. Metternich's policy found signal expression in the secret clause of a treaty concluded in 1815 with Ferdinand I. of Naples: "It is agreed between the two high contracting parties that his majesty the King of the Two Sicilies, in
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restoring the Government of his Kingdom, will not admit any change that is not in accordance with the ancient institutions of the monarchy, and with the principles adopted by the Austrian Emperor "for the internal administration of his Italian provinces." The price of Austrian protection was thus Austrian tutelage. Hence to extirpate the grinding oppression of arbitrary and capricious despots, and to reap the golden harvest of a freer life, the first and indispensable step was to drive the foreigner from Italian soil.

Unity of aim is not incompatible with diversity of opinion as to how the aim shall be accomplished. Austria was the common foe, and the overthrow of her ascendancy was placed in the foreground of all political programmes. But the efforts of Italian patriots were weakened by their failure to formulate a single line of action; they sought to mould the destinies of their country in different ways, and mutual distrust impeded their cordial co-operation. In the main, we can distinguish three schools of thought: the republicans, the federalists, and the adherents of the House of Savoy.

The republicans were followers of Giuseppe Mazzini, the prophet of the Italian movement. Exiled in 1831 for alleged conspiracy he proceeded to establish the society of 'Young Italy,' for in the youth of Italy he looked to find the salvation of his country. "Place youth at the head of the insurgent multitude," he counselled, "you know not the secret of the power hidden in these youthful hearts, nor the magic influence exercised on the masses by the voice of youth. You will find among the young a host of apostles of the new religion." He gathered round him a multitude of ardent spirits, inflamed with patriotic fervour, and willing to endure the severest hardships in the faith that "ideas grow quickly when watered with the blood of martyrs." In the pursuit of their mission the disciples of Mazzini were told to "climb the mountains and share the humble food of the labourer; to visit the workshops and the artisans, hitherto neglected; to speak to them of their rights, of their memories of the past, of their past glories, of their former commerce; to recount to them the endless oppression
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of which they were ignorant because no one took it on himself to reveal it." 1 It is the peculiar merit of Mazzini that, more than any other man, he grasped the vision of a United Italy, and set himself with all the ardour of one who preaches a new religion to make his countrymen share in that vision. "Italy," he wrote, "will to be a nation; and one she must become, happen as it may. As certain as I am writing these words, this age will not pass away ere the protocols of the Treaty of Vienna shall have served for wadding—perhaps on the march to Vienna itself—for the muskets of our Italian soldiery." 2 Mazzini's task was to educate the Italian nation to realize that it was a nation and not a 'geographical expression,' to drive home the conviction that the whole Peninsula, though divided by artificial political barriers, was a living unity with a common heritage of traditions and historic memories. His appeal was addressed to "men speaking the same language, treading the same earth, cradled in their infancy with the same maternal songs, strengthened in their youth by the same sun, inspired by the same memories, the same sources of literary genius." 3 The Carbonari had served a useful purpose in keeping alive the spirit of patriotism, but their lack of organizing capacity was a fatal flaw in their movement. "From the want of known leaders," wrote Metternich, "and of concerted action among themselves, the sects [secret societies] are not nearly so dangerous as we might fear." Their strength was frittered away in local outbreaks, which were powerless to achieve anything but a temporary success. So long as unity of action was divorced from unity of purpose, failure was a foregone conclusion; so long as the revolutionaries relied upon isolated efforts, they were bound to meet with disaster. One part of Italy must fight shoulder to shoulder with another if victory was to be assured; in 1821 Piedmont did not rise until the Neapolitans had been practically crushed, and in 1830 the revolts were sporadic and ill-designed. The futility of this narrow policy may well seem obvious to us in the light of
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history, but it needed a succession of failures to impress it upon the minds of the people; and without the teaching of Mazzini the lesson might never have been learnt at all. In any case, Mazzini merits all the honour due to a pioneer whose life was devoted to the pursuit of a great ideal. His propaganda broadened the political horizon of Italians and created a vigorous public opinion in favour of national independence; hence amongst the makers of modern Italy he holds an imperishable place.

But while Mazzini gave to the Italian world the ideal of a United Italy, it was reserved for other men to translate his ideal from theory into fact. Mazzini was a republican; the new State was to be built upon democratic foundations. The spontaneous rising of the whole people to throw off the yoke of foreign oppression would emancipate them at the same time from their bondage to monarchical rule. This part of Mazzini's dream, however, remained unfulfilled. Practical men preferred to pin their faith to the House of Savoy, and the efficacy of organized force. Italian opinion turned to Piedmont, because alone among Italian States she possessed an army of sufficient pretensions to cope with Austria in the field, and her claims to leadership in the coming struggle could also be defended on other grounds, more especially her comparative immunity from any foreign intermixture. As early as 1817 Metternich remarked that "the Turin Cabinet entertains ambitious views which can only be gratified at the expense of Austria." 1 Piedmont was now ruled by Charles Albert, who had come to the throne in 1831. Allusion has already been made to his equivocal conduct during the revolt of 1821, and another insurrection, a dozen years later, was repressed by him with excessive severity. But events were to prove the truth of his assertion that "to my dying day the words 'Patriotism' and 'Freedom from Foreign Rule' will cause my heart to throb." "When the opportunity occurs," he declared, "my life, my sons' lives, my arms, treasure and all, will be expended for the cause of Italy." Meanwhile the wisdom of his administration encouraged the hopes of those who saw in
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the House of Savoy the salvation of Italy. "We shall march," he said, "with the times"; and a number of salutary reforms were set on foot, designed to transform Piedmont into a modern State, and to prepare her for the work of national reconstruction.

For the moment, however, a section of Italian patriots were attracted by the glamour of Gioberti's proposals in his famous Primato; and, extravagant though they seemed, they were destined to exercise a remarkable influence upon the shaping of events. His scheme had at least the merit of originality, for at its inception it was without parallel among the multitude of ideas with which the political situation was flooding contemporary literature. It was nothing less than to constitute the Pope head of an Italian league composed of the different States associated together in a Federation. For centuries the temporal power of the Papacy had been regarded as the main obstacle to the resuscitation of Italy; it was now designed as the basis upon which a united and regenerated Italy should be built up. A reformed Papacy, raised from its degradation, was to resume under altered conditions its former duel with the Empire, and to fulfil once more its historic rôle of championing the interests of Italy against foreign intruders.

Of all the solutions of the Italian Question, that of the Federalists and Neo-Guelphs appeared in the light of history the most remote. Yet the strange irony of events decreed that it should be afforded the first chance of fulfilment. In 1846 Pius IX. ascended the papal throne, and from this moment dates the dawn of Italian liberation, the beginning of the revolution which was ultimately to end in the expulsion of the foreigner and the unification of the Peninsula. After wandering thirty years in a wilderness of disappointed hopes, the Italian people had at last approached the threshold of the Promised Land, and the political structure established at the Vienna Congress forthwith began to crumble to the dust. The new Pope was believed to be anti-Austrian and a Liberal; he had studied the writings of Gioberti, which seem to have exercised the same influence over him as Bolingbroke's Patriot King over George III. Accordingly,
his accession was greeted with boundless enthusiasm, a token of the yearning with which Italy awaited the coming of a leader. His first step appeared to justify the expectations which his election had aroused: he proclaimed an Amnesty for all political offenders. Whether intentionally or not, this act amounted to a virtual defiance of Austria; it meant that in the eyes of the Church patriotism was no longer stigmatized as a crime. "We were prepared for everything," confessed Metternich, "except for a Liberal Pope; now we have got one, there is no answering for anything." The Amnesty was followed by other measures, such as the institution of a Council of State, the membership of which was thrown open to laymen, the establishment of a municipality in Rome, and the formation of a civic guard. These spontaneous reforms on the part of the most conservative Government in Italy were interpreted throughout the Peninsula as a call to arms. The Sicilians were the first to move; they rose in revolt, and within less than a month had reduced the whole island except Messina. A constitutional Government was set up, and the galling chains of Bourbon despotism were discarded. Alarmed for the safety of his mainland kingdom, Ferdinand II. hastened to forestall a revolutionary movement in Naples by granting a Constitution. In this way he also thought to punish the Pope for his patronage of the Liberal movement, since the whole Italian people would now raise the cry for a constitutional system of Government. This expectation was speedily fulfilled. The Pope was compelled to follow Ferdinand's example and proclaim a Constitution, while the precedent which Naples had set was also imitated by Leopold of Tuscany. Charles Albert, recognizing the importance of enlisting Liberal sympathy in the struggle which seemed imminent, issued an edict giving to Piedmont the Constitution which was one day to serve as the basis of the new Italian State. At the same time events in Austria deepened the conviction that the hour of Italian emancipation was at hand. Vienna, the very citadel of Metternich's power, had revolted against his system of government, and in an instant the minister had fallen. The Habsburg Empire,
stripped of all its pretensions, appeared after all but a house of cards which would go to pieces at the first touch of organized resistance. With the confidence born of this belief, the Italian provinces of Austria promptly seized the occasion to make common cause with the neighbouring States in a general movement to achieve national independence. Milan in the Cinque Giornate (the Five Glorious Days) compelled the Austrian forces under Radetzky to evacuate the city. Venice immediately followed suit, driving out the garrison and proclaiming the Republic of St. Mark.

Everything now turned upon the course of action which the King of Piedmont would resolve to pursue. Cavour gave utterance to the famous exhortation: "The hour of fate has struck for the Sardinian monarchy. One road only is open, that of immediate war." Hitherto Charles Albert, a devout son of the Church, had been reluctant on religious grounds to draw the sword against a great Catholic Power. But in 1847 Austria, taking up the gage thrown down to her by the reforming party, had occupied Ferrara despite the Pope's protests. This blunder, for it proved to be no less, gave Charles Albert an opportunity to pose as defender of the Church, and to invest a war for the sacred rights of nationality with the character of a crusade for the sacred rights of religion. Accordingly he now accepted the invitation of Milan to intervene on its behalf, and taking the field against Austria, he assumed responsibility for the conduct of the war. All Italy flocked to his banners, for no State dared to withstand the popular enthusiasm. The Pope, the Duke of Tuscany, even Naples, were all forced to join in the struggle. The Piedmontese won the victory of Goito over the Austrian general Radetzky, but they failed to pursue their advantage and allowed the enemy to retake Vicenza, Padua, and other places in Venetia, until Venice alone remained. This supineness was the more inexplicable since Radetzky had been fighting with inferior forces, and a vigorous offensive would have cut him off from his communications and prevented the arrival of reinforcements. It proved disastrous not only in a military, but in a political sense, for it furnished an opportunity to the Italian Govern-
ments to withdraw from a cause which they had only embraced with reluctance. The counsels of Pius IX. had long been distracted by his conflicting obligations as an Italian ruler, pledged to co-operate in the expulsion of the foreigner, and as a Catholic pontiff, of whose spiritual dominion the Austrian monarchy was the main prop. It was impossible to reconcile interests so divergent, and Pius decided to sacrifice his interests as a secular prince. In the famous Encyclical of April 1848 he declared to the world that war with Austria was "wholly abhorrent from the counsels" of a Pope. This announcement was significant in more ways than one; primarily it meant that the dream which had inspired Gioberti's Primato had collapsed. The plan of a Federation was definitely set aside, for the leadership of the Italian cause could never be entrusted to a Government which had shirked its responsibilities at a conjuncture so favourable to a fortunate issue. The immediate result was to encourage the King of Naples to overthrow the Constitution of the southern kingdom and recall his forces from the front.

The defection of her allies left Piedmont to carry on the struggle with Austria single-handed; but the situation might still have been retrieved, if Charles Albert had thrown off his irresolution and displayed the energy which the conduct of a military campaign demanded. Undeterred by the papal Allocution, the States of Central and Northern Italy—Venetia, Parma, Piacenza, and Modena—passed a series of plebiscites in favour of their incorporation with the kingdom of Piedmont; while the Sicilians also offered their crown to the second son of the Sardinian King. But within a short time the King suffered a severe defeat at Custozza; and, after the capitulation of Milan, was forced to conclude the Salasco Armistice which restored to Austria her territorial possessions in Upper Italy, although Venice continued to hold out in her resistance.

The movement which had opened so auspiciously for the redemption of Italy was now upon the verge of complete disaster. Austria, though crippled by internal weakness, had shown unexpected powers of resistance, and the tenacity
of her generals had snatched victory from the very mouth of defeat. Moreover, the failure of Charles Albert to establish the kingdom of Upper Italy, an ambition which he had long cherished, discredited the cause of monarchy, and was the immediate occasion for democratic outbreaks. The revolutionary elements in Rome proclaimed a republic of which Mazzini became the virtual head—the Pope passing into exile; and a provisional Government was also set up in Tuscany. Events hastened to the final consummation which was to mark the end of the first—and most disastrous—phase of the Italian War of Independence. Piedmont suddenly terminated the truce with Austria and recklessly plunged once more into war; within eleven days after the rupture of the armistice, the issue was decided on the field of Novara in Austria’s favour. Charles Albert, worn out by his struggles, and to enable Piedmont to obtain better conditions in the peace negotiations, abdicated his throne in favour of his son Victor Emmanuel II., and departed into exile; thus sealing with his martyrdom his devotion to the Italian cause. The triumph of reaction reached its culminating point when France intervened on behalf of the Pope, and in spite of Garibaldi’s gallant efforts overthrew the Roman Republic, and when simultaneously the Duke of Tuscany was restored to his duchy and the heroic resistance of Venice was finally overborne.

Italy, once more a geographical expression, relapsed into her former condition. A heavy price was exacted for the efforts she had made to shake off the Austrian yoke. The retrogrades, making fear the buttress of their power, inaugurated a reign of terror and indulged in an orgy of excesses which awakened the moral indignation of all Europe. The Italian princes had been tried, and with one exception they had been found wanting. The exception was Piedmont, and the misfortunes of Charles Albert were not endured in vain since they evinced to the sincerity of the House of Savoy and linked its fortunes indissolubly with the future development of Italy. Meanwhile the happy destiny of Piedmont was raising up for her a great statesman in the person of Cavour, whose life-work constitutes
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the history of the Italian War of Liberation in its second phase. Cavour came to the head of the Government in 1852, and with one short interval of a few months enjoyed a tenure of power which lasted eight years. His achievements in the domestic sphere merit some notice, for they not only served to rally round the Minister the important body of Liberal opinion, but they laid the foundations of an organized and consolidated State—the necessary prelude to an efficient foreign policy. Cavour reformed the finances, developed the railway system, lowered commercial tariffs, adopted an enlightened social and agrarian policy, and improved the military defences. He recognized, in fact, that the only sound basis for a vigorous policy abroad is a contented and prosperous population at home, and the wisdom of his economic administration was rewarded by the loyalty with which the nation supported all his foreign undertakings.

From the first moment of office Cavour set before himself the supreme task of resuming the heroic struggle with Austria, temporarily interrupted by the catastrophe which had befallen Charles Albert. How well he accomplished his task is written imperishably in the history of the modern Italian kingdom, whose political unity is the best testimony to the enduring value of his work. With the vision and judgment of a true statesman Cavour grasped the vital condition of success—the isolation of Austria. Piedmont was too weak to cope single-handed with the Central Empire, and the European Powers looked askance at any violation of the Treaties of 1815. Without an ally Italian resistance would break to pieces beneath the diplomatic pressure which would certainly be brought to bear in order to maintain the status quo. It was necessary, therefore, to secure for Piedmont a sympathetic hearing in the councils of Europe, then to enlist the active co-operation of some great military Power, and finally to take up arms when Austria, goaded into war, should appear guilty of wanton aggression. The skill with which Cavour drew the net round Austria, and achieved all the points of this programme, was a masterpiece of diplomacy. His first step was taken when he inter-
vened in 1853 on behalf of the political refugees from Lombardy and Venetia, whose property had been sequestrated by the Austrian Government. The intervention failed in its immediate object, but it was approved by England and France, and revealed Piedmont as the champion of oppressed Italians. The real turning-point, however, came in 1855 with the momentous decision of Cavour to participate in the Crimean War, a decision which enhanced the prestige of the Sardinian monarchy and gave it a claim upon the gratitude of its allies. At the same time it completed the isolation of Austria, which lost the friendship of Russia by her ingratitude,¹ and estranged the Western Powers by her vacillation. At the Congress of Paris (1856) Cavour denounced the evils of Austrian oppression in Italy, and his disclosures shamed Austria into moderating the harshness of her rule. But the day for conciliatory measures had passed beyond recall. Daniele Manin, the eminent patriot, voiced the general sentiment when he declared: "We do not want Austria to mend her ways in Italy; we want her to go."

In England public opinion was deeply sympathetic towards the Italian nationalists, but her statesmen considered themselves still pledged to the Treaties of 1815, and could not be relied upon to lend material assistance. Cavour therefore turned to France, and in the Emperor he found the ally whose encouragement and military support were indispensable for the furtherance of his schemes. Napoleon III. was induced by a variety of motives to assume an active part in the Italian movement. He was sprung from an Italian house, and in his early days had fought in the ranks of Italian insurgents. Mingled with personal inclinations and an unfeigned interest in the Italian cause were his imperial ambitions. He was the inheritor of the Napoleonic traditions; and, as interpreted by a warm though unstable imagination, they seemed to invest him with the championship of all oppressed nationalities. Moreover, he had a strong hereditary reason for seeking to discredit the settlement of 1815, apart from the more ignoble motive of creating

¹ See p. 150.
a general turmoil in order to fish in troubled waters. As early as 1855 he had given an inkling of his intentions by his famous question to Cavour: "What can be done for Italy?" Three years later the situation had matured sufficiently for the holding of a conference at Plombières, where Napoleon secretly met Cavour and promised his aid in return for the cession of Savoy to France. At this time Cavour's calculations apparently did not travel beyond the expansion of Piedmont into the kingdom of Upper Italy by the absorption of the provinces wrested from Austria. He did not yet contemplate the formation of a United Italy, for the Pope was to remain undisturbed in Rome, while the Bourbon dynasty was to retain possession of Naples. Six months afterwards the secret engagement, into which Napoleon had been induced to enter, became transparent to the whole world. The Emperor himself revealed it in addressing the Austrian ambassador with the words: "I regret that our relations are not as satisfactory as formerly." This utterance created a profound impression, which was deepened by the speech of Victor Emmanuel at the opening of his Parliament a few days later: "With all our respect for treaties," ran the memorable words of the King, "we are not insensible to the cry of pain which rises towards us from so many parts of Italy." It was impossible to mistake the significance of this warning; thousands of volunteers poured into Piedmont, and the hopes of Italian patriots mounted high as they waited for the moment when the banner of Piedmont would again be unfurled in the cause of Italy.

Events were now marching rapidly, and it was the policy of Cavour to hasten the crisis. He held in his hands all the diplomatic threads, but at any moment they might snap. The great statesman had accurately gauged the mercurial temperament of Napoleon, whose varying moods changed with every hour, and he also knew that the Emperor's native irresolution was being reinforced by the difficulties of the internal situation in France—the opposition of the Clericals. Moreover, as the chanceries of Europe were swift to recognize, there lurked all the danger of a universal conflagration in a French advance upon Italy; and they had proposed
a Congress of the Powers as the best means of preserving peace. But a Congress was the last thing that Cavour wanted, for it meant the shipwreck of all his hopes. The experience of half a century had shown that Congresses were more concerned to devise checks and balances than to satisfy whole-heartedly the claims of nationality. The situation was thus extremely critical when Austria, whose diplomacy was immeasurably inferior to that of her astute and resourceful adversary, played into Cavour’s hands. It was obviously her policy to wait in patience while the alliance between Piedmont and France inevitably went to pieces under the weight of European disapproval. Indeed Piedmont, overborne by the tyranny of circumstances, was actually on the point of disarmament when the war party in Austria carried the day, and sent her an ultimatum. “The die is cast,” cried Cavour in an outburst of joy, “and we have made history.” In the face of overwhelming difficulties he had achieved the end for which he had so long laboured. Austria had committed the folly of declaring war at the very time when the Powers were working for peace, and so had afforded Piedmont an adequate pretext for taking up the challenge thrown down to her.

The war opened with the Austrian invasion of Piedmont (April 1859). Victor Emmanuel and Napoleon took the field at the head of their forces, and a rapid succession of victories culminating in the battle of Solferino attended their arms. But misfortunes still continued to mar the destiny of Italy, for the moment she was about to drain her cup of triumph it was again dashed from her lips. At the height of success, when the destruction of Austria seemed assured, Napoleon drew back, and in return for the surrender of Lombardy to Piedmont concluded peace at Villafranca (July 1859). His action has been severely criticized, and the bitter grief of Cavour, who was completely stunned by the wreck of his well-laid plans, shows that it came as a complete surprise. Yet in truth nothing less might have been expected from the impressionable character of Napoleon III., who was accessible to every conflicting emotion and swayed by every passing breeze. It must be confessed also
that the difficulties of his position placed him in an emergency full of imminent peril. Prussia showed marked uneasiness lest his victories should tempt the Emperor to extend the frontier of France towards the Rhine, and so fulfil the ambition which the French people had never ceased to cherish; and she had already seized the pretext to arm in defence. Moreover Napoleon was not a little disconcerted by the lightning-like rapidity with which Austrian resistance was collapsing; he felt that the control of the situation was slipping from his grasp, and that events would shape themselves without reference to his own particular interests. Nor were his misgivings entirely unwarranted. He had planned the settlement of the Italian Question on lines which would satisfy the legitimate ambitions of the Sardinian monarchy in the north, while maintaining the status quo in central and southern Italy. He had never contemplated the political unity of the whole Peninsula—a development fraught with menace to his own military power and involving the grave risk of a collision with the French Clericals, who would be infuriated at the threatened extinction of the papal dominion. Yet in the direction of a United Italy, as risings in Tuscany and the States of the Church showed, the current was flowing with irresistible force.

Cavour resigned office and his work seemed hopelessly compromised. But at this crisis in their fate the Italian people took their destiny into their own hands, recognizing that a nation must learn to lean upon itself. French assistance had been invaluable, but the completion of the task which others had begun could only be accomplished by the Italians themselves. Central Italy boldly refused to accept the decision that the rulers of Parma, Tuscany, Modena and the Romagna—who had been expelled during the Austrian debacle—should be restored. In the hour of darkness its indomitable resolution opened up a new vista. Out of compunction, perhaps, for his equivocal policy in the war, Napoleon would allow no coercion on the part of Austria, and accepted England's proposal for a plebiscite. An overwhelming vote declared in favour of union with the Sardinian monarchy, but as the price of their annexation the Emperor
extorted the surrender of Savoy and Nice. His reluctance to permit the incorporation of the Central States with Piedmont had only been overcome with difficulty, as he realized, the impossibility of checking any longer forces which he himself had set in motion. The acquisition of Italian territory was intended to reconcile French public opinion, but it completed the alienation of Italy, and it obscured the great services which Napoleon, despite his tortuous policy, had rendered to the Italian cause.

The eyes of the Italian world were now fixed upon Sicily, where an astonishing panorama was unfolding itself before their gaze. In some respects the ‘Garibaldian epic’ was the most striking, as it certainly was the most dramatic, episode of the Italian movement. After tasting to the full the bitter waters of diplomacy, Italy witnessed a succession of heroic achievements which recalled the age of mediæval romances rather than one of sober historical facts. The effete Bourbon monarchy had long been tottering to its fall, and its final dissolution was brought about by the Sicilian Revolution. The movement was organized by the followers of Mazzini, but a new direction was given to its course when Garibaldi, an adherent of the Savoy dynasty, assumed the leadership. At the head of his ‘Thousand’ he landed at Marsala on May 11, 1860, and from that day onwards his march was one triumphal progress. Within a month the ‘red-shirts’ had forced the retirement of the Neapolitan garrison, over 20,000 in number, from the island; they then crossed the Straits of Messina, and on September 7 took up their headquarters at Naples, which the Bourbon King had already evacuated. Meanwhile Cavour, who had returned to power, watched Garibaldi’s precipitate advance not without embarrassment. He recognized the danger that the Mazzinians, whose influence was not propitious for the fortunes of the Sardinian monarchy, might gain the upper hand among the population of the south. Even more imminent was the danger of an international crisis, which could hardly be averted if Garibaldi fulfilled his intention of marching on Rome in order to make her the capital of Italy. Garibaldi did not trouble his head about diplomatic compli-
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cations, and cared little whether an attack on the French garrison in Rome provoked France into a declaration of war. But Cavour, who knew that the enemies of Italy were only waiting for an opportunity to swoop down upon her at the first false move, could not view the prospect of a European conflagration so lightly. His skill saved a perilous situation; to forestall Garibaldi, he despatched an army into the Papal States. He had no difficulty in finding the necessary pretext to cover his action. From Ireland, Belgium and France the Papal Court had summoned a multitude of volunteers to check by force of arms the deluge which was threatening to sweep away the last remnants of its temporal power. A great campaign was inaugurated which had for its immediate object the protection of the patrimony of St. Peter, while it also foreshadowed the re-habilitation of the principle of 'Legitimacy.' Yet any reversion to 'Legitimist' pretensions—in other words, the restoration of exiled rulers—would have been fatal to the existing order in Italy and France alike; it was, therefore, to the interest of both Cavour and Napoleon to stop the progress of the movement before Austria was drawn into it. Accordingly, the Italian Government called upon the Roman Curia to disband its foreign troops, and upon its refusal declared war. Within two weeks all was over; the papal forces were routed at Castelfidardo, and the States of the Church passed out of the possession of the Pope. The victory was a personal triumph for Cavour; he had emerged successfully from a critical ordeal, and his hands were enormously strengthened for coping with the situation in Naples. It was true that in baulking the plans of Garibaldi he had intensified the dislike and suspicion with which the soldier regarded the statesman, but he was well aware that Garibaldi needed his assistance to reduce the Neapolitan fortresses; moreover the Italian Parliament supported the minister. The time was therefore ripe for Victor Emmanuel to cross the Neapolitan frontier; and, at his meeting with Garibaldi, the latter surrendered his authority into the hands of the King of Italy. This act of renunciation, accompanied by a refusal to accept the honours pressed upon him,
1860–70 was a fitting end to the heroic achievements of the great Italian hero. The political unity of Italy was now almost achieved. Plebiscites were held in Naples and Sicily, and in both cases a decisive vote was cast in favour of annexation; a little later they were supplemented by similar votes in the States of the Church (Umbria and the Marches). Rome and Venice alone were needed as the coping stone of the edifice. Venice was acquired in 1866, when the outbreak of the Austro-Prussian War furnished Italy with an opportunity to strike a blow at her traditional enemy. Rome came into Italian possession in 1870, when the Franco-Prussian War compelled the retirement of the French garrison. This completion of his life-work Cavour did not live to see, for he died in June 1861. But he lived long enough to create the *Italy of the Italians*, and to earn the undying gratitude of the Italian people.
CHAPTER VI

THE BALKAN STATES

The rise of the Balkan States is the history of the decline of the Ottoman Empire. This decline has been very gradual. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries Turkey owed her survival, not to her own inherent strength, but to the weaknesses and jealousies of her neighbours. She found her salvation in the rivalry of Austria and Russia on the Lower Danube, and in the Mediterranean interests of Great Britain. The 'Sick Man of Europe' clung tenaciously to life, and the prognostications of his speedy dissolution were doomed to disappointment. It is, of course, obvious that recent developments have brought new factors into play, and have given an entirely different aspect to the whole Eastern Question. But any serious attempt to unravel the tangled web of Balkan diplomacy in the nineteenth century must deal with the problem from the standpoint of the nineteenth, not of the twentieth century.

The Eastern Question has always been an international Question. In one form or another it has furnished the background of European politics for twelve centuries. As early as the eighth century Europe was almost submerged by a wave of Mohammedan conquest; and, though the tide rolled back, its menace was always present. A thousand years later the Eastern Question was still acute, but its character had fundamentally changed. European statesmen no longer feared the expansion of the Ottoman Empire; what they now dreaded was its disruption. Austria abandoned her historic rôle as the bulwark of Europe against Turkey, in order to become the bulwark of Turkey against Russia.
The trend of Russia southwards to the shores of the Bosporus, the traditional policy of expansion inaugurated by Peter the Great and culminating under Catharine, converted Austria into a rival and an enemy. In the eyes of Austria, Russian ascendancy in the Balkans foreshadowed a great Slav Empire, which would one day absorb all the Slavs of South-Eastern Europe. Hence the integrity of the Habsburg monarchy seemed bound up with the integrity of the Turkish dominions. Great Britain also believed that the continued existence of Turkey in Europe as a barrier against Russia was necessary to safeguard her empire in India and her position in the Mediterranean. She had already intervened in 1790 to prevent the partition of Ottoman territory by Joseph II. and Catharine the Great; and she intervened a second time in the Crimean War when the dissolution of Turkey again appeared imminent. Yet while the European Powers successfully warded off the perils which threatened Turkey from without, they could not prevent the foundations of the Ottoman Empire being slowly undermined by internal weaknesses. In the main the sources of these weaknesses were twofold. One was the ambition of the pashas, or provincial governors, who were practically free from control and independent in all but name. A degenerate line of sultans held nominal sway, but as a rule they were deficient in resolution and capacity; and their incompetence served to accelerate the process of decay. Two powerful pashas in the early years of the nineteenth century were Ali of Janina and Mehemet Ali, the former building up a great power in Albania, the latter in Egypt. But the fundamental causes of the gradual shrinkage of the Ottoman Empire were racial and religious. Built up by the sword, Turkish dominion was maintained only by the sword. No ties of common sentiment or common religion knit together conquerors and conquered, and the Turks always remained isolated in the midst of a subjected population. An impenetrable barrier rigidly divided the faithful and the unbeliever, the Mussulmans and the Orthodox, mutual hatred fanning the flames of religious discord and racial antipathy. As the spirit of revolt spread among the Balkan races, the
THE BALKAN STATES

Eastern Question passed out of the control of diplomatists, and the despised peasant of the Balkans asserted his manhood before the eyes of the whole world.

The Greeks were the first to achieve their emancipation. Two circumstances fostered the longing for independence, which had found expression in a rising in the Morea as early as 1774. In the first place, the Turks usually displayed great moderation in their treatment of the Greek population. "In their village communities, which the Turks had suffered to survive, the Greeks had the elements of the vigorous local life which suited their genius; in the Orthodox Church they possessed the organization necessary to bind them together in the sense of a common nationality. Long before the outbreak of the insurrection the wealthy island communities of the Ægean and the Adriatic, though nominally forming part of the Ottoman Empire, had enjoyed a practical independence, tempered only by the obligation to send to Constantinople an annual tribute in money and in sailors to man the imperial navy. Their armed trading-brigs... were destined to play a decisive part in the struggle for independence. In the Morea and on the mainland there was indeed no such practical autonomy as in the islands; but here too the weakness of the administration had suffered a spirit of independence to grow up which asserted itself in the only way open to it—brigandage."¹ It is only fair to remember also that the tolerance of the Turks set an example to Europe which was sorely needed. The Christian was allowed "a greater measure of liberty than that enjoyed by dissidents in any other country in Europe. Catholics in Ireland and Protestants in Austria might envy him his privileges. He was free to exercise his religion, to educate himself as he pleased, to accumulate wealth; however humble his origin, in a system which accounted nothing of birth, he could hold high office in the Government." The importance of the Greek Church, both in keeping alive the spirit of hostility to the followers of Mahomet and in providing the framework of an organized resistance, can scarcely

be over-estimated. Thus the Turks themselves by their
tolerance made possible the national movement which was
to lead to the dissolution of their power in Greece. In the
second place, the revived study of Greek classics brought
home to the modern Greeks the great traditions of which
circumstances had made them the depositaries. As in
Hungary, so in Greece, a linguistic and literary revival
associated with the name of Korais heralded a national
uprising. On the other hand, the driving force behind the
Greek revolution was not Hellenism, but the Orthodox
religion; and the traditions of Hellenism were chiefly
potent in their appeal to the sympathies of those whose
minds were stored with classical culture. An English poet,
who shared in the Greek insurrection, voiced the sentiments
of his countrymen when he wrote:

"The isles of Greece! The isles of Greece!
Where burning Sappho loved and sung—
Where grew the arts of war and peace,
Where Delos rose and Phœbus sprung!
Eternal summer gilds them yet—
But all, except their sun, is set. . . .

"The mountains look on Marathon,
And Marathon looks on the sea;
And musing there an hour alone,
I dreamed that Greece might still be free;
For, standing on the Persian's grave,
I could not deem myself a slave."

The first rising of the Greeks broke out in 1821 in the
North. The leader was Prince Alexander Ypsilanti, who
seized the opportunity afforded by the war between the
Sultan and Ali of Janina to set up the standard of revolt
in the Principalities of Moldavia and Wallachia. He relied
upon the support of Russia, but the Emperor Alexander
was now under the influence of Metternich, who persuaded
him not to lend assistance. The movement was easily
suppressed, and Ypsilanti fled into Austria. Meanwhile,
another insurrection was gaining ground in the Morea,
whence it rapidly developed into a War of Independence. It differed from the revolt in the North because it was the work of an organized body, the Hetairia Philike, a widespread secret society, which—like the Carbonari of southern Italy—kept alive the sparks of patriotism. It was also a national movement—the uprising of a nation; whereas the rebellion of Ypsilanti met with no response from the Roumanian peasants of Moldavia and Wallachia, who had endured great oppression at the hands of their Greek masters. But while the soil had been prepared for a Greek revolution by the propaganda of the Hetairists, the insurrection in the Morea was spontaneous and unorganized. A series of sporadic outbreaks culminated in a general massacre of the entire Mussulman population, and the torch of revolt was then carried northwards beyond the Isthmus of Corinth, until the whole of Greece—including Thessaly and Macedonia—was caught up in a general conflagration. Unhappily, however, the Greeks sullied the cause of freedom by barbarous atrocities, and the War of Independence degenerated from the outset into a war of extermination.

The struggle was protracted over a period of eight years (1821–1829), though the final decision was not reached till 1831. At first the Turks were heavily handicapped by the fact that they were fighting on two fronts. For many months their best troops were held up before the island fortress of Janina, where Ali maintained a stout resistance in the face of overwhelming forces. Moreover the Greeks had command of the sea owing to their superior seamanship, and this was a factor of enormous importance. "The Greeks," said Wellington, "have the superiority at sea; and those who have this superiority must be successful." But in 1824 came the turn of the wheel of fortune, and the Turks now began to gain the upper hand. The Porte summoned to its aid Mehemet Ali, the Pasha of Egypt, who was promised the pashaliks of Morea, Syria and Damascus as the price of his assistance against the Greek insurgents. It was the policy of the Sultan Mahmud to weaken the 'over-mighty subject,' but he was compelled by force of circumstances to undermine his own position by lavish
promises of future rewards. "A drowning man clings to a serpent," and at the moment the help of Mehemet Ali was indispensable if the authority of the Sultan was to be restored in his Greek dominions. The intervention of the Pasha of Egypt at once made itself felt. He possessed an army and fleet organized by French officers and engineers according to Western ideas, and by sea and by land their superiority was speedily asserted. The situation of the Greeks now became extremely critical. It was abundantly clear that they were powerless to save themselves by their own exertions; and the volunteers, like Byron, who flocked to their standard, were too few to prevail against the disciplined forces pitted against them. Nothing short of a European intervention could avert the utter collapse of the Greek revolution, but the obstacles in the way of concerted action revealed the fundamental difficulties inherent in the Eastern Question.

At the first news of the Greek revolt Metternich exclaimed: "This affair must be looked upon as placed beyond the pale of civilization." In the eyes of the Austrian statesman the Greeks were rebels against the lawful sovereignty of the Ottoman Government, and the principle of 'Legitimacy' was invoked to serve as a plea for non-intervention. With this view the Tsar of Russia was easily brought to concur. "The Emperor Alexander," Metternich proudly boasted, "has taken root in my school." Moreover, Alexander was averse from war. "I have no ambition," he is reported to have said, "my Empire is already too big for me—I am not blood-thirsty, every one knows it—and this war would not be to Russia's interest." On her side England adhered strictly to the theory of non-intervention. Castlereagh, and still more Canning, believed that it was the bounden duty of Great Britain to hold aloof from the internal concerns of other States, except where she was entitled to intervene in virtue of treaty-obligations. At the same time England and Austria, as we have already seen, regarded the integrity of the Turkish Empire in the light of a political axiom. They were shrewd enough to recognize

1 Memoirs, iii. 325.
that the success of the Greek insurrection would be the begin-
ning of the end, and they not unnaturally dreaded the interna-
tional complications which would ensue once Turkey were to disappear from the map of Europe. Hence they bent all their energies to isolating the Greek revolt and preventing it from developing into a European conflagration. For a time this policy was successfully pursued. Public opinion, carried away by memories of 'the glory that was Greece,' was overwhelmingly in favour of a race which bore the name, even if it only partially inherited the blood, of the classical Greeks. It was not strong enough, however, to divert the Governments of Europe from the course which counsels of expediency and prudence alike seemed to dictate.

This was the situation during the early years of the struggle. Yet even at this stage it became increasingly difficult for the European Powers to refrain from interference. Russia, in particular, showed signs of restlessness. The Tsar, whatever his personal views, could not forget that he was the champion of the Orthodox Church, and therefore had a peculiar interest in a war which bore the character of an Orthodox crusade against the infidel. Moreover it was the traditional policy of Russia to advance southwards, and it seemed folly to let slip an opportunity which offered such inviting prospects. At the same time the actions of the Porte itself gave Russia a pretext for intervention. The Patriarch of Constantinople, the spiritual head of the Orthodox Church, was made to expiate with his blood the butchery of Mussulmans in the Morea. This crime was as inexcusable as those it was intended to avenge, and it provoked a great outburst of indignation among the Russian people. Other grievances were not lacking; in defiance of treaty-obligations Turkey retained her hold upon the Danubian Principalities, and she also seized Greek ships flying the Russian flag. This led to a rupture of diplomatic relations between Russia and Turkey, and the outbreak of war now seemed unavoidable. Both England and Austria, however, were anxious to avert hostilities, and urged the Sultan, who felt his dignity gravely compromised, to make concessions. The result was to preserve peace for the
moment, until the situation was profoundly modified by two important events.

The first of these events was the appointment of George Canning as Foreign Secretary (1822). The keynote of Canning's policy was expressed in the maxim: "Every nation for itself, and God for us all!" While he privately shared the pro-Hellenic sympathies of his countrymen, his public attitude towards the Eastern Question was shaped purely by national considerations. "You know my politics well enough," he wrote, "to know what I mean when I say that for Europe I shall be desirous now and then to read England."¹ He explained his meaning in these terms: "Intimately connected as we are with the system of Europe, it does not follow that we are therefore called upon to mix ourselves on every occasion, with a restless and meddling activity, in the concerns of the nations which surround us." He supported whole-heartedly the doctrine of non-intervention. "Our object in common with our allies," he said, "has been to maintain peace, aware that a new war, in whatever quarter it might be kindled, might presently involve all Europe in its flames"; while in the event of a war in the East, "no human foresight could anticipate the issue." On this ground he withheld assistance from the Greeks, though he counselled the Porte to conciliate Russia by removing her grievances, and to treat the insurgents with greater moderation. But the rapid march of events soon forced Canning to realize that something more than a policy of Olympian detachment was needed to safeguard the interests of Great Britain; and on March 25, 1823, he recognized the Greeks as belligerents. "The recognition of the belligerent character of the Greeks," Canning explained, "was necessitated by the impossibility of treating as pirates a population of a million souls, and of bringing within the bounds of civilized war a contest which had been marked at the outset, on both sides, by disgusting barbarities."² It was impossible to call to account the Turkish Government, which had no control, for acts of piracy committed by the Greeks who

¹ Stapleton, *Canning and his Times*, 364-365.
were in command of the sea; the only alternative was to recognize the Greek provisional Government and hold it responsible for the actions of its fleet. This step on the part of England reacted profoundly on the whole international situation, and awakened lively apprehensions at the Courts of Vienna and Petrograd. They could no longer profess to treat the Greeks as rebels, "beyond the pale of civilization," now that Great Britain had entered into formal relations with them. They could no longer leave the Greek War of Independence to take its own course, indifferent whether the Greeks massacred the Turks or the Turks butchered the Greeks. Sooner or later they were bound to intervene, for the recognition of the Greeks as belligerents was interpreted as a sign that England was seeking to oust Austria and Russia from the credit of intervention. But while the necessity for concerted intervention was now reluctantly admitted, there was no agreement as to the character of the intervention. It was clearly out of question to assist the Turks; yet if they helped the Greeks they would set the seal of approval upon a revolutionary movement and undermine the whole fabric of 'Legitimacy.' Russia proposed the establishment of three semi-independent principalities, enjoying autonomy, but under Turkish suzerainty. Metternich objected to the scheme on the ground that the new Greek States would inevitably gravitate towards Russia, looking to the Muscovite State for protection against Ottoman encroachment. He therefore advanced the alternative proposal that Greece should be made a sovereign State. This in its turn was equally unacceptable to Russia, which recognized the danger that Greece might pursue an independent course and shake herself free from Russian tutelage. A deadlock was thus reached, in the midst of which the Emperor Alexander died (1825).

As the accession of George Canning to office gave a new turn to English policy, so a change in Russian policy was produced by the accession of Nicholas I. to the throne of the Romanoffs. Alexander I. had subordinated the traditional policy of Russia to what he conceived to be the
interests of Europe. Enamoured of the idea of a European Concert,¹ he was easily persuaded by Metternich not to act independently in the affairs of Turkey. His successor reverted to the policy of Peter the Great and Catharine; and Canning, alarmed lest Russia should declare war on the Porte on her own account, proposed the joint intervention of the two Powers. According to the 'Protocol of Petrograd' (1826), Greece was to be erected into a vassal State, and this suggestion was laid before the Ottoman Government. England thus abandoned her policy of non-intervention in order to forestall isolated intervention on the part of Russia. The Porte rejected the Protocol, and Canning was driven to employ force as the only way to prevent the defection of Russia from the principles embodied in the Protocol. The Protocol of Petrograd was therefore converted into the Treaty of London (1827), by which Great Britain, France and Russia undertook to establish Greece as an autonomous State under Turkish suzerainty, and to take the necessary steps to compel the Porte to acquiesce in this settlement.

Austria and Prussia would not agree to the coercion of Turkey in favour of rebellious subjects, and refused their assent to the treaty. Metternich proffered his mediation at Constantinople, when matters were brought to a crisis by the battle of Navarino (October 20, 1827). The fleets of England and France, while attempting to enforce an armistice between the Turks and the Greeks—in accordance with the instructions of the home Governments—came to blows with the fleet of Mehemet Ali and destroyed it. The results of Navarino were momentous. The Sultan proclaimed a Holy War against the Christian Powers, and in particular repudiated the treaty into which he had recently entered with Russia (Treaty of Akkerman, 1826) respecting the Danubian Principalities and the navigation of the Straits. This afforded Russia a pretext for intervention in Turkey, against which it was now impossible for the Western Powers to raise any effective protest. Meanwhile, however, Wellington had become Prime Minister (1828).

¹ See Chapter VII.
He was inflexibly opposed to coercive measures against the Porte, clinging to the hope that the Ottoman Empire might still be preserved intact as a barrier against Russian ambitions in the Mediterranean. Russia therefore took action alone, and war was declared on Turkey (1828). But the outbreak of war forced Wellington's hands; if England stood aside from the struggle she would have no voice in the final settlement, or at any rate Greece, liberated by the arms of Russia, would become a dependency of Russia. Accordingly, he fell in with the suggestion of the French Government to despatch an expeditionary force to the Morea to drive out the army of Mehemet Ali. Before the arrival of the French, Codrington, the English admiral, had already secured the evacuation of the Morea by making a naval demonstration before Alexandria. The war was brought to an end by the bold strategy of the Russian commander, Diebitsch, who with barely 13,000 troops pressed on to Constantinople and extorted from the Turks the Treaty of Adrianople (1829). The Danubian Principalities, while remaining nominally under Ottoman suzerainty, became to all intents and purposes the appanage of the Russian Empire, and the rights of the Russian flag in the Bosphorus and the Dardanelles were reasserted. The Greek Question was settled by the Powers. Russia would have been content with the erection of Greece into a vassal State, autonomous but tributary. This solution was not acceptable to the British Government, which shared the conviction of Austria that the creation of a tributary State would open the door to Russian intrigues in the Balkans and furnish the pretext for perpetual interference in the affairs of Turkey. Hence Wellington and Metternich, who had both strenuously upheld the preservation of the Ottoman Empire, were compelled by the force of circumstances to recognize Greece as a sovereign and independent State. The new State was placed under the protection of the three Powers—Great Britain, Russia, and France—to whose joint efforts the Greek nation owed its resurrection; and the crown was offered to Otho, second son of King Louis of Bavaria, who assumed the reins of government.
in the opening months of 1833. In this way the first serious breach was made in the integrity of the Ottoman Empire; and a precedent was established which cleared the ground for the rise of a group of Balkan States, whose relations with each other and with the Great Powers have completely revolutionized the whole political situation in the Near East.¹

Among the Balkan States the most considerable in size in the year 1914 was Roumania, whose population then numbered seven million people. In addition there were three and a half million Roumanians in Hungary, and nearly one and a half millions in Bessarabia, a province of Russia. These constituted Romania Irredenta, the ‘unredeemed’ part of the Roumanian race still under alien rule. The significance of these figures will be readily grasped when it is borne in mind that the Magyars only numbered eight to nine millions, the Southern Slavs (Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) eleven millions, the Czechs and Slovaks about nine millions, the Bulgarians five to six millions, the Greeks less than seven millions, and the Albanians about one million. The trade of Roumania was almost as great as the combined trade of Serbia, Montenegro, Bulgaria and Greece; and her army came next to those of the six Great Powers. Roumania has been called ‘the Belgium of the East,’ and the epithet bore testimony to her striking progress.²

The Roumanian State is comparatively a recent creation, but the history of the Roumanian people goes back over sixteen hundred years. In the second century A.D. Trajan settled Roman colonies on the Lower Danube (in

¹ Otho’s reign lasted thirty years. The chief events were: (1) The Revolution of 1843, when the King was forced to grant a Constitution and dismiss his Bavarian advisers; and (2) the occupation of the Piraeus by English and French troops during the Crimean War to prevent Greece making war on Turkey. Otho’s unpopularity and lack of an heir led to his deposition in 1862. His successor was George I., second son of Christian IX. of Denmark, at whose accession the British Government ceded the Ionian Islands to Greece. After the Russo-Turkish War (infra, p. 208) Greece obtained Thessaly and part of Epirus (Arta). In 1897 disturbances in Crete provoked the Greco-Turkish War, in which Greece was defeated, and the intervention of the Powers alone saved her from loss of territory.
² R. W. Seton-Watson, Roumania and the Great War (1915), 2, 5, 6.
Dacia), which subsequently served as an outpost of the Empire against the assaults of barbarians from the North. Then comes a break in their history of a thousand years, after which they reappear once more in the thirteenth century, when they were now divided into two Principalities—Moldavia and Wallachia. At a later period these Principalities became part of the Ottoman Empire, but they continued to be governed by their own rulers. When Russia began to advance southwards against Turkey in the eighteenth century, the geographical situation of the two provinces condemned them to play the part of a shuttlecock between the Muscovite State on the one side and the Ottoman State on the other. The boundary between Russia and Turkey was the River Pruth, which also formed the northern frontier of Moldavia; hence, whenever Russia was at war with the Turks, her first step was always to occupy Moldavia and Wallachia. As a result of the famous treaty of Kutchuk-Kainardji (1774), Russia acquired the right of intervention in the Principalities, and in 1812 (Treaty of Bucharest) she received the eastern portion of Moldavia known as Bessarabia. Under the Treaty of Adrianople, as already mentioned,¹ the Principalities became protectorates of the Russian Empire. This was practically equivalent to annexation, and Russian influence was now in the ascendant. The position, in fact, was analogous to that in Poland before the final partition, when Russia was in virtual possession of the country; accordingly it speedily awakened the apprehensions of Austria. The Principalities command the banks of the Danube, and their acquisition would have enabled Russia to control the navigation of the most important river in Europe. Hence, at the Congress of Paris (1856),² Moldavia and Wallachia were converted into autonomous States under Ottoman suzerainty, and Russia was compelled to restore Bessarabia.

The next stage in the history of Roumania was the union of the two Principalities. A movement in favour of a single national State had been steadily growing, and it found a powerful, if not disinterested, advocate in the French

¹ Supra, p. 193.
² Supra, p. 38.
Emperor. Napoleon III. rendered greater services to the cause of nationality than is usually recognized, and Roumania at any rate owes her national existence to the exertions of a French ruler. The Treaty of Paris, which brought the Crimean War to an end, provided that a constituent assembly should be elected in each of the Principalities to lay before a European Commission its views upon the question of union. The elections were improperly conducted, Turkey and Austria bringing pressure to bear upon the inhabitants and even resorting to intimidation. Napoleon annulled the elections and took steps to secure a free expression of opinion. The constituent assemblies declared in favour of a united State, but the scheme was wrecked by the opposition of England and Austria. The former supported the authority of the Ottoman Government from fear of Russia, while the latter recognized the dangerous attraction which a national Roumanian State would have for her own Roumanian subjects in Transylvania. It was settled, therefore, that each Principality should elect its own prince and legislative assembly (1858). The Roumanians thereupon proceeded to nominate the same Prince (Alexander Couza) both in Moldavia and Wallachia, thus outwitting the Powers who had overlooked the possibility that the Principalities might hit upon the same choice. Austria, now on the brink of the Italian war,\(^1\) was unable to interfere, and the two provinces became united under one ruler. In 1861 the Porte also agreed to the union of the two legislatures; and in a proclamation to his people the Prince could announce to the world that 'The Roumanian nation is founded.'

Prince Couza's tenure of power lasted only seven years (1859–1866). It was a period of internal reforms. Ecclesiastical property was sequestrated; two Roumanian Universities were founded; and the peasants were relieved from their more onerous feudal obligations. These measures excited the hostility of the Church and the landowners, and brought about Couza's compulsory abdication. His successor was Prince Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, whom Bismarck had counselled to accept the proffered

\(^1\) Supra, p. 178.
dignity. "Accept," he said; "it will at any rate be an agreeable souvenir for your old age." His reign covered nearly half a century (1866–1914), and during this long period Roumania became the chief military State in South-Eastern Europe. The efficiency of the Roumanian army was first revealed to the world in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877, when the Roumanians captured the famous Grivotza redoubt, the strongest of all the fortifications of Plevna. Russia rewarded the services of her Roumanian ally by wresting from her Bessarabia, which had been restored to Moldavia after the Crimean War. This ingratitude estranged the Roumanian people who deeply resented their separation from their kinsfolk across the River Pruth, the "accursed stream" as it was called. One other result of the war was the formal recognition of Roumanian independence; and, in token of her new status, Roumania in 1881 was erected into a kingdom.

Roumania enjoyed one inestimable advantage over her neighbours in the Balkans. "For a whole generation, while Serbia was the scene of repeated coups d'état and political scandals, while in Bulgaria, despite wonderful progress, the representative idea has always been ruthlessly subordinated to the will of the sovereign, while Turkey groaned under the Hamidian despotism and Greece still waited for the statesman ¹ who was to free her from the ban of political anarchism, Roumania, alone of all the Balkan States, could boast of an uninterrupted constitutional development." ² In two important respects, however, Roumania down to 1914 was behind her neighbours. The agrarian problem was extremely acute. The feudal system, which had disappeared elsewhere in the Balkans, continued to survive in Roumania, and ownership of land was mainly vested not in the peasants but in the boyards or nobles. The agrarian unrest was a serious menace to the stability of the Roumanian State, and even as recently as 1907 the disaffection of the peasants provoked a formidable insurrection. Another grave defect in the Roumanian State was the persecution of its Jewish subjects, who were debarred

¹ Venizelos. ² Seton-Watson, op. cit. 22.
from the exercise of all civil and political rights. The Congress of Berlin (1878) made the removal of religious disabilities a condition of Roumanian independence, complete religious equality being the primary obligation imposed on every civilized community. In gross violation of this international guarantee the Jewish people were rigidi excluded from the privileges of citizenship, though not from its burdens, from the ownership of land, and from certain trades. It was, "moreover, peculiarly galling," observed Dr. Seton-Watson, "that the Jews, though regarded as aliens and denied political rights, should be liable to military service—an arrangement which conflicts with all democratic and constitutional tradition and indeed with the most elementary ideas of give and take."  

The origin of the Bulgarian people is wrapped in obscurity. In very early times the country was inhabited by Thracian and Illyrian tribes, who were brought under the sway of Philip of Macedon and Alexander the Great, and were afterwards subdued by the Romans. These Thracians and Illyrians were eventually displaced by the Slavs, the date of whose incursion into the plains of Bulgaria is unknown. In the seventh century the Slavs in their turn were conquered by a race of Bulgarians (Bulgari), who entered the country at this period. The two races slowly amalgamated, the former perpetuating their speech, the latter perpetuating their name. Thus the modern Bulgarians are descended in the main from two different stocks, the Slavs and the old Bulgarians. At two periods in the Middle Ages Bulgaria emerged as the greatest State in the Balkans. In the reign of Simeon (893–927), who adopted the title of Tsar, she "assumed a rank," as Gibbon wrote, "among the civilized Powers of the earth."  His empire extended over Bulgaria proper, modern Serbia, and the greater part of Albania, but his successors were powerless to wield the sceptre he had bequeathed them. In 1018 the

---

1 Seton-Watson, _op. cit._ 25.
2 E. Gibbon, _Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire_ (ed. J. B. Bury, 1912), vi. 140.
Greek Emperor subjugated the whole Balkan Peninsula, and for over a century and a half the Bulgarians remained under the Byzantine yoke. They recovered their independence in 1186, and under John Asen II. (1218–1241) Bulgaria again attained the position of a great military State, embracing not only Bulgaria herself, but Macedonia, Albania and part of Serbia. "All lands have I conquered," was Asen's proud boast in an inscription preserved in the church of the Forty Martyrs at Trnovo, the ancient capital of Bulgaria, "from Adrianople to Durazzo, the Greek, the Albanian, and the Serbian land. Only the towns round Constantinople and that city itself did the Franks hold; but these too bowed themselves beneath the hand of my sovereignty, for they had no other Tsar but me." 1 The second Bulgarian Empire survived from 1186 to 1396, though its power was destroyed in 1330 by Serbia at the battle of Velbužd (Köstendil). The memory of this exploit is still fresh. Upon the outbreak of war between Serbia and Bulgaria in 1885 the Serbian army marched through Belgrade with the name on their lips of the mediæval Serbian King, Dušan, who had taken the title of 'Tsar of the Bulgarians.' 2

In the feuds of the Balkan peoples the Turks found their best ally, and towards the end of the fourteenth century Bulgaria and Serbia alike collapsed before the Ottoman invaders.

For nearly five centuries Bulgaria remained an integral part of the Ottoman Empire. The Bulgarian peasant lost his warlike character without developing political instincts, and sunk in apathy he passively accepted the supremacy of his Turkish masters. On the eve of his liberation from bondage, a material improvement in his economic condition was effected by the reforms of Midhat Pasha, the most enlightened of Turkish statesmen. The Russian officers, who passed through Bulgaria in 1877, discovered "that the 'little brothers,' whom they had come to free, were better off under the Turkish yoke than many of their own mujiks [peasants] under the benevolent despotism of the Tsar. In the words of an impartial eye-witness, to exchange places

1 W. Miller, The Balkans (1896), 176.  
2 See infra, p. 204.
with the Bulgarian ḍiyah 'would have been no bad bargain for the Russian peasants.'\(^1\) Moreover, in 1870, the Bulgarians obtained from the Porte the concession of an independent National Church, the Bulgarian Exarchate—a concession which relieved them from the tyranny of the Greek ecclesiastical system. The Bulgarians were therefore not ill-disposed towards the Turks, and the efforts of a revolutionary committee established at Bucharest to arouse the patriotism of their countrymen met with little response. In 1875, however, an event occurred which changed, as in a flash, the entire political situation in South-Eastern Europe. An insurrection broke out in the Herzegovina,\(^3\) and it awakened revolutionary echoes throughout the whole Balkan Peninsula. Bulgaria did not escape the universal unrest, and a rising took place at Tatar-Bazardjik. The revolt was without much significance and was suppressed with ease, but the unspeakable cruelty of the Turkish soldiers covered them with infamy. At Batak, where five thousand inhabitants out of a population of seven thousand were ruthlessly massacred without distinction of age or sex, the butchery was stigmatized by the British Commissioner as "perhaps the most heinous crime that has stained the history of the present century." 'The Bulgarian Atrocities' (1876) earned the reprobation of the whole civilized world, and the unmeasured denunciations of William Gladstone helped to impress the horror of the outrage upon the conscience of Western Europe.

Of the war between Russia and Turkey which followed in April 1877, we shall speak presently.\(^8\) Overpowered on every side, Turkish resistance soon collapsed, and the struggle was brought to an end in March 1878 by the Treaty of San Stefano. This treaty was extremely favourable to the Bulgarians; for the moment it realized the vision of a Greater Bulgaria, the legacy of the heroic age of Bulgaria. It erected Bulgaria into a vassal State extending from the Danube to the Ægean and from the Black Sea to Albania, and comprising North and South Bulgaria (Eastern Roumelia) as well as a considerable part of Mace-

\(^{1}\) Miller, op. cit. 206.  \(^{3}\) See infra, p. 208.  \(^{8}\) Infra, p. 208.
Greece and Serbia, however, vigorously protested against a settlement which ignored their own claims upon Macedonia, and the Great Powers were no less hostile, though on different grounds. England, in particular, viewed with disapproval the proposed aggrandizement of Bulgaria, expecting that the new State would become a Russian province and so pave the way for the ultimate acquisition of Constantinople. Austria had her own grounds for dissatisfaction; she claimed as her share of the spoils the occupation of Bosnia and the Herzegovina. Russia bowed before the storm, and the Treaty of San Stefano was abrogated. The famous Congress of Berlin met in June 1878, Great Britain being represented by Lord Beaconsfield, the Prime Minister, and Lord Salisbury, the Foreign Secretary. The outcome of its deliberations was the Treaty of Berlin, which rudely shattered the dreams of a Greater Bulgaria. The new State, now established as an "autonomous and tributary principality under the suzerainty of the Sultan," was only a fragment of the State contemplated by the Treaty of San Stefano. It was restricted to Bulgaria proper, extending from the Danube to the Balkans and from the Black Sea to the frontiers of Serbia and Macedonia. The land south of the Balkan range, Eastern Roumelia, was erected into an autonomous province "under the direct political and military authority of the Sultan," but administered by "a Christian Governor-General nominated by the Porte, with the assent of the Powers, for a term of five years." The result of this settlement was to divide the Bulgarians from their kinsfolk in Eastern Roumelia and Macedonia, while "the Bulgarian-speaking district of Pirot" was also incorporated with Serbia. In the nature of things a settlement which openly violated the legitimate claims of Bulgarian nationality had no elements of permanence. The separation of North and South Bulgaria was no less indefensible on national grounds than the similar attempt to keep apart Moldavia and Wallachia twenty years before. It is a significant commentary on the foresight of diplomats, and the vaunted arts of diplomatic expediency, that the formation of a united Bulgarian State, only a few
years later, met with the approval of Great Britain, and the disapproval of the Russian Government.

The first Prince of Bulgaria, 'the peasant State,' was Alexander of Battenberg, in whose reign the union of the two Bulgarias was effected as the result of a bloodless revolution at Philippopolis, the capital of Eastern Roumelia. The Turkish Governor was quietly expelled, and Prince Alexander was proclaimed ruler of the principality. Turkey offered no resistance, but the Tsar of Russia, Alexander III., showed his resentment by recalling the Russian officers from Bulgaria. This only had the effect of heightening the Prince's popularity among his subjects, whose gratitude to their Russian 'liberators' was rapidly cooling owing to the tactless and overbearing conduct of Russian agents. More serious at the moment, however, was the opposition raised by the other Balkan States, Greece and Serbia, who were alarmed at the aggrandizement of their rival. Greece was prevented from declaring war by the action of the Powers, which blockaded the Greek coasts, but Serbia had a free hand. The relations between the two countries had steadily deteriorated in consequence of boundary disputes and a tariff war, and public opinion in Serbia was ripe for a conflict. King Milan was also anxious to retrieve his waning prestige, and therefore easily accommodated himself to the national wishes. The Bulgarians, deprived of experienced officers, were taken at a disadvantage, but the national enthusiasm and the inspiring generalship of the Prince overcame all obstacles. The two armies came into collision at Slivnitsa; and, after a fiercely contested battle which continued for three days, the Bulgarians remained masters of the field. Austria barred their advance to the Serbian capital, and the war which had only lasted a fortnight came to an end. The Treaty of Bucharest (March 1886) brought the Bulgarians neither an indemnity nor accession of territory, but the victory of Slivnitsa had achieved its purpose of consolidating the Union.

The military exploits and frank bearing of Prince Alexander endeared him to his unemotional subjects, but Russian intrigues rendered his position untenable. He was person-
ally disliked by his cousin, Alexander III., and his efforts to pursue an independent policy determined his enemies to compass his destruction. After two unsuccessful attempts the Prince was forcibly kidnapped on August 21, 1886, compelled to abdicate the throne, and then conveyed out of the country. The nation, however, rallied to his support and the Prince was recalled from exile; but lacking confidence in his ability to withstand the power of Russia, he voluntarily renounced his position. The strenuous exertions of Russian agents to defer the election of a successor to the vacant throne failed to accomplish their object, but they completed the alienation of the Bulgarian people from their Russian protectors. After an interval of several months a suitable candidate was discovered in the person of Prince Ferdinand of Saxe-Coburg, a descendant of King Louis Philippe, who was chosen Prince of Bulgaria in July 1887. The new sovereign was a great contrast to his predecessor; "accident made Prince Ferdinand a sovereign, nature intended him for a student." On the other hand, he was a far abler diplomatist than Prince Alexander, and during the first seven years of his reign (1887–1894) he had the wisdom to entrust the destinies of his adopted country into the hands of Stephen Stambuloff. This remarkable man, the greatest statesman the Balkans had yet known, earned the designation of "the Bulgarian Bismarck." He came into prominence during the revolutionary movements which preceded the emancipation of Bulgaria from Turkish control, and his energetic patriotism had defeated the nefarious conspiracy against Prince Alexander. In his capacity as prime minister he raised the prestige of Bulgaria in the eyes of Europe by his firmness of will and the pursuit of a policy whose single aim was his country's interests. Prince Ferdinand, however, resented the uncourtierlike manners of his great minister, and the relations between them grew embittered. In 1894 he followed the example of the German Emperor¹ and dispensed with Stambuloff's services. The hatred of his enemies pursued the fallen statesman into his

¹ W. Miller, The Ottoman Empire (1913), 424.
² Infra, Chapter VIII.
retirement, and the following year he was brutally murdered. This shameful crime, and still more the equivocal conduct of the Government which delayed the trial of the assassins, disclosed unsavoury glimpses of the intemperate and vindictive character of Balkan domestic politics.

The Serbs entered the Balkan Peninsula in the seventh century, and their settlements soon covered the Adriatic coast, extending as far south as Macedonia and embracing also the modern State of Montenegro. Ere long they were drawn into conflict with their Bulgarian neighbours, with whom they were at enmity for more than a thousand years. The fortunes of war inclined now to one side, now to the other. When the first Bulgarian Empire was at its widest extent Serbia suffered complete annihilation. But after the death of Simeon the Serbs recovered their independence, though for a time they passed under the sway of the Byzantine Emperor. The turning-point in the history of Serbia came in the twelfth century. Their misfortunes in earlier times were due in large measure to the defects of their political organization. The Serbian State was a loose federation of tribes ruled by chieftains owning but a nominal obedience to the authority of their prince. Their failure to form an effective union dissipated the strength of the Serbs and retarded for centuries their political development. This weakness was remedied by Stephen Nemanja (1143 or 1159 to 1195), who established his control over the chieftains and founded the Serbian monarchy. At the same time he enlarged his dominions to twice their original size by the acquisition of Dalmatia, Bosnia and other territories. Mediæval Serbia attained her zenith in the reign of Stephen Dušan (1336–1356), the most powerful of all Serbian rulers. He built up a great empire which covered very nearly the whole Balkan Peninsula—extending from the Danube to the Gulf of Corinth, and from the Adriatic to the Ægean, and including Bosnia, the Herzegovina, Macedonia, and the vassal State of Bulgaria herself. Even Constantinople was only saved by the sudden death of Dušan in 1356. The

1 Supra, p. 198.
Serbian Empire did not long survive its founder; it rapidly fell to pieces, and thirty-three years after Dušan's death its power was finally and irrevocably shattered by the Turks at the memorable battle of Kossovo. This battle (1389) sealed the fate of the Balkan States for five centuries. Serbia was allowed to maintain a separate existence for a period of seventy years, though she was now nothing more than a dependent province; but in 1459 she was at length incorporated as an integral part of the Ottoman State.

The Bulgarians owed their emancipation from Turkish bondage to the swords of a foreign Power, the Serbs to the strength of their own right arm. Even before the nineteenth century the Serbian race, imbued with a passionate love of freedom, struggled to deliver itself from the Ottoman yoke. After the battle of Kossovo, and at subsequent periods, large numbers of Serbian emigrants sought refuge across the Danube and settled in southern Hungary, where they have remained to this day. In their new home they retained their attachment to their native soil and their hatred of its oppressors, and they were a valuable auxiliary to the Hungarian kings in their wars with Turkey. On more than one occasion the liberation of Serbia seemed at hand, more particularly on the eve of the French Revolution. A Serb poet, Obradovich, called upon the Emperor Joseph II. "to protect the Serbian race and turn thy face towards a people dear to thy ancestors, towards unhappy Serbia, which suffers miseries without number. Give us back," he cried, "our ancient heroes, our ancient country!" 1 The Ottoman Empire, which owed its preservation in the nineteenth century to the mutual jealousies of the European Powers, appeared on the point of dissolution. The alliance of Austria and Russia, so often locked in deadly rivalry, foreshadowed the expulsion of the Turks from the entire Balkan Peninsula. At this critical moment in the history of the Balkans Joseph II. died (1790), and his untimely end diverted Austrian policy into other channels. The Serbian people, again enslaved by Turkey, suffered once more the bitterness of hope deferred. Their powerful neighbours had proved

1 Cited, Miller, The Balkans, 306.
1804-6 broken reeds; and repeated disappointments drove home the lesson which the Dutch had learnt three centuries before in their struggle against Spain, that nations like individuals must fight their own battles.

The founder of the modern Serbian State was Kara George, the son of a peasant. Driven into revolt in company with other of his countrymen by the evil practices of the Janissaries quartered in Serbia (1804), he took refuge in the mountains, where he soon found himself at the head of a considerable force. It was fortunate for the Serbs that the Janissaries were equally obnoxious to the Sultan, whose authority they had defied by their insubordinate conduct and traitorous alliance with the rebellious Pasha of Widdin. The Porte therefore ordered the Pasha of Bosnia to combine with the Serbs in wrestling Belgrade out of the hands of the Janissaries. The united forces accomplished their objective; the Mussulman revolt was suppressed; and Serbia was freed from the military oppression under which she had groaned. Flushed with their victory over the turbulent Janissaries, and finding themselves in possession of arms, the Serbs were now tempted to make a bid for independence against the Turkish Government itself. They demanded the evacuation of Serbian fortresses by Turkish troops. The Sultan was in no mood to concede a demand which would have destroyed his hold over the population. He endeavoured to crush the revolt of the Serbs, as he had crushed the revolt of the Janissaries. Army after army was sent against the insurgents, who profited by the rough and mountainous conditions of their country—conditions "profoundly favourable to guerilla warfare." ¹ The war was brought to an end by the overwhelming defeat of the Turkish army at Mischar (1806). The Sultan yielded most liberal terms: complete autonomy, the evacuation of all Serbian fortresses except Belgrade, and the expropriation of Turkish landowners. It was indeed a memorable triumph for the Serbs, who had fought their way to freedom under their peasant leader without any foreign help. For a few years

¹ Lyde and Mockler-Ferryman, *A Military Geography of the Balkan Peninsula* (1905), 89.
the land had rest. The interests of Turkey demanded peace, for the shadow of Russia had fallen across her path. In 1812, however, the shadow passed away, and Russia, preoccupied with Napoleon’s approaching invasion of her soil, did not attempt to save the Serbian people from reconquest. Kara George threw up the unequal contest in despair, but the mantle of the heroic Serbian leader fell upon the shoulders of another peasant, Milosh Obrenovich, the second founder of modern Serbia. The struggle for independence was renewed, and in 1815 the Sultan, again confronted by the prospect of Russian intervention, conceded the right of self-government. A few years later the Treaty of Adrianople (1829) erected Serbia into what was practically an independent State, and Milosh was recognized as hereditary Prince.

It has been a grave misfortune for Serbia that she is indebted for her liberation to the founders of two rival dynasties, the Karageorgevich and the Obrenovich. The feuds of these families assumed from the first the character of a vendetta. Milosh set an evil precedent when he procured the assassination of Kara George (1817) in order to remove a dangerous rival from his path, and the crime was avenged to the second and third generations in the blood of his own kinsfolk. Moreover, his tyrannical rule and arbitrary exactions estranged his countrymen, and in 1839 he was forced to abdicate. He was succeeded by his two sons, Milan Obrenovich II. and Michael Obrenovich III. The former died almost immediately after his accession, and even the latter only occupied the throne for three short years. The Serbs next chose as their ruler Alexander Karageorgevich, the son of the great national leader. After a reign of sixteen years (1842–1858) Alexander in his turn was deposed. During the Crimean War he had remained neutral, and this policy was unpopular with the nation, whose sympathies were with Russia. Another change of dynasty now followed. Milosh was recalled from exile at the age of seventy-nine, and resumed his autocratic sway until his death in 1860. He handed on the reins of govern-

1 Supra, p. 193.
ment to his son, Michael Obrenovich III., who had occupied the throne for a short period eighteen years before. Prince Michael was the wisest and most capable ruler Serbia has yet known. He instituted various political and economic reforms adapted to the backward condition of his peasant subjects, and in 1867 he induced the Porte to withdraw the Turkish garrisons from all Serbian fortresses. By this great diplomatic triumph and the moderation of his rule Prince Michael had earned well of his country, but the adherents of the Karageorgevich dynasty were irreconcilable, and the Prince was brutally assassinated in 1868. An attempt was made to proclaim as his successor Peter Karageorgevich, son of the exiled Prince Alexander, but the energy of the Government defeated the project, and the crown devolved on Michael's cousin, Milan Obrenovich IV.

The reign of Prince Milan is memorable for the great uprising of the Serbian race in 1875. We have already dealt with its influence upon the fortunes of Roumania and Bulgaria, and we have now to see how it affected Serbia and Montenegro. The movement began in the Herzegovina, where the peasantry suffered intolerable oppression at the hands of landlords and rapacious tax-farmers. It is said that the cultivator of the soil paid no less than two-thirds of his crop in taxes, and the burden of feudal obligations involved him in all the evils of economic servitude. The insurrection spread to Bosnia, and public opinion forced Serbia and Montenegro to come to the assistance of their oppressed Serbian kinsfolk. In the war which ensued the Turks were victorious, and Russia intervened to save Serbia from destruction. There seemed for a time a danger lest Russia would become embroiled with Great Britain, but the peril passed away as a result of the Bulgarian atrocities, which made it impossible for this country to ally itself with Turkey, as it had done in the Crimean War. "The impression produced here by events in Bulgaria," wrote the English Foreign Secretary, "has completely destroyed sympathy with Turkey. The feeling is universal and so strong that even if Russia were to declare war against the Porte, Her Majesty's Government would find it practically impossible
THE BALKAN STATES

The Treaty of San Stefano, by which the war was brought to an end, was favourable to the two Serbian States, whose frontiers now became almost coterminous. Serbia received a large accession of territory on the south, and Montenegro was "trebled in size and doubled in population." These terms, however, were revised at the Congress of Berlin. Montenegro was made to resign half her acquisitions, and Serbia was compensated for the loss of her southern gains at the expense of Bulgaria. In addition, Bosnia and the Herzegovina were "occupied" by Austria. This settlement drove a wedge between the Serbs of Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and the Herzegovina. It disappointed, therefore, the expectations of Serbian patriots, who had hoped to unite the whole Serbian race under one ruler, and it sowed the seeds of an irreconcilable feud between the Serbs and the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

As the result of the Russo-Turkish War, Serbia gained not only a great accession of territory, but the formal recognition of her independence, and in 1882 Prince Milan assumed the title of king. For the next twenty years Serbian history is mainly a record of court scandals, assassinations, and repeated coups d'État. King Milan, who was very unpopular with his subjects, abdicated in 1889. His successor, Alexander, was a minor, and for a period of four years the country was ruled by Regents. In 1893 the King seized the reins of government into his hands and abolished the Liberal Constitution drawn up by his predecessor. An unfortunate marriage undermined his position, and in 1903, on the anniversary of the assassination of Prince Michael (June 10), he was foully murdered with his Queen by his own officers. The assassination of Alexander, who died without an heir, brought the Obrenovich dynasty to an end. The throne reverted to the Karageorgevich dynasty, now represented by King Peter, whose father had been Prince of Serbia for sixteen years (1842–1858). In two respects the new sovereign differed from his predecessors. He abandoned the Austrophil policy of King Milan, and—as was fitting for one who had translated John Stuart Mill's Essay on Liberty—he governed Serbia as a constitutional King.
CHAPTER VII

THE EUROPEAN CONCERT

1815-23

Among the effects of the French Revolution on English political thought, perhaps the most important, and certainly the most immediate, lay in concentrating the attention of English reformers on the possibility of universal peace. The main accusation brought against the eighteenth-century governments was that they sacrificed the interests of the nation to the dynastic and territorial ambitions of its rulers. In every country, wrote Thomas Paine in the Rights of Man, we see "age going to the workhouse and youth to the gallows"; and he attributed the poverty and wretchedness of the great bulk of mankind to the perpetual system of war and the enormous burden of taxation which it necessarily involved. The money wasted on war, and the preparations for war, deprived civilization of its abundance, and ground the poor down to the extremest poverty. The French Revolution inspired the belief in English writers that the dawn of peace was at hand, and that democracy would unite nations in the bonds of lasting friendship. The history of the nineteenth century has shown how little this expectation was fulfilled. The warm hopes which filled the hearts of English reformers were doomed to disappointment, and the golden age which the Revolution promised was never fulfilled. For Rousseau and the vision of nature were substituted Napoleon and a Europe in arms, and a titanic duel ensued between France and the Coalition, extending over twenty years. The close of the revolutionary epoch left Europe satiated with blood, and painfully anxious to devise a form of international government which would
serve as a security against the menace of future wars. The experiment of a European Concert lasted eight years (1815–1823); its history and the causes of its failure convey a lesson of profound interest at a time when the course of events has produced a situation parallel, in many respects, to that which existed over a hundred years ago.

The idea of a commonwealth of nations was not a creation of the nineteenth century; it was a legacy of mediæval political philosophy. The Holy Roman Empire was the earliest form of a European Confederation, and it represented a rudimentary attempt to give substance to the vision of Isaiah—a world united in peace. After the Reformation the Holy Roman Empire ceased, even in theory, to be the pivot of the European state-system; and the public law of Europe, as enunciated in the classical treatises of Grotius and other famous publicists, entirely discarded the notion of a supreme head ruling over a community of nations. Henceforth the cardinal doctrine of international relationships rested upon the theory that all sovereign States are not only absolutely independent, but treat with each other upon a footing of complete legal equality; and whether weak or strong, they are burdened with the same rights and obligations. International law, as it is now constituted, no longer recognizes the existence of a sovereign authority empowered to settle disputes and issue commands having the force of law. In practice, however, this doctrine of the legal equality of States has been superseded by the actual political superiority of the Great Powers. In the nineteenth century the destinies of Europe were in the hands of five or six States, which arrogated to themselves a preponderant influence in all matters of general concern: for example, the separation of Holland and Belgium,¹ and the Eastern Question.² We might suppose that this predominance of the great States and elimination of the secondary States would have facilitated the harmonious working of a European Concert, but in reality the effect was to sharpen the rivalry of the survivors. Hence a situation emerged in which Europe became divided into two armed camps,

¹ *Infra*, p. 229,
² *Supra*, Chapter VI.
and the prospect of international comity appeared more remote than ever. The purpose of the present chapter is to examine the reasons why the first serious effort to establish a Confederated Europe failed so disastrously.

The close of the Napoleonic Wars seemed to afford a unique opportunity for an international experiment: the establishment of a European federal system. The danger of revolutionary propaganda had drawn together the Great Powers in a coalition which had finally imposed its will upon the French people. The question therefore arose whether it was possible to create a United Europe, sharing common rights and acknowledging common obligations. But the Congress of Vienna disappointed the expectations of a confederated Europe. "Men had promised themselves," wrote Gentz in a survey of the work accomplished by the Vienna Congress, "an all-embracing reform of the political system of Europe; guarantees for peace; in one word, the return of the Golden Ages. The Congress has resulted in nothing but restorations, which had already been effected by arms; agreements between the Great Powers, of little value for the future balance and preservation of the peace of Europe; quite arbitrary alterations in the possessions of the less important States; but in no act of a higher nature, no great measure for public order or for the universal good, which might compensate humanity for its long sufferings or reassure it as to the future. . . . The Protocol of the Congress bears the stamp rather of a temporary agreement than of work destined to last for centuries."

The ultimate reason why the Great Powers failed to work together in harmony after the fall of Napoleon must be ascribed to fundamental diversities in their ideas and institutions. In a well-ordered community all men are not required to profess identical opinions on social, religious, or political questions; they can combine their efforts for the common good, and co-operate in the pursuit of common ends, without sharing the same sentiments on every conceivable subject. A dead level of uniformity, rightly understood, is a source of weakness rather than of strength, for variation is the law of our being and the primary con-
tion of progress. None the less, association for any purpose necessarily implies a general similarity of outlook, consciousness of mutual interests, and willingness to sacrifice freedom of action. Upon the extent to which these postulates are satisfied, will depend whether a State is unitary like Great Britain, or federal like the United States of America. Where none of these postulates are satisfied, there can exist neither a unitary State nor a federal State. Now in 1815 the development of Europe was not sufficiently advanced to fulfil any of these conditions, and this explains the fundamental weakness of the new international structure and its rapid collapse. The history of (1) the Holy Alliance, and (2) the Quadruple Alliance, will serve to show why it was impossible to establish, in the words of Gentz, "a political system by which wars of conquest would be rendered impossible." The delicate adjustment of rival national claims was to prove a task insuperable for the nineteenth century.

(1) The Holy Alliance was the creation of Alexander I. The Russian Emperor was a visionary and a mystic, open to generous impulses, but a man of moods and unstable imagination. In the early part of his reign he showed a leaning towards Liberal principles, going so far as to bestow a Constitution on Poland, while he also contemplated a Constitution even for Russia. His Liberalism, it is true, never penetrated far below the surface; for, as his own minister, Czartoryski, wrote: "The Emperor would willingly have consented that every one should be free, on condition that every one should do his will alone." The plan of a European Confederation naturally made a warm appeal to his impressionable temperament. Two centuries before, Henry IV. of France had unfolded a somewhat similar idea to the Holy Alliance in the Grand Design, which is said to have been inspired by Queen Elizabeth. It set up a General Council, or Senate, modelled on the Amphictyonic Council of Greece, comprising sixty-six delegates from the different countries, whose duties were to settle disputes and keep the peace of Europe. Sully

1 W. A. Phillips, The Confederation of Europe (1914), 57.
described the purpose of the Grand Design as intended “to deliver them for ever from the fear of bloody catastrophes, so common in Europe; to secure for them an unalterable repose, so that all the princes might henceforth live together as brothers.”¹ This scheme was cut short by Henry’s death in 1610, but it reappeared a century later in the *Projet de paix perpétuelle* of the Abbé de St. Pierre (1713), which proposed the formation of a European League, whose members surrendered the right of making war on each other, and submitted their differences to the arbitration of a permanent Congress.² At the beginning of the nineteenth century it was again revived by the Russian Emperor. “The drawback to Russia as an ally,” said Moltke, “is that she arrives on the field very late, and is then too strong.” This happened in the War of Liberation, and the unbroken strength of his forces in the field gave Alexander a preponderant influence in the councils of the Allies, which he now employed on behalf of his favourite project. Already in 1804 he had made overtures to England for a new international system, which was chiefly noteworthy for the admission that the peace of Europe could never be established until the “internal order” of every country “shall have been founded on a wise liberty,” as “a barrier against the passions, the unbridled ambition, or the madness which often drives out of their senses” those in whom power is vested. These memorable words recall the teaching of Kant, that the only possible basis of universal peace is true representative government.³ Alexander’s overtures resulted in a treaty between Great Britain and Russia, in which Pitt agreed that after the conclusion of peace the Great Powers should guarantee each other their possessions, in order to prevent “future attempts to trouble the general tranquillity.”⁴ It is clear that the English minister meant only that France should not be allowed to disturb the future settlement of Europe by fresh “projects of aggrandizement

---

¹ *Mémoires de Sully* (ed. 1745), ii. 81; iii. bk. xxx.
² The provisions are given in Phillips, *op. cit.* 22.
³ Kant, *Perpetual Peace* (ed. M. Campbell Smith, 1903), 120 seq. Cl. also 33 seq.
⁴ Phillips, *op. cit.* 34, 38.
ALEXANDER I.
Emperor of Russia (1801-1825)
From the Portrait by Gerard at Versailles
and ambition." Alexander, on the other hand, interpreted his scheme in the light of a European League on the lines of the Grand Design. Thus, while Great Britain was concerned only with an immediate and practical object—the overthrow of Napoleon—the Emperor entertained the more ambitious idea of a supreme court whose sphere should cover all matters of European interest. This clash of opinions could no longer be concealed after Alexander published to the world the plan of the Holy Alliance. The English Government withheld its signature, declining to stultify its freedom of action by taking part in a vague and shadowy project which bound the contracting monarchs "on all occasions and in all places [to] lend each other aid and assistance."

The Holy Alliance has been greatly misunderstood; not only has its purpose been misinterpreted, but its practical significance has been overrated. It was regarded at the time as a symbol of Reaction, a conspiracy against Liberalism, a league of princes against their peoples. It is worth while to quote the text of the Holy Alliance in order to show how far this view is justified. "The present Act," it is solemnly declared by the contracting parties, "has no other object than to publish, in the face of the whole world, their fixed resolution, both in the administration of their respective States and in their political relations with every other Government, to take for their sole guide the precepts of that Holy Religion, namely, the precepts of Justice, Christian Charity and Peace, which, far from being applicable only to private concerns, must have an immediate influence on the counsels of Princes, and guide all their steps, as being the only means of consolidating human institutions and remedying their imperfections." Translated into other terms, the Holy Alliance seemed to imply nothing more than that sovereigns were henceforth to regard each other as brothers "united by the bonds of a true and indissoluble fraternity," and their subjects as their children, whom they were to rule "as fathers of families." This exemplary doctrine, honoured in the breach but rarely in the observance,

1 Hertelot, The Map of Europe by Treaty, i. 317.
and subscribed to by the three great autocracies, naturally awakened the suspicion that it veiled a sinister design against the liberties of Europe. This, however, was not the case; on the contrary, Alexander even sought to persuade his allies that the Holy Alliance involved as its corollary the acceptance of constitutional principles of government.

The Holy Alliance was nominally, then, an attempt to apply the principles of morality to international diplomacy, in other words, to create in Europe a political conscience. To all intents and purposes this nebulous scheme, which loomed so prominently before the eyes of contemporaries, never materialized, and was still-born. All Alexander’s efforts were unavailing “to provide the transparent soul of the Holy Alliance with a body.” Castlereagh treated it as “a piece of sublime mysticism and nonsense”; and Metternich, who regarded the Russian Emperor as a Jacobin, looked upon it as merely a “loud-sounding nothing,” or “moral demonstration.” “The Holy Alliance,” he explained, “was merely a philanthropic aspiration clothed in a religious garb.” It “was not an institution to keep down the rights of the people, to promote absolutism or any other tyranny. It was only the overflow of the pietistic feeling of the Emperor Alexander and the application of Christian principles to politics.”¹ But though the practical importance of the Holy Alliance was negligible, it merits attention because it disclosed a fundamental disparity of opinion between the Eastern Powers on the one hand and the British Government on the other.

(2) We have seen how Alexander’s vision of a Holy Alliance was shattered, in so far as its main purpose was concerned, by the refusal of English statesmen to be drawn into an alliance whose objects were so vague and undefined. A like fate overtook what may be termed the ‘system of Metternich,’ which eventually led England to withdraw from the European Concert and “move steadily on in her own orbit.”²

¹ Metternich, Memoirs, i. 250, 262.
² Canning’s words: A. G. Stapleton, The Political Life of George Canning (1831), i. 489.
While persisting in her resolution to hold aloof from the Holy Alliance, Great Britain was willing to co-operate with the Continental Powers for certain well-defined ends. As early as 1791 Kaunitz, the Austrian minister, had urged that since Europe was "a single family of nations," it was the duty of all States "to make common cause in order to preserve the public peace, the tranquillity of States, the inviolability of possessions, and the faith of treaties." ¹ His proposals were directed against France, and the European Concert in its origin was thus the direct outcome of the French Revolution. For over twenty years the Governments of Europe fought the revolutionary democracy of France, resisting the aggression of French ideas and French force; and coalition after coalition was built up until Napoleon, exhausted by the struggle, finally succumbed at Waterloo. After the Congress of Vienna the dissolution of the Quadruple Alliance—consisting of Great Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia—appeared imminent, since it had now achieved the purpose for which it was originally formed. Indeed, from the start its existence had been endangered by petty jealousies and rivalries, which were only hushed for the moment by the dramatic episode of the Hundred Days when Napoleon returned from Elba. In reality the work of the Quadruple Alliance was not completed, and it was necessary to devise measures which would shield the new order in Europe from the shock of fresh revolutionary assaults. The reception accorded by the French nation to Napoleon upon his reappearance in their midst showed that he still retained his extraordinary hold upon their affections. It demonstrated that France at heart was not reconciled to the Government imposed upon her by the arms of the Allies, and it seemed to suggest that at the first opportunity the old revolutionary passions would blaze out again in a great national effort to recover the Rhine frontier. The peril of French propaganda had called into existence the Concert of Europe, and the dread of France continued to keep the Quadruple Alliance together even after Waterloo. In order to safeguard the territorial

and political settlement so laboriously constructed by the Congress of Vienna, the Allies must be prepared for a renewal of the conflict at the first sign of unrest. Accordingly, in November 1815, the four Great Powers contracted a Treaty of Alliance, purporting "to guarantee Europe from dangers by which she may still be menaced." The purpose of the Alliance was laid down in clear unmistakable terms, testifying to the fear that "Revolutionary principles ... might again ... convulse France, and thereby endanger the peace of other States." The contrast between the Treaty of Alliance, openly designed as it was for a definite and practical object, and the Holy Alliance with its vague and nebulous principles, served to measure the difference between the idealism of Alexander and the sober statesmanship of Castlereagh.

The Treaty of Alliance, while framed in a moderate and cautious spirit, contained one clause which lent itself to elastic interpretation. This was the famous Sixth Article, which on account of its extreme importance merits quotation: "In order to consolidate the connexions which at the present moment so closely unite the four sovereigns, the High Contracting Parties have agreed to renew at fixed intervals, either under their own auspices or by their representative ministers, meetings consecrated to great common objects and the examination of such measures as at each one of these epochs shall be judged most salutary for the peace and prosperity of the nations, and for the maintenance of the peace of Europe." This Article was the foundation of the European Concert destined, as will be seen, to cover a period of eight years (1815-1823). It provided a basis for common action on the part of the Great Powers, who were to hold periodical conferences in order to deal with the various questions submitted for their consideration. Now it was immediately apparent that meetings consecrated to great objects would not confine their attention to the situation in France; thus the Article pledged the Allies to cooperate together in a variety of matters which had nothing to do with the nominal objects for which the Alliance existed.

1 Hertleit, The Map of Europe by Treaty, i. 372 seq.
Hence, while Great Britain disclaimed the principles embodied in the Holy Alliance, she found herself committed to a system of joint conferences, unconscious at the moment of the purpose to which the conferences would be turned. The net result, in short, was to substitute the hegemony of the Allies for the federative unity of all the Powers as contemplated by Alexander. In the eyes of the secondary States the dictatorship of the four Great Powers was, in a moral sense, no less unjustifiable than the dictatorship of Napoleon which it superseded; but they protested in vain. We have now to see how these Congresses—which were four in number, Aix-la-Chapelle, Troppau, Laibach, and Verona—worked out in practice. Their history will serve also to elucidate the principles by which English policy during this period was governed.

The first Congress met in 1818 at Aix-la-Chapelle after an interval of three years. Metternich, who wrote that he had "never seen a prettier little Congress," ¹ had good reason to congratulate himself on its success, for it marked the zenith of the system by which the Allied Powers endeavoured to establish a joint control over the affairs of all continental States. Like the Amphictyonic Council of Greece, the Congress was universally recognized as the supreme council of Europe, and it entertained appeals in the most miscellaneous matters. Denmark invoked assistance against Sweden; the Elector of Hesse petitioned for the title of king; German princes sought redress of their grievances; the people of Monaco complained against their ruler; and the Congress also dealt with the disputed succession to the duchy of Baden and the position of Jewish citizens in Austria and Prussia. In spite of the moral ascendancy of the Congress, however, the inherent weakness of the system which it embodied was already in evidence. The Congress at Aix-la-Chapelle witnessed, in fact, the first rift in the lute, which steadily widened at subsequent Congresses until the whole Alliance was shattered to pieces. On the question of the evacuation of France there was general agreement, and at the same time France was admitted into the Alliance

¹ Memoirs, iii. 144.
which now became, in the phrase of Metternich, a "moral pentarchy." But in other directions a fundamental divergence of opinions was speedily disclosed. In the first place the failure to settle the two outstanding questions of the Congress—regarding the Slave Trade and the Barbary pirates—showed that, where any question seriously affected its interests, no State was prepared to make concessions or sacrifice its own inclinations and wishes for the common good. In order to suppress the Slave Trade, Great Britain suggested that the European States should exercise a mutual right of search, but the proposal was wrecked from jealousy of England's sea-power, since none of the countries would tolerate interference with their commercial relations. The Barbary pirates menaced the whole European seaboard, and Russia proposed that an international fleet should be stationed in the Mediterranean to stamp out the evil. Great Britain, whose flag the Barbary pirates respected, was alarmed at the prospect of a Russian navy in the Mediterranean; and the project therefore fell to the ground. Thus incurable distrust fomented the spirit of discord and foiled all attempts at effective concert and harmonious co-operation.

The real significance of the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle, however, lies deeper; it awakened for the first time the apprehensions of English statesmen as to the real character of the principles underlying the European Concert. Alexander proposed that a Declaration should be signed by all the Powers guaranteeing the existing territorial settlement and the rights of sovereign princes. This proposal was greatly welcomed by Austria and Prussia. On his part Metternich recognized that a universal guarantee of the status quo would facilitate the systematic suppression of free institutions, stifling the development of Europe in the fetters of hide-bound conservatism. It pledged the European States to concert common measures against revolution and to come to the assistance of any Government which was unable to keep its subjects in order. It was, in fact, nothing less than a crusade against the heresy of revolution, and would have retarded indefinitely all constitutional progress.
It would have been equally fatal to the other great revolutionary force of the nineteenth century, the principle of nationality. It guaranteed the inviolability of possessions, and this would have prevented the unification of Italy and Germany; the separation of Holland and Belgium, Norway and Sweden; the liberation of the Balkan States—in a word, the map of Europe as it is to-day. Accordingly the European Concert, as conceived at this period by Russia, Austria and Prussia, would have secured the peace of Europe at the price of constitutional liberty and national independence. The credit for the failure of this sinister project belonged to the British Government whose firm attitude compelled the other Powers to abandon the scheme. The point at issue really turned on the right of intervention: it involved the fundamental question whether the five Great Powers, the moral pentarchy of Europe, were entitled to arrogate to themselves authority to intervene in any country on the pretext of preserving the status quo. The nominal purpose of the Concert of Europe was to prevent the recurrence of those revolutionary wars, which had already engulfed the Continent once in a sea of blood and might do so again. This logically implied a certain degree of control over the external relations of the different countries, which in its turn seemed to involve the right to regulate their internal affairs. For since Europe, in the words of Kaunitz, constituted "a single family of nations," what concerned one concerned all; and the infection of a revolution which was not stamped out at its source would spread over Europe with the rapidity of lightning. This actually happened in 1830 and 1848, when the example set by the democracy of Paris awakened echoes in almost every capital on the Continent. None the less England refused to subscribe to a doctrine of intervention fraught with such deadly menace to the national liberties of every European country. It is true that the case of France could be cited as an example of intervention, but one isolated instance did not establish a principle. The circumstances were clearly exceptional, yet even here Castlereagh in the Treaty of Alliance (1815), the original basis of the European Concert, had been careful to
prevent "too strong and undisguised an interference in the internal concerns of France." In regard to other States, Great Britain was not prepared to acquiesce in any general principle of international control; each particular emergency was to be considered separately as it arose, in order that the Powers should not be bound beforehand to a course of action which might be injurious to the interests of the nation concerned. The English Government strenuously repudiated the idea that the collective force of the Allies was "to be prostituted to the support of established power, without any consideration of the extent to which it was abused." The Alliance, protested Castlereagh, was never "intended as an union for the government of the World, or for the superintendence of the internal affairs of other States." Its purpose was not to suppress revolutionary movements in whatever part of Europe they might break out, independent of the special circumstances which might be pleaded on their behalf. With the fear of Parliament before their eyes, neither Castlereagh, Wellington, nor Canning, dared embark upon an uncharted sea, where navigation was particularly perilous when the helm was guided by Governments so reactionary as those of Austria and Russia.

The suspicions of English ministers, first awakened at Aix-la-Chapelle, that the Concert of Europe threatened to extinguish the liberties of Europe, were amply confirmed by the proceedings at the Congresses held in later years. The second Congress met at Troppau in 1820, and the following year was adjourned to Laibach. It was summoned on account of the Neapolitan revolt, with whose history we have already dealt. Under pressure from his subjects Ferdinand, King of Naples, had been compelled to grant a Constitution, and this afforded Austria a pretext for intervention. Castlereagh’s attitude was clearly defined from the outset. He believed that Austria was justified in interfering in Naples for two reasons. In the first place she had great interests at stake in the Peninsula; and the stability of her dominion in Lombardy, Venetia, and the Central States

---
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was imperilled by the revolutionary ferment in the south. In the second place, a treaty concluded by Ferdinand with the Austrian Emperor five years before entitled the latter to resist any changes in the Neapolitan system of government inconsistent with the principles adopted by Austria in her own Italian provinces.¹ On these grounds none of the Powers protested against Austria lending her forces to crush the Neapolitan rising, although Ferdinand’s appeal for assistance was a flagrant breach of the solemn oath he had taken to respect the new Constitution. Metternich, however, was not content with the bare recognition of his right to exercise a free hand in Italian affairs. He wanted the moral support of the Allies and proposed that they should back up the Austrian policy by refusing to acknowledge the revolutionary Government of Naples, and at the same time bring diplomatic pressure to bear upon the situation through their ministers. To this proposal Castlereagh returned a categorical refusal. He took his stand by the principle that no State was justified in meddling with the domestic affairs of any other State unless on grounds of treaty rights. The Neapolitan revolt lay outside the orbit of Great Britain’s concerns, and this country having no legitimate pretext for interference would preserve an attitude of strict neutrality. The case of Austria rested on a different footing; her treaty with Naples gave her a legal excuse for intervention, if she considered that her vital interests were at stake. Metternich, on the other hand, was anxious to obtain a mandate from Europe in order to establish the right of intervention not on narrow legal grounds, but on the broad basis of a general principle—the principle, namely, that popular insurrections, revolutions originating from below, were ‘illegitimate,’ and should be placed under the ban of Europe as a violation of its public law. In adopting this standpoint the Austrian statesman formulated a policy containing within it the seeds of disruption, since it was bound sooner or later to occasion a schism in the Alliance.

Metternich’s hands were strengthened at this juncture by a change which took place in the personal views of the

¹ Supra, p. 166.
Emperor Alexander. The murder of Kotzebue had shaken his faith in Liberal principles which were never deep-seated, and his alienation was completed by the news of a mutiny of the Imperial Guards at Petrograd. The revolt was provoked by the cruelty of the German colonel of the regiment, who had introduced Prussian methods of discipline and "did not spare" his men "any of those indignities which are as dishonouring to those who suffer as to those who inflict them." No political significance, therefore, attached to the mutiny, but it served to throw Alexander unreservedly into the arms of the Austrian minister. "So we are at one, Prince, and it is to you that we owe it," he said to Metternich at Troppau. "You have correctly judged the state of affairs. I deplore the waste of time, which we must try to repair. I am here without any fixed ideas; without any plan; but I bring you a firm and unalterable resolution. It is for your Emperor to use it as he wills, Tell me what you desire, and what you wish me to do, and I will do it." The results of Alexander's conversion to the Austrian 'system' were, in a diplomatic sense, momentous. Hitherto Austria had entertained a profound distrust of Russian policy, believing that the mass of verbiage in which Alexander wrapped his lofty sentiments veiled a secret determination to make himself the dictator of Europe. It was well known, for example, that Russian agents had spread themselves over every part of the Continent, encouraging revolutionary unrest and inspiring the belief that Russian influence would be exerted on the side of progressive movements. Hence for five years the counsels of Metternich had been distracted by the fear of an alliance between Russia, on the one hand, and France and the minor German States—like Württemberg—on the other. The reconciliation with Alexander simplified the position immensely, for it ensured that Austria in her campaign against Liberalism could henceforth rely upon Russian support. Thus it foreshadowed the cleavage of the Quintuple Alliance into two divisions: on the one side the reactionary Governments of Austria,
Russia and Prussia; on the other side the constitutional Governments of Great Britain and France.

The altered situation was reflected in the famous Protocol of Troppau, which enshrined the principle of intervention in set terms: "States which have undergone a change of Government due to revolution, the results of which threaten other States, ipso facto cease to be members of the European Alliance, and remain excluded from it until their situation gives guarantees for legal order and stability. If, owing to such alterations, immediate danger threatens other States, the Powers bind themselves, by peaceful means, or if need be by arms, to bring back the guilty State into the bosom of the Great Alliance." Great Britain refused to be a party to this declaration. A second time Castlereagh reiterated his objection to the attempt "to reduce to an abstract rule of conduct possible cases of interference in the internal affairs of independent States." The arguments he employed in a skilful analysis of the situation were irrefutable. The Protocol would be interpreted as a league of sovereigns against their subjects and so hasten the advent of the very revolutionary crisis it was intended to hold in check. Moreover, "would the Great Powers of Europe be prepared to admit the principle that their territories were to be thrown open to each other's approach upon cases of assumed necessity or expediency, of which not the party receiving aid, but the party administering it, was to be the judge?" 1 An English minister who dared to endorse the application of this principle to Great Britain would lay himself open to impeachment; and it was equally out of question to sanction its application to other States as part of the public law of Europe. The French Revolution was exceptional "from its overbearing and conquering character"; it did not justify intervention in all cases of revolution. In short, the British Government expressly dissociated itself from "the moral responsibility" of a police-system which would inevitably "lead to the creation of a species of general government in Europe, with a superintending Directory, destructive of all correct notions of internal sovereign authority"

1 See Camb. Mod. Hist. x. 28 seq., and Phillips, op. cit. 222 seq.
The fourth and final Congress was held at Verona in 1822. It dealt almost exclusively with the Spanish Question. As the result of a revolution in 1820, the King of Spain, Ferdinand VII., had been forced to abolish the Inquisition and proclaim a Constitution; but from the first he acted with duplicity, invoking foreign help against his own subjects. His solicitations met with a favourable response from the Ultra-Royalists, who were pursuing under the influence of Chateaubriand a policy of glory and were eager to espouse the cause of the Bourbon King.¹ At the Congress of Verona, France announced her intention to intervene in Spain to restore the absolute monarchy, and claimed the moral support of the Allied Powers. Austria, Russia and Prussia replied, as Wellington, the British plenipotentiary, informed the home Government, that they would give France every countenance and assistance she should require. Great Britain, on the other hand, remained obdurate, adhering steadfastly to the doctrine of non-intervention. The instructions of Wellington insisted upon “a rigid abstinence from any interference in the internal affairs” of Spain. The result was therefore a definite breach with the continental Powers, and when a French army crossed the Spanish frontier the collapse of the European system was rendered complete and undisguised. Canning, who had succeeded Castlereagh as Foreign Secretary on the eve of the Congress of Verona, felt no misgivings at this failure of the European Concert. He did not conceal his gratification that “the issue of Verona [had] split the one and indivisible Alliance into three parts as distinct as the Constitutions of England, France and Muscovy.” ² “Things are getting back to a wholesome state again,” he wrote. “Every nation for itself, and God for us all. The time for Areopagus, and the like of that, is gone by.”

The attempt to establish a Federated Europe was thus shipwrecked upon the rock of conflicting national aspirations. It was impossible to reconcile the divergent views of Great Britain on the one hand, and those of the continental Powers on the other. The key to British policy was the principle

¹ Supra, p. 10. ² Stapleton, Canning and his Times, 369.
of non-intervention in the affairs of sovereign and independent States. To this principle Castlereagh and Canning consistently adhered, though the former was anxious to avoid an open rupture with the Allied Courts. His successor, however, had no such scruples; and Metternich looked upon him, therefore, as a "malevolent meteor hurled by an angry Providence upon Europe." ¹ Canning's letter to the British ambassador at Vienna in 1823 expressed in unequivocal language the course of action which the English Government from the first had steadfastly pursued. "England is under no obligation to interfere, or to assist in interfering, in the internal concerns of independent nations. The specific engagement to interfere in France is an exception so studiously particularized as to prove the rule. The rule I take to be, that our engagements have reference wholly to the state of territorial possession settled at the Peace; to the state of affairs between nation and nation; not (with the single exception above stated) to the affairs of any nation within itself." He added: "What is the influence we have had in the councils of the Alliance? We protested at Laibach, we remonstrated at Verona. Our protest was treated as waste-paper; our remonstrances mingled with the air. Our influence, if it is to be maintained abroad, must be secure in the sources of strength at home; and the sources of that strength are in the sympathy between the people and the Government; in the union of the public sentiment with the public counsels; in the reciprocal confidence and co-operation of the House of Commons and the Crown." ² The justification of England's attitude lay in the fact that, while the Alliance had been formed with the definite purpose of safeguarding the new order in Europe from the peril of a revolutionary France, the autocratic Powers sought to convert it into a bulwark of conservatism, a barrier against all progressive movements.

¹ Canning's opinion of Metternich was equally uncomplimentary. In 1825 he wrote to Lord Granville: "You ask me what you shall say to Metternich. In the first place you shall hear what I think of him—that he is the greatest r—— and I—— on the Continent, perhaps in the civilized world": Stapleton, Canning and his Times, 427.
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In asserting the rights of nationality Great Britain helped to liberate a mighty force of whose potentiality she was at the time supremely unconscious. Her policy was opportunist, caring solely for what seemed practical and expedient, and eschewing principles which were abstract and theoretical. She rendered no active assistance to the great national movements which shattered the territorial system established by the Vienna Congress in 1815 and remoulded the map of Europe. Yet her defection from the Concert of Europe gave the death-blow to a political system which would have strangled at its birth, or postponed indefinitely, the growth of a national spirit. Almost inevitably, however, British policy involved itself in contradictions which to all appearance were unavoidable. "Our business," declared Canning, "is to preserve the peace of the world"; and, as the means to this, he proclaimed the need of safeguarding the independence of the nations. He could not foretell that the result of the awakening of nationalities would be not only to adjourn the blessings of universal peace, but ultimately to provoke the greatest conflagration the world has yet witnessed. Still, while the dream of a Confederated Europe was finally dissipated after the Congress of Verona, and the effort to govern Europe through a council of the Great Powers was not repeated, the traditions of concerted action in international affairs continued to survive. Europe was henceforth divided into two camps; on the one side the three Eastern Powers, welded together in an alliance avowedly intended to stamp out all revolutionary movements; and on the other side the two Western Powers, the champions of nationality and constitutional principles of government. But, in spite of this division, Europe still remained, as Kaunitz had described it, a family of nations, and its members had too many interests in common for each to plough a lonely furrow. Hence, from time to time, the European Concert reappeared throughout the course of the nineteenth century; and the Great Powers, drawn together in a temporary union by the needs of the moment, imposed their will upon the whole of Europe. Three main problems furnished material for common action: (1) the Eastern
THE EUROPEAN CONCERT

Question, with which we have already dealt; (2) the establishment of the Kingdom of Belgium; and (3) the Polish Question.

The union of Belgium and Holland was part of the territorial settlement of 1815. For over two centuries these countries had remained separate from one another. When the Dutch people renounced their allegiance to Philip II., they severed their connexion with their southern neighbours, who continued under the rule of Spain, until they were annexed first by Austria, and then by France during the French Revolution. The collapse of the Napoleonic Empire liberated Belgium from French control, but the Allies treated it as conquered territory to be disposed of as best they pleased. Austria refused to burden herself again with an outlying province so much exposed to French aggression, and sought compensation in North Italy. Castlereagh, therefore, proposed that Belgium should be incorporated with the Kingdom of the Netherlands under the sovereignty of the House of Orange. "The establishment of a just equilibrium in Europe," it was explained, "demanded that Holland be constituted so as to be in a position to maintain its independence by its own resources." What this meant was that a new State must be established on the north-eastern frontier of France strong enough to hold in check a French attack. The celebrated Eight Articles laid down the conditions of the Union. Among other provisions, the two countries were to 'amalgamate' as one State; religious equality was guaranteed as well as complete reciprocity of commercial rights and constitutional privileges; and the public debts of both provinces were made a common charge on the State treasury. So far as the union of two distinct entities can be cemented by diplomacy, nothing was left undone to weld the Low Countries into a consolidated State. It is also fair to remark that the Union had greater prospects of success than historians are wont to recognize. Admittedly,

1 "We wished to remove our country from direct contact with France, and thus put an end to the wars which had been in consequence of this contact perpetually occurring between the two neighbouring Empires"; Metternich, Memoirs, i. 264.
it was a defiance of the principle of nationality; it linked together two different races, two different religions, two different languages, perhaps most important of all, two different sets of traditions. There was, however, another side to the picture. The union of the two countries threw open to the Belgians the free navigation of the Scheldt, and gave them access to the Dutch colonial possessions. As a result, "Belgium made great advances in material prosperity. The means of communication by road and canal were greatly improved. The mineral resources of the country were developed. Flourishing iron, wool, and cotton manufactures were established. Liége, Ghent, Verviers and other places became thriving industrial centres; and, owing to the extensive colonial and foreign markets thrown open by the Dutch connexion, the volume of Belgian trade kept growing year by year. The southern provinces had thus from the material point of view every reason to be satisfied with the results of the Union; and there can be but little doubt that, by the exercise of wise and conciliatory statesmanship, the friction which was certain to attend the compulsory fusion of two peoples might have been greatly diminished, so that in process of time Belgian and Hollander might have been taught to recognize that the political and commercial advantages of Union were worth the sacrifices and the concessions required from each for the common good. But this was not to be."  

A variety of causes combined to bring about the Revolution of 1830. Holland, with a population of two millions, and Belgium, with a population nearly twice the size, were represented in the States-General by an equal number of deputies. The political inferiority of the Belgians was brought home to them by the fact that Belgian deputies who held office under the Government voted with the Dutch, thus giving Holland a majority in the Chamber. Administrative inequality between the two countries was even more marked. The heads of public departments, the civil service, the diplomatic profession, the higher military commands, were recruited in the main from the Dutch people. This

unwise discrimination between Belgian and Hollander, which was as impolitic as it was unjust, furnished legitimate ground for complaint; but the opposition raised by the extreme Catholic party to the principle of religious equality was less commendable. The thorny problem of language, as was inevitable, also provoked acute dissensions. The Belgians are divided into Flemings (Flanders and Brabant) and Walloons (Hainault, Namur, and Liège). The former comprise two-thirds of the population, and their language is almost Dutch; the speech of the latter, on the other hand, resembles French. The Dutch language had, therefore, the prior claim to become ultimately the national tongue of the new Netherland State; but the attempt to make it by compulsion the official language of Belgium added fuel to the racial conflict. The arbitrary treatment of the press widened still further the breach between the northern and southern provinces. The right of free discussion was expressly guaranteed by an article of the Constitution, but in practice it received scanty recognition, and heavy penalties were inflicted upon those who ventured to attack the Government’s policy. This conduct, so far from silencing hostile criticism of the administration, sharpened its shafts, and an incessant agitation was carried on by Belgian writers. But no action of the Government excited deeper resentment than its financial policy. Holland had contracted an immense national debt, and the Belgian people were compelled to share half the burden. This seemed indefensible enough in the eyes of the Belgians, and the situation was not improved by the nature of the new taxes levied to meet the national deficit. One was a tax on flour, that is, on bread; the other on meat; in other words, the taxes affected the two primary necessaries of life. Nothing more oppressive and injudicious could have been devised. The taxes came home to every class of the community, more especially the poor, and they served to inflame the minds of the whole nation against the supremacy of the Dutch.

Under the influence of these various factors Belgian public opinion gradually crystallized in a form definitely antagonistic to Holland. The cleavage between north and
south steadily deepened. The two political parties of Belgium, the Clericals and the Liberals, were fused together for the moment in a national party, and minor differences were sunk in the face of the common peril. The Belgians were still loyal at heart to the Union, for the economic benefits derived from the Dutch connexion had contributed materially to the industrial development of Belgium. Their programme was, therefore, not the dissolution of the Union, but administrative autonomy. A vigorous agitation sprang up everywhere, and the public unrest was voiced in the multitude of petitions presented to the States-General. Unfortunately King William, while endowed with many excellent qualities, had an obstinate and unyielding disposition. Conscious of good intentions, and actuated by a real desire to promote the welfare of his subjects, he was not inclined to give way to the unreasoning clamour, as he thought it, of a few unruly agitators. In these circumstances the news of the French Revolution (July 1830) found the Belgians in a mood ripe for revolt. The performance of an opera at Brussels on the night of August 25 gave the signal for insurrection. The theme of the opera was the Neapolitan struggle for independence, and the crowded audience was completely swept off its feet by a wave of revolutionary passion. Without premeditation a riot ensued and rapidly assumed the proportions of a revolution. The army under the Prince of Orange was repulsed in an attempt to enter Brussels, which had been barricaded by its inhabitants, and the moral effects of this defeat were momentous. The insurrection spread like lightning over the whole country, and a provisional Government forthwith proclaimed the independence of the Belgian State. A National Congress was held on November 10, and the task of drawing up a Constitution was immediately taken in hand.

The Powers, hitherto passive spectators, now began to bestir themselves. King William appealed to them to restore a Union established at their own instance and guaranteed by their own solemn declarations. Ten years earlier the appeal would have met with a ready response; but the international situation was no longer what it had
been in 1820. The European Confederation was now completely shattered, and Europe stood arrayed in two opposing camps. The reactionary Powers would gladly have intervened on behalf of the King of Holland to crush the Revolution; but the hands of Russia and Austria were tied by the outbreak of the Polish insurrection, and Prussia was too weak to cope single-handed with France and England. The Western Powers were thus left in possession of the field, and their sympathies were on the side of Belgium. Louis Philippe knew that it would be impossible for him to retain possession of his throne if, in defiance of French public opinion, he allowed Prussia to suppress the new Belgian State; he therefore announced his intention to resist by force of arms the coercion of Belgium. In this resolute policy he was supported by the anxiety of the British Government to avert a European war, which was recognized as inevitable if France and Prussia came into collision over the Belgian Question. A Conference of the Powers was held in London; and, as the outcome of its deliberations, the union of Holland and Belgium was dissolved, Luxemburg was restored to the House of Orange, and about half the national debt was assigned to Belgium. This settlement, called the Protocols of January, was accepted by King William, but bitterly repudiated by the Belgian National Congress. The controversy raged more particularly over the disposal of the grand duchy of Luxemburg. The duchy had been assigned to the House of Orange in 1815, in return for the sacrifice to Prussia of its ancestral territories. But Luxemburg had sent representatives to the National Congress, and the Belgians were loth to surrender their hold over it. Not only did the Belgian Assembly reject the conditions imposed upon it by the European chancelleries, but—in express defiance of their determination to exclude a French prince from the Belgian throne—it offered the crown to the Duke of Nemours, second son of the French King. It was an unpardonable offence in the eyes of the French people that Louis Philippe declined for his son the proffered dignity. He was well aware that Europe would not allow a French dynasty to rule in Belgium, and he wisely
shrank from a war which could only have one issue. Eventually a candidate acceptable to the Powers was discovered in Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg, who became King of the Belgians in July 1831.

To conciliate his new subjects, Leopold prevailed upon the Powers to modify the terms of settlement embodied in the Protocols of January. The new conditions, known as the Eighteen Articles, made valuable concessions in favour of Belgium. Luxemburg remained in Belgian possession; and, instead of an equal division of the national debt, Holland was required to discharge the liabilities she had contracted prior to the Union. This revision of the Protocols, which had been pronounced fundamental and irrevocable, gave King William a pretext for disavowing the whole settlement. He saw clearly that he would gain nothing by passive acquiescence in the decisions of the Powers, and he was burning to wipe out the stain of former reverses. At the head of 36,000 men the Prince of Orange marched into Belgium. The Belgian army, as yet almost completely unorganized, was compelled to fall back before the invaders; and Leopold’s tenure of power seemed likely to be short-lived. The advance of the invaders was checked, however, by French intervention, and the Dutch, having successfully asserted the superiority of their arms, withdrew from Belgian soil. Belgium now paid the price of defeat. The Eighteen Articles were superseded by a fresh settlement (the Twenty-Four Articles), which gave to Holland as compensation Limburg and all but the Walloon, or western, portion of Luxemburg. William, who had set his heart upon regaining possession of the whole of Luxemburg, which he considered his rightful territory, persisted in his demand for better terms. There was, therefore, no alternative but to employ coercion. A French force captured Antwerp, hitherto occupied by a Dutch garrison, and the fleets of England and France blockaded the Dutch coast. Holland submitted to pressure, and suspended hostilities with the southern kingdom (1833). But the Dutch King still refused to acknowledge the independence of Belgium; and the situation was really left unchanged, for Luxemburg and
Limburg remained in Belgian hands. This condition of affairs lasted for five years, when William suddenly announced his acceptance of the Twenty-Four Articles, and demanded possession of Luxemburg and Limburg. Belgium deeply resented the enforced sacrifice, but the Powers were resolved to settle the Belgian Question once and for all, and they supported the claims of the Dutch Government. In return Holland recognized the independence of Belgium, and so the way was paved for friendly relations between the Northern and Southern Netherlands. In this manner a new sovereign State was added to the state-system of Europe, and its neutrality was placed under the solemn guarantee of the five Great Powers.¹

We have seen how the dormant sense of nationality was awakened in the Belgian people by the pressure of alien rule. The Poles were also one of the submerged nationalities of the nineteenth century, but the resurrection of Poland was delayed until the present century. In 1914 the Polish people numbered some 20 millions, of whom 5 millions were ruled by Austria, 3½ millions by Germany, and the rest by Russia. We may glance at their condition at that date in (1) Austrian Poland, (2) Prussian Poland, and (3) Russian Poland, before we turn to trace the history of the ill-starred Polish insurrections.

(1) Nowhere in Eastern Europe was the position of the Poles so favourable as in Galicia. At the time of the Ausgleich (1867), the Austrian Poles were granted a Constitution which made them to all intents and purposes autonomous. Their language was the official language of the country, and their Diet enjoyed a full measure of political power. This generous policy converted the Austrian Poles into contented subjects of the Habsburg monarchy. It was in striking contrast with the ill-considered policy which sought to repress Polish nationality in Russia and Prussia. The population of Galicia, however, was not exclusively Polish—only 53 per cent. in fact were Poles, and

¹ Luxemburg was neutralized by the Great Powers in 1867.
² Supra, p. 155.
43 per cent. were Ruthenians. The former constituted the majority in Western Galicia, which contained the important town of Cracow; the latter, chiefly peasants, formed the majority in Eastern Galicia (Ruthenia), which included Lemberg. This ethnological division of Galicia foreshadowed yet another racial problem. In 1914 there were no less than four million Ruthenians, and the spread of education was said to be gradually awakening in them a feeling of national self-consciousness.\(^1\) Austria, which subsisted largely by playing off her polyglot races one against the other, recognized the Ruthenian tongue as an official language even in schools, and also conceded the establishment of a Ruthenian University. The development of national feeling among the Ruthenians was stimulated by the fact that in language, race and religion they were akin to the Little Russians, dwelling immediately across the Russian frontier. The two halves of the Ruthenian race, Ruthenia and Little Russia, were beginning to hold out hands to each other across the barrier which separated them; and a common name, Ukraine, was coming into vogue. For the moment, the Ruthenians fixed their hopes upon the acquisition of a Diet which would liberate them from the rule of their 'Polish masters.' But they also contemplated the day when the whole Ruthenian race, comprising thirty million people, would be gathered together under the aegis of an independent Ukraine State.

(2) Prussia for forty years down to 1914 pursued in the Eastern Marches a policy of compulsory nationalization. As the Magyars of Hungary endeavoured to Magyarize all the neighbouring races, so Prussia attempted to Germanize the Poles in the Eastern Marches, the Danes in North Schleswig, and the French in Alsace-Lorraine. This policy, which originated with Bismarck, was based on the erroneous idea that the best way to consolidate an empire is to establish a dead level of uniformity. "No consideration for the Polish people," wrote Prince von Bülow, "must hinder us from doing all we can to maintain and strengthen German nationality in the former Polish domains. . . . In the struggle between nationalities, one nation is the hammer

---

\(^1\) N. Hill, *Poland and the Polish Question* (1915), 186.
and the other is the anvil; one is the victor and the other the vanquished." In 1873 Bismarck ordered that German should be the only language used in schools, except for religious teaching. Thirteen years later began the system of expropriating Polish landowners and importing German colonists. The result was a profound disappointment for the German Government. "As an increase in the percentage of Germans," von Bilow has admitted, "was what Bismarck aimed at, our policy and in particular the work of colonization must be considered to have failed." In less than a quarter of a century (1886–1906) the Government had settled 90,000 Germans on Polish soil, but the Polish population had risen by 200,000. The value of land also went up owing to extensive purchases of property by the Government, and the native owners reaped the benefit. At the same time the Poles, in self-defence, formed co-operative associations and set up saving and lending banks. This not only reinforced their economic powers of resistance, but it gave a stimulus to their sense of nationality. Subsequently the policy of expropriation was carried a stage further. The Government discovered that only German proprietors were willing to part with their land, and the Expropriation Law of 1909 empowered it to compel Polish landowners to sell their estates. Finally, the Law of Associations (1908) dealt yet another blow at the Polish language; it ordered the exclusive employment of German at all public meetings other than those held during elections, except where more than 60 per cent. of the population were ignorant of German—even this concession was limited to a period of twenty years. Nevertheless, in spite of their stringency, these new provisions equally failed to achieve their end. "The Polish language," observed a German professor in 1914, "gains not only in the country districts, but in the towns as well, and even in the capital of Posen. The Polish middle class grows, while the German decreases." 1 These results of German policy in Prussian Poland expose the unwisdom of the view

1 E. Barker, The Submerged Nationalities of the German Empire (1915), 17.
that a State is strengthened by the compulsory assimilation of its various national elements.

(3) The condition of the Poles in Russia was very much the same as their condition in Germany; and they objected no less to the policy of Russification than to the policy of Germanization. This policy lay at the root of Polish unrest. Russian was the language of public business and Government schools and colleges, and the country was administered by Russian officials. On more than one occasion the Poles made a strenuous bid for independence, and their struggle for freedom occupies a striking chapter in the history of the nineteenth century.

The Polish problem had engaged the attention of the Vienna Congress in 1815. As a result of the three Partitions (1772–95), Russia had annexed three-fourths of Poland, and during the War of Liberation (1813–15) she also seized possession of the grand duchy of Warsaw, created by Napoleon out of the Polish territory originally assigned to Austria and Prussia. The Emperor Alexander was anxious to retain the duchy in his own hands, and undertook to restore the Kingdom of Poland under Russian suzerainty. Castlereagh feared the aggrandizement of Russia, and strenuously combated the Emperor's proposal. His policy has been severely criticized; but, whatever its errors, it was not conceived out of want of sympathy with Polish aspirations. "I represented," he wrote of an interview with Alexander, "that most certainly the British Government would view with great satisfaction the restoration of Poland to its independence as a nation, but that they took a broad distinction between the erection of a part of Poland into a kingdom merged in the Crown of Russia, and the restoration of the whole into a distinct and independent State. . . . If the question of restoring Poland was to be stirred at all . . . it ought to be taken up upon a broad and liberal basis." 1 From the point of view of Poland, however, this policy was a profound mistake. It was fundamentally wrong to undo the work of Napoleon and destroy once again

1 Castlereagh's official despatches are printed in Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, Third Series, vii. 70 seq.
the unity of the Polish nation. Moreover a homogeneous Polish State, even under the dominion of Russia, would have had a greater chance of holding its own against Russian bureaucratic oppression. Instead of this, the duchy of Warsaw was broken up, and Polish territory was once again incorporated with Austria and Prussia.

Disappointed in his hope of restoring the original Polish Kingdom, Alexander yet persevered in his intention to set up a Kingdom of Poland. The new Polish Constitution was not devoid of grave defects, but in some respects it was in advance of other European Constitutions. The Crown was vested in the Emperor of Russia. The legislature consisted of two houses, a Senate and a Chamber of Deputies, the former composed of Imperial nominees, the latter containing representatives of the nobility and deputies elected under a franchise more liberal than the French. The Polish language became the official language, and civil and military appointments were confined to Polish citizens. Poland was thus erected into an autonomous State, and the nationality of the Polish people was fully recognized. The experiment, however, was a disastrous failure, though there is a conflict of opinion as to the reason. One historian ascribes its want of success to the Poles themselves "It had been always...

the fatal weakness of the Polish national movement that it was directed in the interests of a dominant caste rather than of a whole people. . . . Clearly, had the Poles cared more for the good of their country than the privileges of their caste, they could have used the tolerable liberties conceded to them to weld together . . . a national force strong enough, if occasion should arise, to assert itself against the domination of the foreigner. But instead of trying to make the best of a not very bad bargain, the Diet proved by its attitude of indiscriminate obstruction that an organized conspiracy existed to make Russian rule impossible. The Tsar soon grew discouraged, and . . . began to take precautionary measures." 1 A Polish historian, 2

1 Phillips, Modern Europe, 203.
on the other hand, exonerates the Poles from blame. "The worst misfortunes which fell upon this country . . . were all due to the intervention" of Novosiltsoff, the 'evil spirit' of Poland, who poisoned Alexander's mind against the new State. One source of the trouble between Russia and the Poles was the extravagant hopes—more particularly the promise to concede the Lithuanian provinces, which had formed part of the original Polish Kingdom—which 'the coxcomb Tsar,' as Byron called him, raised without satisfying.

"The coxcomb Tsar,
The autocrat of waltzes and of war!
Now half dissolving to a liberal thaw,
But hardened back whene'er the morning's raw;
With no objection to true liberty,
Except that it would make the nations free.
How nobly gave he back to Poles their Diet,
Then told pugnacious Poland to be quiet."

Whatever the explanation, whether it was the intractable disposition of the Poles, or Alexander's conversion from Liberalism to the creed of Metternich, the liberties of Poland were gradually curtailed and resulted in a growing estrangement between the two countries. The first breach in the Constitution was the establishment of a censorship of newspapers and books (1819). The next step was to suspend the Diet for a period of five years (1820–25) in punishment for its outspoken criticism of the Government. Even in Alexander's lifetime the Polish Charter of Liberties appeared likely to be short-lived, and the probability developed into a certainty after the accession of Nicholas I., the inflexible opponent of all free institutions. Secret societies sprang up, and a military insurrection was on the point of breaking out as early as 1828, during the Russo-Turkish War, when the unexpected difficulties of the campaign were severely taxing Russia's resources. Two years later followed the French Revolution, and its effect upon the Poles was profound. The discovery that Nicholas intended to employ the army of Poland in a war against France decided the Polish con-
spirators to take instant action, for in the absence of the Polish army any attempt at insurrection was bound to meet with disaster. On the night of November 29, 1830, a rising took place in the capital. The movement was badly organized and could have been suppressed with the greatest ease, but the Viceroy, the Grand Duke Constantine, was seized with panic and fled from the city. Warsaw was left in the hands of the insurgents, and the revolution rapidly became general throughout Poland. A provisional Government was set up under the dictatorship of General Chlopicki, a Napoleonic veteran, who showed himself thoroughly unequal to the demands of the situation. He entered into long and fruitless negotiations with Nicholas, during which he lost an admirable opportunity for organizing the insurrection on a really effective basis. The Russian army was unprepared, and a vigorous offensive in Lithuania would not only have furnished a valuable recruiting-ground, but might have changed the fate of the whole campaign. The revolution, however, was ill-managed from the start. Its leaders were incompetent, irresolute, and divided among themselves. Meanwhile, Nicholas was pushing on his own preparations with the utmost energy, and at the beginning of February the Russian commander, Diebitsch, crossed the Polish frontier. Even yet the situation might have been retrieved, but the vacillation and dilatory tactics of the Polish generals threw away every possible chance of success. In September the Russians entered Warsaw, and a few weeks later the revolution had been stamped out in every part of the kingdom.

The Poles had relied upon the prospects of European intervention, but their hopes were doomed to disappointment. Prussia was unreservedly hostile. "Saved, if ever country was, by the voluntary impulse of the people, why is it that the Government of Prussia," asked Canning in 1825, "is of all Governments the most ostentatiously anti-popular in its politics?" ¹ Austria's attitude was equivocal. Her anxiety to weaken Russia was neutralized by the fear of a Polish rising within her own borders, and, after toying

¹ Stapleton, George Canning and his Times, 465.
1831-55

with the idea of accepting the Crown of Poland for an Austrian archduke, she finally allowed the war to take its own course. In England and France public opinion was loud in support of the Poles, but Louis Philippe was not disposed to risk his throne in a quixotic crusade against the vast autocratic power of Russia, and the English Government adhered steadfastly to its policy of non-intervention. After the revolution had been suppressed, Palmerston remonstrated with the Russian Government against the extinction of the Polish Kingdom as a flagrant violation of the public guarantees of 1815. Nicholas, flushed by his victory over the Poles, turned a deaf ear to England's protest, and ruthlessly set to work to obliterate every vestige of Polish independence. Poland, deprived of a separate national existence, was henceforth merged in the Russian Empire. Her free institutions were abolished; the administration was flooded with Russian officials; the Russian tongue was erected into the official language of the country; and the army was incorporated with the Russian imperial forces.

The policy of Russification was carried on with relentless vigour for a quarter of a century. With the accession of Alexander II., however, the dawn of a new era seemed at hand. The oppressive rigour of the Government was immediately relaxed; the exiles of 1831 were recalled from banishment; and the national movement, which had received a powerful stimulus from the Crimean War, once more reared its head. The Poles were divided into two sections, the 'Reds' and the 'Whites.' The former—the Polish Revolutionary party—felt for Russia the deepest hatred, for in their eyes she was the cause of all the woes of Poland. The latter—the Conservative party—were willing to effect a reconciliation with Russia on the basis of the Constitution of 1815. Outside these parties, there was a handful of politicians whose programme was more modest in its aspirations, but at the same time infinitely more practical. Their representative was the Marquis Vielopolski, whose influence prevailed with Alexander II. to adopt a policy of conciliation. Vielopolski was appointed head of the civil administration,
while the Grand Duke Constantine, the Emperor's brother, who had strong Liberal sympathies and was well disposed towards Poland, was created Viceroy. Various concessions were made in deference to Polish national pride, but the Poles were irreconcilable. Their disaffection had been recently increased by the suppression of the Polish Society of Agriculture, founded to ameliorate the condition of the Polish serfs, and also by the provocation of the Cossacks who had fired upon unoffending demonstrations. Vielopolski's well-meant efforts at pacification were, therefore, powerless to soften the obduracy of his countrymen. The 'Reds' replied to his overtures by repeated attempts upon his life, and upon that of Constantine. The 'Whites' would accept nothing less than the Constitution of 1815, and refused to support the Government on any other terms. Vielopolski was moved to an indignant outburst: "I neither ask for nor desire assistance from you or from any one else," he told a 'White' deputation. "It is possible to do some good for the Poles sometimes, but through them never." In spite of brave words, however, the consciousness of failure was forced upon him, and the discovery that the revolutionary leaders were secretly weaving the nets of a conspiracy over the length and breadth of Poland drove him to a fatal step. To forestall a revolt, he attempted to seize as conscripts for the Russian army all who were suspected of complicity in political agitation. The majority made good their escape to the forests, where they organized themselves in bands. A few days later (January 21, 1863), the Revolutionary party gave the signal for insurrection and appointed a dictator. The struggle which ensued was remarkable even in the history of Poland. The prospects of success were infinitesimal. In 1830 the Poles had control of the army and the Government. In 1863 they had neither one nor the other; they were even without arms. Yet in the face of overwhelming odds they kept up a guerilla warfare for the space of several months, and their heroic resistance was only finally extinguished in March 1864. Once again the Poles displayed their inveterate national qualities, their bravery, their tenacity, their intractability.
The movement was directed by a secret committee of five members, whose identity was hidden even from the very instruments which executed their commands. This secret Government wielded throughout Poland an authority more universally obeyed than the imperial Government itself, backed though it was by a victorious army.

The international situation in 1863 was hardly more favourable than in 1830. The attitude of the Powers towards the Polish Question remained unchanged. Prussia, under the guidance of Bismarck, promptly seized the occasion to conclude a convention with Russia, which secured the western frontier against attack; a second time she revealed herself the relentless enemy of Polish ambitions. Austria, willing to wound yet afraid to strike, oscillated between a policy of intervention and a policy of severe detachment. In England the Poles were always assured of popular sympathy. In France the Clericals and Liberals united in support of an insurrection, commended to the former as a Catholic revolt against religious persecution, and to the latter as a national revolt. Napoleon and the English Government therefore made a half-hearted attempt to intervene on the strength of the Treaty of Vienna (1815); but, as they were not prepared to enforce their protests by an appeal to arms, the negotiations were fruitless. The Poles were left to fight single-handed against a great military empire, and the outcome of so hopeless a struggle was from the first a foregone conclusion.

Under the inspiration of Nicholas Miliutin, one of the principal authors of the Edict of Emancipation, Russia now embarked upon a new policy. Every insurrection in Poland had been the work of the nobles, who were unable to reconcile themselves to the loss of the turbulent independence they had once enjoyed. The country was still in the grip of the feudal system, and the nobles, who owned all the land, had the right to exact compulsory labour from their serfs. With the prestige and economic independence of a large landowner, the Polish noble also combined various political functions. He administered police and justice on his
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1 Supra, p. 71.  
2 Supra, p. 93.
own estate, for the control of Russian officials did not extend into rural districts; and in addition he wielded the vast influence of the Catholic Church, which was in deadly enmity with the Russian Orthodox Church. The hatred of the serfs for their masters had wrecked every Polish movement, and Miliutin's project was to deepen the cleavage in Polish society in order to make the feud irreconcilable. The law of 1864 accomplished for Poland what the Edict of Emancipation had accomplished for Russia. It elevated the serf into a free peasant proprietor owning the land he occupied, and relieved him of all obligation to work upon the lord's estate. It left him, moreover, with an undefined right of access to the noble's forest-land and pastures, with a view to perpetuating friction in the rural communities. At the same time a system of village communes was established to support the newly acquired independence of the peasant against pressure from without. The authority of the Polish aristocracy was thus completely undermined, and a new force was raised up to serve as the buttress of Russian power in Poland. A serious blow was also dealt at the Catholic Church, most of its monasteries being dissolved and their land confiscated. In this way it was hoped to destroy the two irreconcilable enemies of Russia, the aristocracy and Catholicism.

This social revolution was succeeded by an industrial revolution. The commerce of Poland grew by leaps and bounds. The population of the large towns increased enormously, and immense factories sprang into existence. The vitality of the Polish national spirit, however, was still undiminished. The repression of the Polish language, the exclusion of Poles from the administration, in short, the whole policy of Russification and bureaucratic oppression, proved a signal failure. At the opening of 1914 the prospects of an autonomous Polish State appeared wildly remote. But time brings its revenges. Upon the outbreak of war the Russian Government pledged itself to the restoration of Poland. The proclamation, which enshrined its promise to the Polish people, may serve as a fitting close to this chapter.
Poles! The hour has struck in which the sacred dream of your fathers and forefathers may find fulfilment.

A century and a half ago the living flesh of Poland was torn asunder, but her soul did not die. . . .

May the boundaries be annihilated which cut the Polish nation into parts! May that nation reunite into one body under the sceptre of the Russian Emperor! Under this sceptre Poland shall be reborn, free in faith, in language, in self-government.

One thing only Russia expects of you: equal consideration for the rights of the nationalities to which history has linked you.
CHAPTER VIII

THE NEW ERA
(1871-1914)

In the history of Western Europe the year 1870 marks the end of the great formative movements which created the German Empire, the Kingdom of Italy, the Third Republic, and the Dual Monarchy. The next four decades were barren of political achievements, and the confused panorama of events makes it difficult to give a coherent and intelligible account of their developments. An era of consolidation necessarily lacks the dramatic qualities which stir the imagination and hold the attention of observers; and the parliamentary annals of the different European States were devoid of general interest. In the present chapter we shall deal only with certain aspects of these four decades which possess special importance for European history, namely, the foundation of the French Republic, the consolidation of the German Empire, the formation of the Triple and Dual Alliances, the Eastern Question, and the Weltpolitik of Germany.

The foundation of the French Republic in 1870 was the result of the Franco-Prussian War. Condemned on the ground that he was "responsible for the ruin, invasion, and dismemberment of the country," Napoleon III. paid the penalty, in the overthrow of his dynasty, for the crowning disaster which he had brought upon France. Although the Emperor maintained the fiction that his empire rested on the will of the people, its real support had always been the army, and the destruction of the imperial forces therefore exposed it to all the hazards of revolution. In their hour
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of need the French people recalled how they had been saved from invasion in 1792 by a republican form of government, and they reverted to the traditions of the Revolution in the hope that history would repeat itself.

It is important to observe that the Republic of 1870, unlike the Republic of 1848, was not imposed on the nation by the democracy of Paris; it was proclaimed in the provinces before the news was known of what had taken place at the capital. The Third Republic was thus erected on a broader basis than its predecessor, a fact which helps to account for its greater stability and longer life. After the fall of the Empire, a Government of National Defence assumed the task of driving the German army from the soil of France. "We will give up," said Jules Favre, Minister of Foreign Affairs, "neither an inch of our territory nor a stone of our fortresses." The conduct of the war was taken over by Léon Gambetta, who threw himself into the work of national reorganization with all the burning energy of his indomitable personality. But his gallant efforts proved unavailing to save the capital, and a National Assembly met at Bordeaux to determine the question of peace or war. Voicing the wishes of the nation, it accepted the heavy terms dictated by Germany in order to bring to an end a disastrous conflict. The moment peace was concluded, the old party feuds which had lacerated France for two generations again reappeared, and the country was given over to all the horrors of civil strife.

Throughout French history Paris has always been something more than the capital of France; as Freeman has pointed out, it was also the kernel round which France has grown. Hence, from the earliest times, Paris has been accustomed to impose its will upon the French people, and the French people have been accustomed to look to Paris for guidance and inspiration. This largely explains the disturbed course of French constitutional development from 1789 to 1871, for whoever made himself master of the capital was forthwith master of the provinces. The significance of the Paris Commune, whose fortunes we have now

1 Seignobos, Contemporary Europe, I. 187.
to trace, lies in the revelation which it afforded that France was no longer willing to accept dictation from her capital. In the struggle between the Parisian democracy and the National Assembly, the triumph of the latter gave the death-blow to the pretensions of a single town to dominate France. At the same time it afforded convincing proof that insurgent democracy has been rendered weaker against a well-organized State owing to the resources with which science has endowed modern Governments.

From the first moment of the outbreak of war Paris showed itself in a mood ripe for insurrection. The weakness of the central authorities, deprived of the forces upon which their power alone rested, relieved the city of the pressure which had kept in check for two decades the old revolutionary passions. Once this pressure was removed, it became evident to skilled observers that only the successful prosecution of the war could silence hostile criticism of the Administration. Instead of victory, however, disaster followed disaster with appalling rapidity; and the discontent of the Parisian population was fanned to fever heat. When the National Assembly ratified the terms of peace, the indignation of those who demanded war to the knife, knew no bounds; and the Revolutionary deputies at once resigned their seats in an "Assembly which had surrendered two provinces, dismembered France, and ruined the country." In the eyes of the extreme war-party the cession of Alsace-Lorraine was a betrayal of the country, while it was also believed that the Republic itself was in danger. Owing to causes which will be recounted later, the majority in the National Assembly was composed of monarchical elements, and it was naturally distrusted by the advanced Republicans. Nor did the Assembly itself exhibit the tact which might have conciliated opposition. It wounded the pride of the Parisians by holding its sessions at Versailles, and it exasperated them still further by its wanton disregard of their material interests. During the siege the payment of rent and other financial obligations had been suspended, and the Assembly refused to prolong the moratorium in spite of the economic dislocation still prevailing in the capital. It also
suppressed the pay of the National Guard, although this was the sole support of those whom the war had deprived of their ordinary occupation. The National Guard had been allowed to retain their arms after the entry of the Germans into Paris, and they made common cause with the insurgents. The starting-point of the insurrection was the attempt of the authorities to seize some cannon in the possession of the National Guard. The attempt failed, and the Government immediately retired to Versailles, leaving the city in the hands of their opponents (March 18).

Paris was now governed by two bodies: a 'General Council of the Commune,' elected by all the inhabitants of the capital, and a Central Committee representing the National Guard and serving as a link between the militia and the Council. Although the Communists adopted the old republican calendar, and the red flag, the symbol of the Socialist party, they seem to have had no social programme. Only a few members of the Council, in fact, were at all concerned with social reforms. On the other hand, the municipal programme of the Communists marked a great advance upon the principles of local government rooted in France for nearly three-quarters of a century. In 1791 the leaders of the French Revolution had established a system of almost complete decentralization, conferring extensive powers of self-government upon the local communes. But the Jacobins, in order to drive back the Prussian and Austrian armies from their soil, reverted to the traditions of the ancien régime, obliterating all vestiges of local autonomy and setting up a form of government more rigidly centralized than any France had yet known. This system of centralized administration was maintained and elaborated by Napoleon I., and it continued, with modifications in detail, throughout the nineteenth century. The Communists, discarding the fundamental principles of Jacobinism, now proclaimed that every town had the right to enjoy complete self-government. "What does Paris ask for?" they said in their Declaration to the French People. "The recognition and the establishment of the Republic, and that the absolute autonomy of the 'Commune' should prevail everywhere in France."
All Communes were to exercise "the rights inherent in the Commune: the right of voting the Communal budget; of fixing and apportioning the taxes; of controlling the local services; of organizing the magistracy, internal police, and education; of administering the Communal property; of choosing public officials by election or competition, with permanent right of dismissal; of organizing the National Guard, which should elect its own officers, and should be the sole guardian of order." These self-governing Communes were to be united in a Federation, whose delegates would constitute the central Executive. But the experiment of Communal Federalism was destined never to receive a trial. The army of the National Government, recruited largely from French prisoners whom the Germans had set free, laid siege to Paris and gradually penetrated into the city. Then followed what has been described as the fiercest civil war of the century—the so-called 'Bloody Week' (May 21-28). "Room for the people, for the bare-armed fighting men," ran one of the Communist proclamations. "The hour of the revolutionary war has struck. . . . After the barricades, our houses; after our houses, our ruins." A struggle of the most savage description ensued. The insurgents were massacred without even the pretence of trial; and at least 20,000 Parisians are said to have perished. In addition the councils of war, which sat for no less than five years, sentenced over 13,000 persons, of whom 7500 were transported to New Caledonia, while others were condemned to death or penal servitude. This was a flagrant violation of French usage, which distinguishes between common-law criminals and political rebels. The advanced Republican and Socialist party, exhausted by the terrible vengeance exacted by the conquerors, ceased to exist; its enemies exterminated it by the same methods of proscription employed with fatal effect in Rome during the last days of the Republic, and in France during the Reign of Terror.

It is rare that anything is said in favour of the Paris Commune.

*Vitrix causa deis placuit, sed victa Catoni.*
The Communist movement is generally looked upon as a suicidal act of madness, a piece of gross treason to France, the more discreditable since the country was in the hands of the enemy. Yet against the view that the "demagogues" of Paris saw in the misfortunes of their country nothing but "an excellent opportunity for establishing their own authority," 1 must be set the fact that the Communists were fighting, as they thought, to defend the Republic whose safety seemed endangered by the monarchist Assembly at Versailles. The root of the trouble lay in the profound mistrust which the Parisians entertained against the "men of Versailles." In its broadest aspect, however, the Paris Commune was the natural culmination of a series of unexampled commotions which had brought the capital to the brink of madness. It was the outcome of an explosion of popular fury unparalleled even in French history—an explosion due to the disasters of the war, the loss of territory, the long siege, and the triumphal march of the Germans through the city.

The interest of French internal politics during the next few years lies in the gradual consolidation of republican institutions. The struggle between those who favoured a republic, and those who upheld the cause of monarchy, was fought out in the parliamentary arena, and for a long time it was doubtful which party would prevail. The Assembly had been elected to make peace, and on this account the country districts voted for Royalists, except in those departments in the south-east which had been invaded by German armies. The impression was widespread that a republican Assembly would carry on war to the knife, and Royalists were therefore chosen, not on the strength of their political convictions, but as the opponents of the extreme war-party. In this way 400 Royalists found seats in an Assembly composed of 750 deputies, and there seemed every reason to suppose that France would once again revert to a monarchical form of government. But in French politics it is the unexpected that happens; and an Assembly whose sympathies were monarchical was destined to be the instrument
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which founded the Republic. Of this surprising event several explanations may be hazarded. The Assembly had been elected for the sole purpose of deciding peace or war, and it had received no mandate to frame a Constitution; it would therefore have been an act of madness, so long as France was occupied by the enemy, to provoke acute party dissensions by proclaiming the monarchy. At all costs it was necessary to preserve national unity in the face of the gravest national emergency conceivable. The Royalists enjoyed a majority in the Assembly, but they dared not bid defiance at this stage to the strong Republican minority. Moreover, the history of the restored Bourbon monarchy had taught the lesson that a dynasty which started on its career by ceding national territory was likely to be short-lived. It seemed more expedient, therefore, that the task of concluding peace should devolve upon the Republic rather than upon the new king, who would be fatally handicapped if the first act of his reign was the surrender of French provinces. On these various grounds the Assembly decided to postpone for a time "the decision of France as to the definite form which her Government should take"; and all parties agreed to a political truce—the Compact of Bordeaux—by which constitutional questions were left for a time in abeyance.

It was fortunate for France that she possessed in Thiers a statesman whose force of personality, signal capacity, and wise moderation, admirably qualified him to guide the helm of State in this unparalleled situation. He was now the most popular man of the hour as the result of his opposition to the war in 1870, although his attitude at the time had been deeply resented by the nation. At heart Thiers was an Orleanist, but he placed his country before party, and threw all his energies into the effort to establish "such a Government as would create the fewest divisions." Appointed 'Chief of the Executive,' he defined his task as one of "pacification, reorganization, the restoration of credit, and the revival of industry." How well he succeeded in this task is shown by the fact that the enormous indemnity exacted by Germany—two hundred million
pounds—was paid off in two years. In spite of this great achievement, which freed France from the occupation of German armies, and afforded the world a striking testimony of the recovery of French credit, Thiers was unable to maintain his position as Chief Magistrate. In proportion as the work of recuperation steadily advanced, the enemies of the Republic redoubled their efforts to bring about a Royalist restoration. But though they succeeded in overthowing Thiers in favour of Marshal MacMahon (1873), they found themselves no nearer their goal. Their impotence to effect the restitution of the monarchy was owing to the failure of the different monarchical groups to formulate a common programme. There were three claimants to the throne: the Comte de Chambord, the grandson of Charles X.; the Comte de Paris, the grandson of Louis Philippe; and the Prince Imperial, the son of Napoleon III. Yet, as Thiers reminded his opponents, there was only one throne and it could not have three occupants. This rivalry between the Legitimists, the Orleanists, and the Imperialists, ruined the cause of monarchy, and the throne remained vacant because the Royalists were divided in their allegiance. A 'fusion' of the two parties, the Legitimists and Orleanists, was nearly effected on the understanding that 'Henri V.' (Comte de Chambord), who was childless, should be succeeded by the Comte de Paris, but the uncompromising refusal of the Comte de Chambord to accept the tricolour flag, which he looked upon as the symbol of revolution, defeated the project. He was resolved to sacrifice the throne rather than surrender the white flag of the ancien régime, with its implied renunciation of the principles of divine right and uncontrolled sovereignty. A restoration of the monarchy in these circumstances was manifestly impossible, and the formal recognition of the Head of the Executive as President of the Republic (January 30, 1875) was a virtual adhesion on the part of the Assembly to the Republican ideal. A few years later (1883), it was expressly enacted that "the Republican form of government cannot be made the subject of a proposal for revision." Henceforth the Republic was placed outside the arena of political strife.
In its final shape the Republican Constitution was the work not of one party, but of all. It was essentially a compromise, in which were mirrored all the manifold phases of French historical development. It preserved the social organization bequeathed by the Revolution, and the centralized administrative institutions inherited from the Empire, while the actual distribution of political power represented a compromise between autocracy and popular sovereignty. This peculiar feature of the Republican Constitution doubtless accounted in a large measure for its stability. There is also another, and more important, explanation of the fact that at long last the French people were enabled to enjoy a continuous political life. Every revolution in France had been the work of Republicans. On the first three occasions their influence did not extend beyond Paris and the large towns, and the revolution was followed sooner or later by a Royalist reaction. On the fourth occasion (1870) the Republican ideal was found to have taken root in the nation at large, and only the accident which gave the monarchical parties a majority in the Bordeaux Assembly delayed the immediate proclamation of the Republic. Hence revolutions automatically ceased when the Republicans, the one party organized for this purpose, had finally accomplished their object.¹

For Germany, as for France, the war of 1870 marked the opening of a new epoch. The year which saw the foundation of the French Republic witnessed also the birth of the German Empire. We have described in a previous chapter the steps by which Bismarck achieved the unification of Germany and created a great military monarchy in Central Europe. But as yet the new State existed only in an embryonic form; it lacked a corporate political existence; and the task of endowing the Empire with the necessary legal and financial institutions was fated to absorb the energies of German statesmen for a generation to come. It was fortunate for the German people that the statesman who had been the architect of their Empire was enabled to

¹ Namely, 1792, 1830, and 1848. ² Cf. Seignobos, op. cit. l. 224.
preside over its destinies for no less than twenty years. We may condemn his methods, but we cannot deny the genius of the man who in the short space of eight years accomplished the federal union of Germany. Nor was any one more fitted than Bismarck to complete the work which he had so auspiciously begun. The prestige he had gained as the Maker of Germany was in itself an enormous asset in helping him to grapple successfully with the problems which confronted the infant State; and he brought to the task qualities of mind which enabled him to overcome the obstacles to unity and to counteract the forces of disruption. Moreover, no one knew better than Bismarck the real weaknesses of the structure which he had called into existence. He had to build up a German national State on federal foundations, and the obligation to conciliate the prejudices of the Southern States was the more insistent since Bavaria and Württemberg had only accepted the union with the greatest reluctance. It is impossible to say how much opposition Prussia actually encountered in her direction of German affairs, for the proceedings of the Bundesrath, in which the different Federal Governments were directly represented, were shrouded in secrecy; but it is unlikely that the relations between Prussia and the Southern States were invariably adjusted with ease.

Apart from the difficulty of overcoming the separatist tendencies of the individual States, and reconciling their claims with the needs and requirements of the supreme Federal Power, another obstacle to internal consolidation lay in the fact that the German Empire contained non-German elements. The 'submerged nationalities,' incorporated against their will in a political community with whose language and traditions they had nothing in common, were the Poles of the Eastern Marches, the Danes of North Schleswig, and the inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine. The Poles numbered 3½ millions, the Danes 150,000, and the inhabitants of Alsace-Lorraine 1,800,000; while the total population of Germany in the year 1914 was 65 millions. Of the condition of Prussian Poland we have already spoken,¹

¹ Supra, p. 236.
and the policy of compulsory assimilation pursued in the Eastern Marches was also attempted among the Danish inhabitants of North Schleswig. In the Treaty of Prague, Prussia had undertaken at the instance of Napoleon III. to restore the population of North Schleswig to Denmark, if a plebiscite of the inhabitants decided in favour of union with the northern kingdom. This article of the Treaty remained a dead letter; and, in spite of the lapse of half a century, the Danes had not become reconciled to their position. This was hardly inexplicable in view of the fact that Prussia sought to prohibit the Danish language and to expropriate Danish owners of the soil. The character of the treatment meted out to Alsace-Lorraine varied considerably. The population of Alsace is largely German, that of Lorraine is largely French; and it is commonly said that Bismarck—while determined to annex Alsace and Strassburg, 'the gate into Germany'—would have been willing to relinquish Lorraine and Metz, 'the gate into France,' but for the pressure brought to bear by the military party. However this may be, the Germans did not succeed in assimilating their acquisitions, and their policy alternated between conciliation and coercion.

The submerged nationalities, however, were too weak numerically to be a serious menace to the German Government, though they were undeniably a source of weakness. The real dangers which threatened the stability of the young State lay in other directions. It is noteworthy that both the German Empire and the Conservative Republic founded by Thiers were confronted by the same enemies, Clericalism and Socialism. The history of the struggle waged by Bismarck, first with the Roman Catholic Church, later with Social-Democracy, will best enable us to grasp the nature of the problems which attended the birth of the new political order.

The Roman Catholic Church enjoyed in Germany extensive powers. It was almost entirely free from the control of the State, and was allowed to administer its own affairs

1 Supra, p. 74.
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without interference. It also wielded considerable influence over the laity, which revealed itself in the creation of a political organization devoted to the interests of the Church, and known as the Centre. In the Reichstag of 1871 the Centre counted 58 seats, a number which was increased to nearly 100 three years later. This growth of clerical influence disquieted the Government, which found itself face to face with a serious parliamentary opposition, for the Centre soon developed the most uncompromising hostility to Bismarck's policy. It included in its ranks the Grossdeutschen—the party of Greater Germany—who wished to incorporate in the German Empire all German elements, that is, the eight million Germans in Austria now irrevocably severed from their kinsfolk. They were unreconciled to the displacement of a Catholic by a Protestant House as the ruling dynasty in Germany; and, as the Catholics were now in a minority in the Empire, the instinct of self-preservation impressed upon them the need for firm political discipline. One plank in the platform of the clerical party was the restoration of the temporal power of the Pope, a proposal which endangered the friendly relations established by Bismarck with the Italian kingdom. The Centre also allied itself with the parties of national, or dynastic, 'protest.' It supported the demand of the Catholics of Posen (Prussian Poland) that the Polish language should be taught in elementary schools; and it countenanced the Guelphic nobility of Hanover, who deeply resented the expulsion of the 'legitimist' king, and the 'usurpation' of the Hohenzollern line. Bismarck, therefore, resolved to break up a party whose policy seemed inimical to the best interests of the Empire.

To destroy the Centre it was necessary to strike at the hierarchy from which its existence was derived. If the Roman Catholic Church were reduced to complete dependence upon the State, its political power would be automatically extinguished. In these circumstances a struggle between Church and State lay in the nature of things, and the exact direction given to the conflict was perhaps more the result of accident than of conscious policy. The dogma of
Papal Infallibility, decreed by the Council of the Vatican in 1870, flung an apple of discord into the midst of German Catholics. Many Catholic professors and teachers protested against the doctrine, and refused to teach it in the Universities and schools. Between the 'Old Catholics'—as these dissidents were termed—and the Roman hierarchy strife was soon provoked; and, as the controversy grew ever more embittered, it became impossible for the Government to remain a passive spectator. In this way began the Kulturkampf, the struggle for civilization, as it was called, against clerical reaction. In order to force their opponents to their knees the Roman Catholic bishops sought to expel them from the theological faculties of the Universities and from the schools under their control; they also punished the Old Catholics with excommunication and with the refusal to perform the marriage ceremony for them. Bismarck interpreted these measures as a challenge to the supremacy of the State, and the narrower issues involved in the conflict became merged in the wider problem of the relations of Church and State. His failure to negotiate a settlement with Rome evoked from the Chancellor the famous utterance: "To Canossa we shall not go, either in the flesh or in the spirit."

1 He severed diplomatic relations with the Vatican (1872); wrested the control of education out of ecclesiastical hands by appointing lay inspectors of schools; and made civil marriage compulsory throughout the Empire (1874). At the same time he carried through the famous 'May Laws' (1873–75) which were intended to curtail the authority of the clergy and bring the Roman Catholic Church into complete subjection to the State. It forbade Catholic priests to coerce individuals by public excommunication; it required candidates for the ministry to pass a State examination in general knowledge and to study theology for three years at a German University; it placed Church seminaries under State inspection; and it ordered the compulsory notification of all ecclesiastical appointments. The Jesuits had been excluded from the Empire

1 An allusion to the submission which the Emperor Henry IV. made to Pope Gregory VII. in 1077.
as early as 1872, and in 1875 all religious Orders were dissolved.

There was now open war between the Government and the Catholic hierarchy. Pope Pius IX. condemned the 'May Laws' root and branch, and out of ten thousand Roman Catholic priests in Prussia barely thirty submitted; while in eight hundred parishes religious services were no longer held. During these years Bismarck was in alliance with the National Liberals, whose support gave him a clear parliamentary majority for his measures. But, owing to his abandonment of Free Trade, a schism took place between the Chancellor and his former allies, and Bismarck began to draw near to the Conservative party. He therefore felt the need of conciliating the Catholic Centre, and one by one began to repeal the anti-clerical legislation. His withdrawal from the position which he had taken up at the height of the Kulturkampf was facilitated by the accession of a new Pope, Leo XIII. (1878–1903). The net result of the struggle was thus a victory for the Catholic clergy, who regained a large measure of the power of which Bismarck had vainly endeavoured to deprive them.

In abandoning the conflict with the Roman Catholic Church Bismarck was largely moved by the desire to reserve all his energy for combating a new and more insidious foe, which challenged the very basis of the structure he had so laboriously built up. The years in which the Prussian statesman was adroitly laying the foundations of a great military monarchy gave birth to a mighty revolutionary force of immeasurable significance. The founders of Social-Democracy in Germany were Karl Marx, who supplied the working classes with a creed (Capital), and Ferdinand Lassalle, who furnished them with an organization (The Universal German Working Men's Association). The progress of the movement showed its hold on the German people. In 1877 the Social-Democratic party counted nearly half a million adherents, and this startling revelation of their strength precipitated the inevitable crisis. Apart from its economic ideals, the Socialist programme involved the destruction of everything to which Bismarck had devoted his
life's work—the strengthening of monarchical institutions against parliamentary encroachment, and the establishment of the German Empire on the basis of 'militarism.' As Prince Bülow, a successor of Bismarck, afterwards wrote: "In the German Empire Prussia is the leading State. The Social-Democratic party is the antithesis of the Prussian State. . . . It will have nothing to do with German patriotic memories which bear a monarchical and military character."1 Accordingly, in 1878, Bismarck entered upon a policy of violent repression, and carried through the Reichstag a measure which aimed at the wholesale ruin of the Social-Democrats. It prohibited all societies, meetings, and publications intended for the propaganda of Socialist principles, and authorized the police to deport any suspected person. During the twelve years in which this Act remained in force no less than 1400 publications were suppressed; 900 persons were deported, and 1500 were condemned to prison. These measures, which robbed the working classes of their political birthright, were powerless to check the spread of Socialism, and in 1890 the party polled a million and a half votes; while on the eve of the war of 1914–18 there were four million German Socialists—embracing one-third of the electorate—though their political influence was rendered negligible because German ministers were not responsible to Parliament.

Bismarck was not content to rely solely upon coercion as the means of stamping out the Socialist movement. He was quick to recognize that the strength of the Social-Democratic party lay in the grave economic disabilities with which the industrial classes are burdened, and he sought therefore to wean the masses from their attachment to Socialist doctrines by a policy of remedial legislation. Thus Bismarck was led by force of circumstances to embark upon a system of State Socialism, and his ability to carry out great social experiments in the teeth of all the traditions of laissez-faire was a remarkable tribute to his will-power and masterful personality. The theory that the only function of the State is to serve as the policeman of society was now discarded in favour of a more enlightened view as to the

1 Imperial Germany, pp. 188, 190.
scope and purpose of the State. As early as 1872 certain German economists, who were known as 'Socialists of the professorial chair' and included in their ranks the distinguished economic historian, Schmoller, had founded a Union for Social Politics in which they advocated State intervention in economic affairs. These men helped to mould public opinion and to prepare the way for an epoch-making departure from the tenets of the Manchester School. The praise which Lord Morley has bestowed on Richard Cobden may not unfairly be given to Bismarck in his character of State Socialist. "Great economic and social forces flow with a tidal sweep over communities that are only half-conscious of that which is befalling them. Wise statesmen are those who foresee what time is thus bringing, and endeavour to shape institutions and to mould men's thought and purpose in accordance with the change that is silently surrounding them."¹ The Message from the Throne in November 1881 asserted in memorable terms the obligation of the State to improve the condition of the labouring classes, and its moral duty to remove social evils and to "promote in positive ways the well-being of all its members and more especially of the weak." In pursuance of the doctrine here enunciated, the German Government brought in laws for the insurance of workmen against sickness (1883), against accident (1884), and against old age and incapacity (1889). These laws affected in 1914 as many as twenty million people, and the principles they embody came to be widely adopted in other countries. But in so far as they were devised by Bismarck with the idea of allaying discontent and wrecking the Social-Democratic party, they can scarcely claim any appreciable measure of success. Social-Democracy grew in Germany by leaps and bounds, and in its ultimate triumph was believed to lie the best hope for the future political transformation of the German Empire.

¹ Morley, The Life of Richard Cobden, ad fin.
Prussian War it seemed as though the whole Continent was about to be united by a common commercial system, and that "the stream of freely exchanging commodities" would, "like the Oceanus of primitive geography, encircle the whole habitable world." The Free Trade movement, victorious in England, had rapidly gained adherents in Continental States, and in the 'seventies Germany became virtually a non-protectionist country. In Bismarck's eyes a "war of cannon-balls" was not so great an evil as a "war of tariffs," and in the negotiations for peace with France he expressly stipulated for the resumption of commercial relations on lines laid down in the commercial treaty of 1862. Nevertheless, eight years later, he recanted his earlier convictions and effected fiscal changes of the most sweeping character. In 1879 he imposed a tariff on foreign corn and foreign commodities. The protective duty on grain was at first light, but afterwards it was greatly increased. The result, while it benefited the agricultural interest, was to alienate the industrial classes and stimulate the growth of Social-Democracy.

It is difficult to determine the precise motives which led Bismarck to throw overboard his Free Trade principles. The German Empire had no separate finances, and depended mainly on the contributions of the federated States. One object of the reform of the customs, therefore, was to create for the Imperial Government independent sources of revenue, and relieve it of the necessity to "beg at the door of the States." The demand for the protection of home industries received also a powerful impetus from the grave economic crisis which overtook Germany in the years 1874-1879. The immense war-indemnity extorted from France resulted in a fever of speculation and over-production, and the economic life of the country suffered severely from the inflation of the currency. Viewed from the broadest standpoint, however, the reaction from Free Trade in Germany was the inevitable sequel of that narrow idea of nationality which now unhappily dominated the German mind. The true conception of nationality has been formulated by

1 Morley, op. cit. (ed. 1910), 808.
Mazzini: “In principle, nationality ought to be to humanity that which division of labour is in a workshop—the recognized symbol of association; the assertion of the individuality of a human group called by its geographical position, its traditions, and its language, to fulfill a special function in the European work of civilization.” The very antithesis of this conception is the belief that the conflict of nationalities “is a law of life and development in history.”¹ The corollary of the German view of nationality is Mercantilism, the system of national policy which interprets progress in terms of Power and jealously seeks to combat the progress of other States. But whatever the reason, the result of the abandonment of Free Trade was to deepen the cleavage which divided the nations of Europe, and to retard their harmonious co-operation in “the European work of civilization.”

After the overthrow of the Napoleonic Empire the international situation was completely changed. Europe found that she had lost a mistress, but had gained a master.² The centre of European gravity shifted from Paris to Berlin; and under the guidance of Bismarck the German Empire established a virtual hegemony over the Continent. This result was achieved not by an ostentatious parade of armed force, but by the exercise of those diplomatic qualities in which the great Chancellor showed himself without a peer. Upon his fall from power in 1890, German foreign policy assumed a new direction, and William II. and his advisers embarked upon the adventurous and perilous course of Weltpolitik. The prudence and foresight of Bismarck’s policy appear all the more striking in the light of subsequent developments.

The Franco-Prussian War left behind it embittered memories. The French people refused to accept the verdict of Sedan as final, or to regard the loss of Alsace-Lorraine as irrevocable; and their hopes for the future were expressed in the single word revanche. Hence, as a German historian

¹ Bulow, Imperial Germany, 240.
has remarked, "from the very outset the new structure of the German Empire was burdened as it were by a French mortgage, since every foreign foe could henceforth reckon unconditionally on French support." Bismarck's own attitude towards France was set forth in a letter to the German ambassador at Paris: "We want France to leave us in peace." He harboured no ill-feelings towards the young Republic; and in the hope of diverting the thoughts of the French nation from a war of retaliation, and turning away their eyes from "the gap in the Vosges," he even sought to occupy them with colonial enterprises. But he was well aware at heart that the breach between the two countries was irreparable; and the unexpected rapidity with which France recovered from the disasters of 1870, coupled with the swift reorganization of her military forces, gave additional weight to the warning publicly uttered by Moltke. "We have earned in the late war respect, but hardly love. What we have gained by arms in six months we shall have to defend by arms for fifty years." In these circumstances Bismarck bent all his energies to the task of isolating France in Europe. "We have to prevent France finding an ally," he wrote. "As long as France has no allies she is not dangerous to Germany."

It was in the successful accomplishment of this design that the German Chancellor revealed his consummate statecraft. Germany had now attained the period of 'satiation' (1871–1890); when, flushed with her military triumphs and territorial acquisitions, she was content to rest on the laurels she had gained. Abandoning the aggressive policy which had now served its purpose to the full, and alive to the necessity of disarming the fears of Europe aroused by the victories of Königgrätz and Sedan, Bismarck had henceforth no other aim than to safeguard the Empire from attack. Throughout the course of the Franco-Prussian War his mind had been haunted by the fear that a European coalition would intervene at the last moment to wrest the fruits of victory from his grasp. Italy, as he was well aware, was bound by ties of gratitude to the French people; Austria meditated revenge for her expulsion from the Germanic
Confederation; and even Russia, whose friendship at this critical moment alone saved Germany from Austrian intervention, was becoming uneasy at the sudden rise of a great military Power on her flank. At the time circumstances had favoured Prussia, and she was left free to wreak her will upon France. But the danger of an anti-German coalition still remained, and Bismarck set to work to build up a strong defensive position and to convert the potential enemies of the new Empire into its firm allies. His adroit tactics achieved the end he had in view. In his overtures to Austria he reaped the benefit of the statesmanlike moderation with which he had treated her in the hour of triumph. The Habsburg monarchy ceased to cherish the hope of regaining its former ascendancy in Germany; it was fast becoming an Eastern Power and finding an outlet for its ambitions in the Balkan Peninsula. In its trend eastward it needed the support of Germany against the Slav races, for Russia in particular was not likely to view with equanimity Austrian intervention in a sphere marked out as her own preserve.

At the outset Bismarck also managed to effect a good understanding with Russia. From the earliest years of the nineteenth century Prussia and Russia had maintained intimate relations, and the personal friendship existing between Emperor William I. and his nephew, the Tsar Alexander II., was a pledge of political concord. The prospects of a permanent alliance were strengthened by the fact that, however divergent their interests in other directions, on one point their interests were identical. It was an easy task for Bismarck to persuade Austria and Russia that the revolutionary unrest manifested in the Paris Commune, German Social-Democracy, and Russian Nihilism threatened the structure of autocracy in all monarchical countries alike. He exploited the fears of the Conservative Powers in order to build up another Holy Alliance. In 1872 the three Emperors met at Berlin and entered into a political understanding, though there was apparently no written agreement. This 'understanding,' or entente, is usually known as the League of Three Emperors, but the term is misleading.
No actual treaty was concluded, but the three Eastern Powers agreed to work together for "the maintenance of the boundaries recently laid down, the settlement of problems arising from the Eastern Question, and the repression of revolutionary movements in Europe." The German Chancellor was able to say with truth: "I have thrown a bridge across to Vienna, without breaking down that older one to St. Petersburg." The visit of King Victor Emmanuel to Berlin in the following year was a token of Italy's friendly attitude; and the isolation of France was thus rendered complete.

The re-opening of the Eastern Question in 1875 introduced a new factor into the situation. The German Chancellor had deprecated any rivalry between Russia and Austria "over the fragments of nations that people the Balkan Peninsula," but the old conflict of interests was revived by the rising in the Herzegovina. At the Congress of Berlin (1878) Germany co-operated with Austria, which was allowed to occupy Bosnia; and Russia was violently incensed at the 'ingratitude' of the Power to whom she had rendered signal services in 1870. The entente of the three Emperors was rudely shattered, and the Russian Government demanded that Bismarck should withdraw his support from Austria or forfeit the friendship of Russia. The result was a re-grouping of the Powers. Russian statesmen began to make overtures to France, while the German Chancellor concluded a formal alliance with the Austrian Empire (1879). The Austro-German Treaty, whose terms were not disclosed till 1887, provided that if either Austria or Germany were attacked by Russia, they would assist each other with all their forces; but in the event of an attack by any other Power, the allied country would remain neutral unless the attacking Power received Russian support. Bismarck thus reversed the traditional course of Prussian foreign policy, substituting an Austro-German alliance for the friendship of Russia. His policy was acceptable to the nation at large, which was bound to Austria by ties of blood, and would have shrunk from a union with the Slav races against their kinsfolk as "a moral impossibility."
The accession of Italy to the Austro-German Alliance converted it into a Triple Alliance. It was a master-stroke of policy on Bismarck's part to include the southern kingdom in the Germanic constellation, and drive through Central Europe a wedge which interposed an insuperable barrier to the effective union of the extremities. The achievement was the more remarkable since the Latin State had nothing in common with the Teutonic Powers, one of which blocked the path to the complete unification of the Italian race. The memories of Austrian oppression were still fresh in the minds of the people, and the hostility to Austria was fanned by the Irredentist agitation. The Italia Irredenta movement for the 'redemption' of the Tyrol and other Italian-speaking districts could only attain its end at the expense of the Habsburg monarchy. Hence the Triple Alliance had in it no elements of real permanence; in the words of an Italian historian it was "tacitly accepted, but not loved," and it was scarcely likely to survive the strain of a European war. Bismarck himself, although he strove to effect a rapprochement with Italy, entertained great doubts as to the possibility of success. As late as 1880 he wrote: "We have much more ground to fear that Italy will join our adversaries than to hope that she will unite with us, seeing that we have no more inducements to offer her." Yet two years later (May 1882) Italy entered the Triple Alliance for a term of five years; and the compact was renewed at intervals. Two reasons in the main account for Italy's association with the Central Powers. To begin with, the occupation of Rome had created a feud between the Vatican and the Quirinal which endangered the stability of the Italian monarchy. The Papacy refused to be reconciled to the extinction of its temporal power, and the recrudescence of clericalism under the Third Republic kept alive the fear that French bayonets might once again restore Papal rule in Rome. This danger gradually passed away as the clerical party in France lost ground, but an evil destiny conspired to keep apart the two sister Latin nations. As the presence of French soldiers in Rome had served to retard for ten years (1860–70) the completion of Italian unity, so
the French seizure of Tunis in 1881 baulked Italian plans for expansion in North Africa. Italy, forestalled by French diplomats and disappointed in her colonial ambitions, threw herself into the arms of Germany, and nourished bitter resentment against France, which was also fed by a tariff war. At the end of the century a better state of feeling grew up, and the French ambassador at Rome voiced the feelings of both countries when he declared, in 1902, "that a conflict between the two Latin nations was no longer possible."

In spite of his intimate connexion with Austria, Bismarck sought to preserve friendly relations with Russia. In his hands the Triple Alliance was not an aggressive instrument excluding all possibility of goodwill towards other Powers; and he steadily maintained a Conservative attitude in European politics. It was an axiom of his policy to keep France and Russia apart. The Treaty of Tilsit, in which Napoleon and Alexander I. joined hands in order to rule the world between them, had proved short-lived, but the danger of its renewal on a more solid basis had been ever present to the minds of German statesmen from Metternich to Bismarck. So long as Bismarck controlled the destinies of Germany he was able to hinder a rapprochement between the Western Republic and the Eastern Empire. In 1884 the three Emperors met once again at Skiernewice, where they renewed their old understanding and agreed that if any one of them made war on a fourth Power, the other two would observe a friendly neutrality. This compact expired after three years, but it was revived in the form of a secret "Reinsurance Compact" between Germany and Russia.

The fall of Bismarck in 1890 modified the European situation; its immediate result was to liberate France from the isolation in which the veteran statesman had held her for two decades. The "Reinsurance Compact" came to an end in 1890, and William II., who had ascended the throne of Germany in 1888, refused to renew it. He thus abandoned one of the cardinal principles of Bismarckian statecraft, and so directly promoted the formation of the
Dual Alliance. Ever since the war of 1870 the current of events had been steadily flowing in the direction of an alliance between France and Russia. This had been advocated in the early part of the nineteenth century, notably by Richelieu and Polignac, ministers of the Bourbon kings. But the Polish insurrections of 1830 and 1863 rendered the idea of an understanding with Russia repugnant to the instincts of the French people, and it was only the inexorable logic of circumstances which gradually drew together the autocracy of the East and the democracy of the West. The loss of Alsace-Lorraine converted France into the irreconcilable enemy of Germany, and the desire to wipe out the stain of national humiliation overpowered every other consideration in her mind. She recognized also that a union with Russia would dissipate her dangerous isolation and afford a solid guarantee against an unprovoked attack on the part of her neighbours. On her side Russia had every motive to make advances to the French Republic. The rise of the German Empire had been a great blow to Russian pride, for the incontestable superiority of her military forces made Germany henceforth the predominant State in Europe. "We need a powerful France," became for the future a maxim of Russian policy; and in 1875 Russia and England had intervened to avert the danger of an outbreak of war on the Western front. It was the Eastern Question, however, now as always, which shaped the course of events. The rivalry of Austria and Russia in the Balkans forced Bismarck to display his hand, and the support which he gave to the Habsburg State was the real occasion of the breach between the Cabinets of Berlin and Petrograd. From this moment onwards an alliance between Russia and France was only a matter of time. In 1887 it was openly stated that "henceforth Russia will watch the events on the Rhine, and relegate the Eastern Question to the second place. The interests of Russia forbid her, in case of another Franco-German war, observing the same benevolent neutrality which she previously observed." The adroit statesmanship of Bismarck, combined with Alexander III.'s distrust of French democracy, continued for some years to
delay the Franco-Russian entente; but two circumstances hastened its final consummation. In 1888 French financiers came to the support of the Russian Government, and immense Russian loans, amounting within six years to £160,000,000, were successfully floated at Paris. In 1890 Bismarck fell from power, and his successors proceeded to inaugurate new lines of policy. The next year the French fleet visited Cronstadt and received an official welcome from the Tsar. A Russian squadron made a return visit to Toulon in 1893, and the Tsar and the President exchanged telegrams, the former alluding to "the bonds which unite the two countries." It is uncertain whether any definite agreement was concluded on this occasion; but at any rate there was now a Franco-Russian understanding. After the death of Alexander III., who entertained all his life an abiding hatred of Western institutions, the relations between France and Russia were placed on a firm basis, and the year 1895 witnessed the formal inauguration of the Dual Alliance.

The international situation at the close of the nineteenth century can best be described in the words of the famous rescript of the Emperor of Russia convening a Peace Conference at The Hague in 1898. "The preservation of peace has been put forward as the object of international policy. In its name the great States have concluded between themselves powerful alliances; the better to guarantee peace, they have developed their military forces in proportions hitherto unprecedented, and still continue to increase them without shrinking from any sacrifice. All these efforts, nevertheless, have not yet been able to bring about the beneficent results of the desired pacification. . . . In proportion as the armaments of each Power increase, do they less and less fulfil the objects which the Governments have set before themselves. Economic crises, due in great part to the system of armaments à outrance and the continual danger which lies in this accumulation of war material, are transforming the armed peace of our days into a crushing burden which the peoples have more and more difficulty in bearing. It appears evident, then, that if this state of things continues,
it will inevitably lead to the very cataclysm which it is
desired to avert, and the horrors of which make every think-
ing being shudder in anticipation."¹ This cataclysm was
suspended over the heads of the European peoples, like the
sword of Damocles, for nearly half a century, and all attempts
to effect a "reduction of the excessive armaments which
weigh upon all nations" were unavailing. The Hague
Conferences held in 1899 and 1907 accomplished useful
work, but the main purpose for which they were convoked
remained unfulfilled, and nothing was done in the way of
"putting a limit to the progressive development of the
present armaments." The countries of Europe found
themselves involved in a vicious circle from which there
seemed no outlet or possibility of escape. Every State
protested its love of peace, yet continued to prepare for war,
and justified its own 'defensive' preparations on the ground
of the 'hostile' preparations made by its neighbours. Of
the complex events which finally brought the 'Armed Peace'
to an end in 1914 and culminated in the First World War
(1914–18), a brief account is all that can be attempted here.
The two main threads which give the clue to these momentous
developments are (I.) the Eastern Question, and (II.) the
Weltpolitik of the German Empire.

I. After the Congress of Berlin (1878) the Eastern
Question remained dormant for thirty years. The energies
of Russia were absorbed in the Far East; Austria was
occupied in consolidating her hold upon Bosnia; while the
young Balkan States were slowly and painfully learning to
solve the domestic problems incidental to their national
growth. Throughout this period the destinies of Turkey
were in the hands of Abdul Hamid II. (1876–1909), whose
astute diplomacy played on the jealousies of the European
Powers and skilfully averted the danger of concerted action
between them. The weakness of the Ottoman State had
long been a commonplace in the Chancelleries of Europe,
just as its methods of government had long been a byword;
and on three occasions in the nineteenth century the Turkish
Empire seemed on the point of dissolution.² On each

¹ Holla, The Peace Conference at the Hague, 3.
² 1829, 1856, 1878.
occasion Turkey managed to weather the storm, but not without suffering loss of territory, and her dominions in Europe steadily diminished. At the end of the century it was no less evident than it was at the beginning that the Turk was very ill; and to those who looked beneath the surface there were unmistakable signs that the process of disintegration was still at work. To remedy this condition of affairs a party of Turkish reformers, imbued with Western ideas, sprang into existence. The programme of the 'Young Turks,' as they were called, was both constitutional and national. Their aim was to breathe new vitality into the worn-out Turkish State, and maintain unimpaired the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. They carried on a secret propaganda in the army, and the Sultan suddenly found himself bereft of the instrument by which alone his despotism was supported. A bloodless revolution took place in Constantinople on July 24, 1908, and in order to save his throne Abdul Hamid restored the Constitution established in 1876 but afterwards abrogated. The new regime soon disappointed the hopes raised in Western Europe that Turkey had entered the ranks of constitutional States and would abandon the evil traditions of 'Abdul the Damned.' The experiment of constitutionalism proved an unqualified failure. "From the very beginning," remarks an eye-witness, "there was no honest and loyal effort made to apply even the most rudimentary principles of constitutional government. . . . The Young Turks, embodied in the 'Committee of Union and Progress,' merely continued the despotism of Abdul Hamid. They were far worse than Abdul Hamid, however, for they were irresponsible and unskilled."\(^1\) The root of the mischief, however, was that the Turks pursued a policy of aggressive nationalism—the very policy which has been the bane of Eastern Europe. "The Empire was to be regenerated, not by humanizing it, but by Ottomanizing it."\(^2\) Within a short space of time it was recognized that the revolution in Turkey not only affected the destinies of the nationalities ruled by the Ottoman State,

\(^1\) H. A. Gibbons, *The New Map of Europe* (1914), 174-5.
but also had a grave European significance. The Eastern Question suddenly entered on a new and acute phase, and the current of events then set in motion led directly to the outbreak of the war of 1914–18.

The first result of the Young Turk revolution was the annexation of Bosnia-Herzegovina on October 7, 1908. Austria-Hungary had been in occupation of the two provinces for over thirty years, and it must have been evident that she would never relinquish her grasp over them except at the point of the sword. Undeniably her constructive policy had effected great material improvement. She had created roads, railways, and public buildings, and a reasonable case could be made out in favour of Austrian administration by those who contend that order and good government "should be the aim of practical statesmen in the Near East rather than exclusive attention to the doctrine of nationalities." It is probable that the Dual Monarchy would have remained content with its virtual sovereignty over Bosnia without the formal repudiation of Ottoman suzerainty. But the rejuvenation of Turkey, and the militant nationalism of the Young Turks who were determined to establish their authority over all the races in the Empire, made Austria alarmed for the security of her Balkan possessions. Her action in changing the status of Bosnia necessarily wore an aggressive appearance. It was a breach of international law, and a direct challenge to the Serbian people. Serbia had always looked forward to the time when she should unite under her ægis the whole Serbian race, and her longing to possess the Serb provinces was deepened by the fact that they were necessary for her expansion to the sea. The action of Austria-Hungary dashed all her hopes of a great Serbian State to the ground, and her indignation knew no bounds. In the tension thus created the outbreak of war seemed imminent, for Russia encouraged the Serbs in their resistance. At length, in March 1909, the German Emperor openly intervened in 'shining armour' on the side of Austria, and the pressure which Germany brought to bear at Petrograd caused Russia to give way. The isolation of Serbia compelled her to bow her
head to the inevitable, and she was obliged to make a formal declaration of her submission to the will of Austria. Serbia declared that she was not affected in her rights by the situation established in Bosnia, and would "cease the attitude of protest and resistance which she has assumed since last October, relative to the annexation, and she binds herself further to change the direction of her present policies towards Austria-Hungary, and in the future to live with the latter in friendly and neighbourly relations." This ended the crisis; for the moment the danger of a European war had been averted by Russia's retirement from her championship of the Slavonic cause and by the humiliation of Serbia, but the aggressive activity displayed by the Central Powers was a portent of evil omen for the future.

In spite of the loss of Bosnia and the Herzegovina, the extent of the Ottoman Empire in Europe still remained considerable. It comprised Macedonia, Albania, Thrace, and the Sandjak of Novi Bazar which separated Serbia from Montenegro. The new constitutional regime effected no change, however, in the system of administration. Competent observers were led to conclude that "The Turk changes not; his neighbours, his frontiers, his statute-books change, but his ideas and his practice remain the same. He will not be interfered with; he will not improve." There have been many Turkish constitutions, but "written laws and institutions are merely temporary forms, almost disguises, which clothe for a time without really affecting the vital realities of Turkish rule." Sir Charles Eliot has also accounted for the survival of Turkey in the face of universal condemnation of her methods of government:

"The first requisite for an elementary knowledge of the Eastern Question is to understand that Turkey is quite unlike any other country in Europe. . . . In Turkey, not only is there a medley of races, but the races inhabit not different districts but the same district. Of three villages within ten miles of one another, one will be Turkish, one Greek, and one Bulgarian, or perhaps one Albanian, one Bulgarian, and one Serbian, each with their own language, dress,

1 *Turkey in Europe,* by 'Odysseus' (1909), 139.
and religion. Under favourable circumstances, eight races and languages may be found in a large town; Turks, Greeks, Jews, Armenians, Bulgarians, Serbians, Vlachs, and Albanians.

"Why do these remain each with their own language, customs, and ideals, not as survivals interesting to the learned, but as living realities whose bickerings and jealousies supply the daily round of Eastern politics?" The Turks "are usually thought of as a destructive force, and rightly; they have destroyed a great deal and constructed nothing. But in another sense they have proved an eminently conservative force, for they have perpetuated and preserved, as if in a museum, the strange medley which existed in South-Eastern Europe during the last years of the Byzantine Empire. Their idea of government has always been simply to take tribute and secure the permanent position of the Osmanli. This once recognized, they do not care to interfere with the manners and customs of their subjects, but treat them with a contemptuous toleration. Further, they gained their first footing in Europe in consequence of the dissensions of Europeans. They have always been numerically inferior to the aggregate of their subjects, and could hardly have maintained their rule had the latter ever been able to unite against them. They have thoroughly learned, and still daily put into practice with admirable skill, the lesson of divide et impera; and hence they have always done, and still do, all in their power to prevent the obliteration of racial, linguistic, and religious differences." ¹

Nowhere was the confusion of races greater than in Macedonia—the storm-centre of the Balkan Peninsula—and nowhere was the policy of 'divide and rule' pursued with more signal success. The racial problems of Macedonia have long been the despair of European diplomats. It is the debatable land to which all the Balkan States lay claim, and the mixture of races, religions, and languages contained in it defies analysis. Neither anthropology, nor language, nor history, enables us to decide whether Macedonia as a whole can fairly be described as Bulgarian or

¹ *Turkey in Europe*, by 'Odysseus' (1900), 16-18.
Serbian, but both countries have carried on a vigorous propaganda, linguistic and ecclesiastical, among the Macedonian races. The Porte fostered these racial divisions in order to preserve its authority in a land where Turks are a mere handful, and even Roumania was encouraged to recognize in the Kutzo-Vlachs their long-lost kinsmen. The Vlachs are a wandering race, and well-disposed towards the Turks owing to a happy understanding on fiscal matters. "When the tax-collector called, the inhabitants of the villages were never at home, and this simple arrangement was accepted by both parties." To add to the welter of races there is also a considerable Greek population in Macedonian towns. The general condition of Macedonia can better be imagined than described; it is hardly necessary to observe that misgovernment was rife. In the way of reform little or nothing was done, and though Commission after Commission of Inquiry came to curse, they all went back with pockets full of money and reports full of blessings.

As a result of the conflicting claims of the Balkan States, Macedonia became the crux of the Eastern Question. The land could not belong to every one, and until the rival claimants had settled the question to their mutual satisfaction, Turkey would continue to remain in possession. The prospects of a Balkan alliance against the common enemy appeared therefore infinitesimal, and yet for one brief moment the impossible was achieved, and to the astonishment of the world a Balkan League sprang into existence. The history of this League is still obscure; it is probable, however, that the Balkan Powers grew alarmed at the fact that the Young Turks were straining every nerve to strengthen their hold upon Macedonia, lest it should share the fate of Bosnia and slip for ever from their grasp. They were also encouraged by the Albanian uprising, and by the action of Italy in waging a war with Turkey for the possession

---

1 When the propagandist movement flagged, "a bomb would be thrown at, let us say, a Turkish official by an agent provocateur of one of the three" interested parties—Bulgars, Serbs, or Greeks——"inevitably resulting in the necessary massacre of innocent Christians by the ostensibly brutal but really equally innocent Turks, and an outcry in the European press": Forbes, Toynbee, Mitrany, Hogarth, *The Balkans*, 66.

2 'Odysseus,' op. cit. 416.

of Tripoli (1911), while Greece knew that only war would solve the Cretan Question. The Great Powers sought to intervene, and warned the Balkan States that they would "not admit, at the end of the conflict, any modification in the territorial status quo in European Turkey." But the rapid march of events completely upset all their calculations. In spite of their protest, war was declared on October 17, 1912. According to the plan of campaign formed by the allies, Bulgaria was to invade Thrace, where the main part of the Turkish army would be encountered, and Serbia and Greece were to take the field in Macedonia. Alike in Macedonia and Thrace the Turk met with overwhelming defeat. The Bulgarians captured Kirk Kilissé, won the great battle of Lulé Burgas (October 28–November 2), laid siege to Adrianople, and pressed on to Constantinople. The Greeks entered Salonika (November 9), and their fleet occupied the Ægean Islands; while the Serbians occupied Uskub (October 26), Monastir, and Ochrida (November 18–23). It seemed hopeless to continue the struggle any longer, and the Turkish Government showed itself ready to enter into peace negotiations. On December 3 an armistice was concluded, and two weeks later a Peace Conference commenced to hold its sittings in London. But the war-party at Constantinople gained the ascendency; and, as a result of a coup d'état, the Ministry of Kiamil Pacha was overthrown by Enver Bey, and the commander-in-chief of the army, Nazim Pacha, was assassinated. Hostilities were resumed, and three great Turkish fortresses fell in rapid succession. The Greeks captured Janina on March 5; the Bulgarians entered Adrianople on March 26, and Scutari was taken by the Montenegrins on April 22. In the Treaty of London (May 30, 1913), which ended the First Balkan War, Turkey ceded all her dominions in Europe west of the Enos-Midia line, and also the island of Crete.

No sooner was peace concluded than the allies began to quarrel over the division of the spoils. It is not easy to apportion the responsibility for the Second Balkan War; but it is at any rate clear that part of the guilt attaches to the Great Powers themselves. Austria and Italy were
resolved at all hazards to exclude the Serbs and Montenegrins from Albania, upon which they had themselves cast envious eyes, and in order to maintain peace the European Powers brought pressure to bear on the two Serbian States, compelling them to relinquish Albanian territory and in particular the fortress of Scutari. Albania was erected into an independent State, although it was a land hopelessly divided against itself. The hostile attitude of the Powers checked Serbia from gaining an outlet on the Adriatic, and in her disappointment she determined to seek compensation in Central Macedonia. In claiming a larger share of Macedonian territory than had been assigned to her in the original treaty of partition—namely, North Macedonia (Old Serbia)—the Serbian Government repudiated the compact into which it had entered with Bulgaria prior to the war (March 1912). On the other hand, Bulgaria was unwise, in the circumstances, in demanding her full pound of flesh, though it is fair to remember that she had borne the burden of the struggle against Turkey. But Bulgaria proceeded to put herself hopelessly in the wrong by an unprovoked and treacherous attack upon her allies (June 29, 1913). She apparently thought to intimidate them into submission, but the effect of her action was the very reverse. The Serbs and Greeks turned with fury upon their assailants, and were joined by the Roumanians, who seized the opportunity to assert their own claims upon Bulgaria. In the course of this fratricidal strife the Christian populations of the Peninsula showed that they had nothing to learn from the Turks in the way of massacres. The Bulgarians were forced to sue for peace, and the Treaty of Bucharest imposed a new settlement upon the Balkan peoples (August 10, 1913). Roumania, without justification, seized the Silistrian plateau—the districts of Dobrich and Silistria which are admittedly Bulgarian. Not only was her action entirely unprovoked, but “it was a crime that the Jews and Turks of the Bulgarian Dobruja, after years of relative toleration, should be flung back into the social degradation and political slavery of the Jews and Turks” under Roumanian sovereignty.1 Serbia annexed

1 L. W. Lyde, Some Frontiers of To-morrow (1915), 89.
Northern and Central Macedonia, including Uskub, Ochrida, and Monastir. Greece acquired South Macedonia, and a littoral on the Ægean Sea, extending as far as the River Mesta and containing the two ports of Salonika and Kavalla. Bulgaria received a large part of Thrace and Eastern Macedonia, with a few miles of Ægean coast, embracing the port of Dedeagach. It was estimated that as a result of the Treaty of Bucharest "well over a million of admittedly Bulgarian people are now under foreign rule in the Peninsula," while the loss of Kavalla deprived Bulgaria of a natural harbour vital for the economic development of her hinterland. At the same time the Turks refused to abide by the Treaty of London, and wrested from Bulgaria the town of Adrianople and a larger part of Thrace. Thus ended the Balkan Wars; and seldom in history have any wars changed their character so completely and so rapidly. "The Balkan War," it has been well said, "began as a war of liberation, became rapidly a war of annexation, and has ended, if all the charges are true, in being a war of extermination." We need add nothing to this description.

The Balkan settlement of 1913 sowed the seeds of the First World War (1914-18), for it was the determination of Austria-Hungary to tear up the Treaty of Bucharest which was responsible for her ultimatum to Serbia. To understand the grounds of the quarrel between the Dual Monarchy and the Serbian State, it will be well to bear in mind two fundamental facts: (1) At bottom the Eastern Question is an economic question. The expulsion of Austria from the Italian Peninsula diverted the course of her trade-routes from the Mediterranean to the Ægean. It left her with only a single port—Trieste on the Adriatic—and henceforth her cardinal aim was to obtain access to the Levant. The port of Salonika was the goal in the direction of which Austria-Hungary had long been striving, and for whose sake

---

1 L. W. Lyle, Some Frontiers of To-morrow (1915).106.
2 Sir Edward Grey, quoted in Nationalism and War in the Near East, by a Diplomatist (1915), 280.
3 It was announced in the Italian Chamber, December 5, 1914, that as early as August 9, 1913, Austria invited Italy to co-operate with her in a war against Serbia, but Italy refused.
she has been steadily advancing eastwards (*Drang nach Osten*); and the occupation of Bosnia was only the first stage upon the path which was to carry the Dual Monarchy through the very heart of the Balkan Peninsula. On this account the premature collapse of the Turkish Empire in Europe was extremely distasteful to Austria, and to her influence is largely to be ascribed the disruption of the Balkan League, which would have barred for ever the road to the East. The effect of the Second Balkan War proved widely different from what had been confidently anticipated at Vienna and Budapest. It confirmed Greece in her possession of Salonika, and it planted Serbia in Central Macedonia, thus interposing an insuperable obstacle to the forward policy of the Germans and Magyars. To remove this obstacle was therefore one of the underlying motives of the war of 1914–18. (2) Nevertheless, this was but one aspect of the problem. The root of the trouble between Vienna and Belgrade lay in the fact that Austria came to regard Serbia in the light of a potential Piedmont; and the real issue involved was nothing less than the future of the Slav provinces of the Austrian Empire. More momentous than her territorial gains was the immense prestige which Serbia had acquired as a result of her victories. She was suddenly converted "from a peasant community to the political nucleus of a South Slav Confederacy," 1 for in the Balkan sun the Serbs of Hungary now saw the dawn of their day. 2 Austria-Hungary began forthwith to reap the fruits of her misdirected policy. On the one hand, the racial tyranny of the Magyars was responsible for that deep-rooted discontent among the Hungarian Slavs, which made them so susceptible to a Pan-Serb propaganda in favour of union with Serbia. On the other hand, the refusal of the Austrian Government to allow the aggrandizement of Serbia in Albania inevitably diverted the stream of Serbian expansion towards its own Slavonic provinces, thus precipitating a conflict which might otherwise have been avoided.

1 *Nationalism and War in the Near East*, by a Diplomatist (1915), 347.
II. In its relation to the war of 1914–18, the Near Eastern Question was only a phase—though a vital one—of a larger movement—the Weltpolitik of Germany. The issues involved in a conflict which developed into a world war did not merely concern the future balance of power in the Balkan Peninsula; the whole question was raised as to the position which the German Empire should occupy in the world of to-morrow. This was the broad historical significance of the First World War; and it served to account for the grim tenacity and unswerving determination of those who were engaged in it.

Without attempting to pass judgment upon the wisdom of German foreign policy between 1890 and 1914—for all judgment pronounced by contemporaries must lay itself open to the reproach of partiality—two things may be safely postulated. In the first place it was a repudiation of the policy pursued by the founder of the German Empire; and Prince Bülow has acknowledged that "voices were raised in protest" when the successors of Bismarck "trod the new paths of international politics, for it was considered a mistake to depart from the approved ways of Bismarck's Continental policy." ¹ In the second place it was bound, sooner or later, to bring Germany into collision with other European Powers. In the absence of authentic evidence the historian is groping in the dark when he seeks to lay bare the secret springs of modern diplomacy, and to elucidate the real meaning of contemporary events. Nevertheless the main tendencies of German development (1890–1914) seem unmistakable.

We have already given some account of Bismarck's prudent and statesmanlike policy during the first twenty years of the Empire. The keynote of this policy was moderation. The Iron Chancellor was haunted all his days by the dread of hostile coalitions, and his heart was set on making the Empire secure from attack. In his hands the Triple Alliance was a weapon of defence, and even English statesmen welcomed its formation as a guarantee of European peace. The moment the reins of power fell from Bismarck's

¹ Bülow, op. cit. 11.
hands, an immediate change made itself felt in the conduct of affairs, and the train of events then set in motion led directly to the war of 1914-18. We may observe at this point that there is a striking parallel between France under Louis XIV. and Germany under William II. Under the guidance of her great statesman, Richelieu, France in the seventeenth century became the foremost Power in Europe, a position she achieved as the protector of the small States against the military domination of the Habsburgs. Louis XIV. spoilt the work of Richelieu by carrying it too far, and his aggressive policy combined all Europe in arms against him. In the same way the successor of Bismarck awakened universal apprehension as to his ulterior aims, and this apprehension was deepened by the fact that German nationalism, in the form of militarism, had developed into "the most dynamic force for political disturbance"¹ that existed. Hence what Bismarck had dreaded came to pass; and the instinct of self-preservation which united Greece against Sparta, and Europe against Louis XIV. and Napoleon, was now aroused against the military domination of Germany.

The history of German foreign policy after 1890 falls into two well-defined periods; in both the aims were fundamentally the same, but there was a marked difference of method. The dividing line is the Russo-Japanese War (1904), and the revelation of Russia's impotence to crush a small Asiatic Power relieved the German Government of the necessity for the caution it had hitherto displayed. The aims of German policy were usually expressed by the term Weltpolitik; and 'world-policy' means, if we accept the interpretation of a German historian, that "Germany has by degrees ceased to regard exclusively the Continent of Europe in framing her policy." This new development, we are told, is "no chance outcome of the personality of a monarch possessed by exuberant schemes of world-conquest, or of the excessive energy of ambitious statesmen, or even of the wild imaginings of small groups of Pan-German enthusiasts without political influence; rather, it forms

¹ Nationalism and War in the Near East, by a Diplomatist, 373.
part of that strong tide of evolution which irresistibly bore the German State out beyond the bounds of its earlier policy."¹ With the conception of Weltpolitik in the abstract, it is hardly possible to quarrel. It is a commonplace that all the chief States of Europe have become World-States, that is, they possess vast territories outside Europe, and their policy is shaped by considerations not purely European. Germany had as much, or as little, claim as her neighbours to a share in the white man's burden—and 'the white man's plunder.' It was unfortunate for her that in the 'scramble for Africa' she was late in the field; but that was the fault—if a fault it was—of Bismarck, who discouraged the idea of colonial expansion. Still, Germany obtained South-West Africa, Togoland, and the Cameroons (1884), as well as New Guinea and the Pacific Islands; and she made more recent acquisitions. After the disappearance of Bismarck, the idea of a colonial empire was embraced with ardour; and it was claimed by Prince Bülow that at the bottom it was not "ambitious restlessness" which led Germany to imitate the Great Powers and embark upon a world-policy, but the exigencies of her economic situation. The industrial and commercial expansion of Germany between 1870 and 1914 was, indeed, most remarkable. Her population increased from 41 to 65 millions; her foreign trade more than trebled, rising from 300 to 950 millions; her mercantile shipping advanced by leaps and bounds; and she became preponderantly an industrial instead of an agrarian State. In short "industry, commerce, and the shipping trade have transformed the old industrial life of Germany into one of international industry, and this has also carried the Empire in political matters beyond the limits which Prince Bismarck set to German statecraft."² To obtain fresh and unrestricted markets for German manufactures thus became the fundamental aim of German statesmanship—the incentive to a German colonial empire, and the basis of all German political calculations.

¹ H. Oncken, "The German Empire" in Camb. Mod. Hist. xii. 168.
² Bülow, op. cit. 15.
The results of her first colonial experiments gave Germany small occasion for satisfaction. German colonies proved a source of financial weakness rather than strength to the mother country, and in any case they could not compare in extent or value with those in the possession of her European rivals. Confronted with the fact that the best part of the world was already parcelled out, and that fresh colonies could only be gained at the point of the sword, Germany endeavoured to build up a sphere of commercial influence in other directions. The primary aim of German Weltpolitik was the desire to dominate the Near and Middle East. Bismarck had treated the whole Eastern Question as not worth the bones of a single Pomeranian grenadier, and at the Congress of Berlin he was content to play the part of "honest broker," without reaping any advantages from the settlement then concluded. Over the mind of his successor, on the other hand, the Levant exercised an irresistible fascination, and the Drang nach Osten—the advance eastwards—opened up a new vista fraught with untold possibilities. As British influence at the Porte declined, Germany ostentatiously came forward as the champion of the Ottoman Empire and the Moslem creed. "The three hundred million Mohammedans who live scattered over the globe may be assured of this, that the German Emperor will be their friend at all times." This utterance (1898) seemed to disclose the intention of William II. to utilize the fighting power of Islam in the coming struggle for the mastery of the Orient; and the 'peaceful penetration' of Asiatic Turkey was henceforth the outstanding feature of Germany's commercial expansion. Apart from considerations of world-power, the exploitation of Asia Minor was widely advocated on economic grounds. The well-known economist, Friedrich List, had a long time before recommended colonization in the valley of the Lower Danube; and the vast fertile regions of Asia Minor and Mesopotamia offered a still more tempting field for German enterprise. "Here was a wide area, unoccupied or occupied only by wandering tribes or semi-civilized peoples, under the nominal sway of a decadent Power.
Here the superfluous population of Germany might be disposed in promising settlements; German capital could be profitably employed in railways and irrigation works, in mining and agriculture; increasing prosperity would provide growing markets for German produce; a country rendered fit for husbandry and possessing untold mineral wealth would supply raw materials for manufacture and food for the toiling millions at home. To these economical incentives were added the political and other advantages to be drawn from a close connexion with Turkey. Financial and economic control over Turkey, European and Asiatic, meant not only the chance of utilizing excellent military material which, under German tuition, could be formed into a first-rate army; it meant also the control of South-Eastern Europe and the Eastern Mediterranean, the command of the Danube from source to mouth . . . the practical possession of Bagdad, and a road to the Persian Gulf; whence it would be easy to bring pressure to bear not only on Persia but on Russian territory east of the Caspian, and even on India.”

All these dazzling possibilities were foreshadowed in the far-reaching scheme for the Bagdad Railway, which was intended ultimately to connect Berlin with the Persian Gulf. The scheme was started in 1888, when Turkey allowed a railway to be constructed from Ismidt (east of Constantinople) to Angora under German auspices, but the project of its extension to Bagdad and the Persian Gulf only took definite shape in 1903.

The conception of a world-policy involved as its corollary the creation of a powerful navy. The victories of Königrätz and Sedan familiarized the German people with the fatal notion that war was “a radical medicine for the ills of State,” and would always cut the tangled knot of all their national difficulties. Prussia had been made by war—her only industry, Mirabeau has said, is war—and she had made Germany by war. It was therefore in accordance with her traditional methods that, in the pursuit of her new aims, Germany should wish to forge a new weapon and

---

1 G. W. Prothero, *German Opinion and German Policy before the War* (1916), 31-2.  
2 Treitschke, *Political Thought*, ed. Davis (1914), 148 seq.
attain her objective by 'blood and iron.' To the ostensible purpose with which the German Navy was originally formed no objection could well be raised. "We are now vulnerable at sea," wrote a German Chancellor. "We have entrusted millions to the ocean, and with these millions the weal and woe of many of our countrymen. If we had not in good time provided protection for them... we should have been exposed to the danger of having one day to look on defencelessly while we were deprived of them... We should have been placed in the position of being unable to employ and support a considerable number of our millions of inhabitants at home. The result would have been an economic crisis which might easily attain the proportions of a national catastrophe." But there seemed good ground for apprehension that the real motive which prompted the rapid growth of a war-fleet was the desire to challenge Great Britain's supremacy of the seas. It was scarcely possible to entertain any other view after the open avowal in 1900 that "Germany must have a battle-fleet so strong that, even for the adversary possessing the greatest sea-power, a war against it would involve such dangers as to imperil his position in the world." The result was to inaugurate an era of acute naval rivalry between Germany and Great Britain, which poisoned the relations of the two countries and helped to provoke the First World War (1914-18).

The Russo-Japanese War (1904) affected profoundly the whole course of international politics—destroying for the time being the 'Balance of Power' on which had rested the European system. Hitherto the policy of the German Emperor had been cautious and restrained; but for the future he was to display greater self-assertion and to stimulate the warlike ardour of the German nation. The Triple Alliance was converted into an instrument of aggression, and the next ten years—a period never free from international complications—witnessed a succession of crises which on more than one occasion brought Europe to the brink of war. In order to appreciate the significance of the conflict between Russia and Japan, we must remember
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that in the nineteenth century Russia enjoyed enormous military prestige owing to the part she had played in the overthrow of Napoleon. The Crimean War showed that her strength was more imposing in appearance than in reality; none the less it was a cardinal principle of Bismarck’s policy to maintain a good understanding with his Eastern neighbour, and the fear of Russia served as a wholesome check upon the activities of William II. But when the vast autocratic Empire was worsted by a young Asiatic State, “whose people fifty years before fought with bows and arrows,” the effect on the European situation was far-reaching. Russia suffered immense losses of men; and she also lost valuable territory, the fortress of Port Arthur, and two fleets; but more disastrous than the material results of the war was the deadly blow to her prestige. She was still further weakened by domestic disturbances, and for the present therefore she was powerless to oppose resistance to the aggressive designs of the Central Powers.

Another result of the Russo-Japanese War was to draw England and France closer together. The British Government welcomed an opportunity to renounce the ‘splendid isolation’ which had hitherto been the keystone of its policy. This momentous deflection in its traditional attitude was due to the anxiety felt during the Boer War lest a European coalition should be formed against us. The fear was probably ill-founded, for a European coalition against Great Britain was manifestly impossible while Germany maintained her grasp upon Alsace-Lorraine. “The irreconcilability of France,” observes Prince Bülow, “is a factor that we must reckon with in our political calculations. It seems to me weakness to entertain the hope of a real and sincere reconciliation with France, so long as we have no intention of giving up Alsace-Lorraine. And there is no such intention in Germany.”¹ Having resolved to secure an ally on the Continent, the choice for Great Britain necessarily lay between the Triple Alliance and the Dual Alliance. It has been said that for a time it was doubtful whether we

¹ Bülow, op. cit. 69.
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would not gravitate towards the Triple Alliance. "Kinship and tradition seemed to beckon us towards Germany and Austria";¹ and with Germany this country had never been at war. But the personality of William II. inspired distrust, and other motives also prompted the decision of British statesmen in favour of the Dual Alliance. On her part France was no less ready to clasp hands with England. Now that the energies of Russia were paralyzed by her ill-fated struggle with Japan, the Republic was plunged back into the perilous isolation from which it had been rescued by the Dual Alliance. Colonial disputes which had hitherto kept the two Western Powers apart were amicably compromised under stress of the necessity for concerted action in European affairs. Great Britain acknowledged the claims of France to dominate Morocco, while in return France recognized the English occupation of Egypt; and rival interests in other directions were skilfully reconciled. Thus was formed the Anglo-French Entente (April 1904);² and incidentally its history serves to show how easy it is for nations to come together in friendship, when there is an honest desire to smooth away difficulties and to arrive at a modus vivendi. If half the wars of history have been the result of deliberate aggression, the other half can surely be traced to misunderstandings and jealousies which could have been composed without armed conflict had those concerned been peaceably inclined.

The strength of the Anglo-French Entente was soon to be tested in the Question of Morocco. For some years France had been engaged in the "peaceful penetration" of Morocco—the preliminary to its political annexation; and she entered into compacts with Italy (1900), Great Britain (April 1904), and Spain (October 1904), in order to gain a free hand in its affairs. Now it was not denied that France "had a special interest in the development of affairs in Morocco," on account of its proximity to her North African possessions and owing to the fact that French trade in
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Morocco exceeded that of England or Germany. On the other hand, Germany could claim with fairness that she also had important economic interests in Morocco; and she was entitled in virtue of the Treaty of Madrid (1880) not to be excluded from any settlement affecting its integrity. The case for intervention was reinforced by her insistence that colonial expansion was vital to Germany, and the disposal of a vast new province was therefore not a matter which only concerned the Western Powers. But the peremptory manner in which Germany asserted her right to be heard aroused serious alarm; and the menacing attitude she assumed was evidently inspired by the great defeat of Russia at the battle of Mukden (March 1-10, 1905). On March 31 the German Emperor landed at Tangier, and proclaimed "in unequivocal language" the independence and sovereignty of Morocco. This was a challenge to France, but the French Government was unprepared for war, and in spite of the opposition of M. Delcassé, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, it accepted the German demand for an international Conference. Delcassé thereupon resigned; and the Conference met at Algeciras. After lengthy negotiations in which the danger of war was brought very near, the Convention of Algeciras (April 7, 1906) patched up a settlement. The sovereignty of the Sultan was formally recognized; the police organization and National Bank were placed under international control; and the principle of the open door for all countries was reasserted. Nevertheless France was left free to proceed with her 'peaceful penetration.' "We are neither victors nor vanquished," said the German Chancellor in his review of the situation. Germany had succeeded in forcing the Western Powers to substitute an international settlement for what she regarded as "the one-sided arrangement between England and France"; and she had also asserted her claim for consideration in "an affair of great international importance." But in so far as Morocco was intended to be a test of the stability of the Anglo-French Entente, then the German Government failed completely to sever the connexion or to sow discord between the two countries. The historical significance of the Morocco crisis
thus lies in the fact that it was the first trial of strength between Germany and the Western Powers.

In the summer of 1911 the Morocco Question once more became acute. Owing to the anarchy in Morocco a French army occupied the capital (Fez). This was interpreted by Germany as a sign that France intended to proclaim a protectorate, and a German cruiser, the Panther, was dispatched to Agadir (July 1, 1911) on the pretext of looking after German interests. Whether Germany intended or not to annex Moroccan territory is disputed, but her action appeared to foreshadow a demand for a naval base at Agadir or Mogador. Great Britain intervened on the side of her ally, for apart from our obligations to France a German port on the Atlantic might have endangered the security of our commercial routes. The British Government therefore intimated that any attempt to ignore British interests "would be a humiliation intolerable for a great country like ours to endure"; and for some weeks the danger of armed collision seemed imminent. The reason which induced Germany to moderate her demands is very obscure. It is generally attributed to a financial crisis,1 but it is uncertain whether the German Government ever intended to force an issue over Morocco. Her real interests lay elsewhere; and, while she was prepared to go to war over the Eastern Question,2 she was evidently willing to compromise over the occupation of Africa. The upshot of the negotiations was that Germany recognized a French protectorate over Morocco (November 4, 1911), and France surrendered the north-west part of French Congo. These terms provoked great dissatisfaction in both countries, yet the principle of 'compensation' was not in itself inequitable. France, now in possession of the second colonial empire in the world, had gained a vast accession of territory in North Africa, as a set-off to which she had already made important concessions to other countries: to England in Egypt, to Italy in Tripoli, and to Spain in Tangier; and she now also made 'compensation' to Germany.

1 Rose, op. cit. 623; G. Murray, The Foreign Policy of Sir Edward Grey (1915), 76.
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The Agadir incident was followed by a great outburst of ill-feeling in Germany against 'the real enemy,' as England was called by the Conservative leader in the Reichstag, but gradually the tension seemed to relax. A strong attempt was made to improve Anglo-German relations, and to dispel by friendly discussion the mists of suspicion which had grown up between the two countries. It was stated by the English Prime Minister (December 6, 1911) that England had no secret engagement with any Power obliging her to take up arms, and he added: "We do not desire to stand in the light of any Power which wants to find its place in the sun. The first of British interests is, as it always has been, the peace of the world; and to its attainment British diplomacy and policy will be directed." The German Government was told that "we would in no circumstances be a party to any sort of aggression upon Germany." But the efforts for a friendly understanding with Germany made no headway; and the British Government (October 2, 1914) has accounted for their failure. "They asked us to pledge ourselves absolutely to neutrality in the event of Germany being engaged in war, and this, mark you, at a time when Germany was enormously increasing both her aggressive and defensive resources, and especially upon the sea. . . . To such a demand, but one answer was possible, and that was the answer we gave." While these negotiations were still pending, a fresh storm arose in the East, and the problem of the Balkans once more held the attention of the world. We have already dealt with the course of events which culminated in the aggrandizement of Serbia and the Greek acquisition of Salonika. These events, as we have seen, threatened the disruption of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, and with it the fundamental object of German policy—the Drang nach Osten. For her Eastern projects Germany in 1914, as in 1909, was prepared to go the length of war. On the earlier occasion Russia gave way to the Central Powers, but in 1914 she refused to leave Serbia to her fate, and the First World War (1914-18) was the sequel.